

Mid-Term Evaluation of the GEF Project:
Integrating Watershed & Coastal Areas Management
in Caribbean SIDS
(GEF-IWCAM)

GFL/6030-05-01

June/October 2009

Contents:

Abbreviations	ii
Executive Summary	iii
1 Introduction and Background.....	1
1.1 Background to GEF-IWCAM.....	1
2 Scope, objectives and methods.....	6
3 Project Performance and Impact with respect to GEF Evaluation Parameters....	8
3.1 (A) Attainment of objectives and planned results (progress to date).....	8
3.1.1 Effectiveness.....	9
3.1.2 Relevance.....	11
3.1.3 Efficiency:	12
3.2 (B) Assessment of sustainability of project outcomes.....	12
3.2.1 Financial resources.....	13
3.2.2 Socio-political.....	13
3.2.3 Institutional framework and governance.....	14
3.2.4 Environmental.....	15
3.3 (C) Achievement of outputs and activities	15
3.4 (D) Catalytic role and replication	16
3.5 (E) Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems	17
3.5.1 M&E design	17
3.5.2 M&E plan implementation	18
3.5.3 Budgeting and funding for M&E activities	18
3.5.4 Long-term monitoring.....	18
3.6 (F) Preparation and readiness	19
3.7 (G) Country ownership/drivenness.....	20
3.8 (H) Stakeholder involvement.....	20
3.9 (I) Financial planning.....	21
3.10 (J) Implementation approach	21
3.11 (K) UNEP/UNDP supervision and backstopping	22
4 Conclusions and rating.....	23
4.1 Summary	23
4.2 Evaluation Ratings.....	23
5 Lessons learned.....	29
6 Recommendations	32
Annex 1 TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	40
Annex 2 Mission programme.....	69
Annex 3 IWCAM – Persons met/interviewed.....	71
Annex 4 Documents and sources of information	73
Annex 5 Demonstration Project Questionnaire and Responses	74
Annex 6 Summary of the evaluator's expertise	100
Annex 7 Project Financing and Co-financing.....	101
Annex 8 Draft Project Assessment Rubric.....	105
Annex 9 Project Progress (APR/PIR 2008)	111
Annex 10 Project Outcomes / Outputs (APR/PIR 2008).....	113
Annex 11 Risk Factor Table.....	117

Abbreviations

APR/PIR	Annual Progress Report / Project Implementation Report
CARICOM	Caribbean Community of Nations
CAR-RCU	UNEP Caribbean Regional Co-ordination Unit / Secretariat of Cartagena Convention
CBD	Convention on Biodiversity
CC	Climate Change
CEHI	Caribbean Environmental Health Institute
EA	Executing Agency (CEHI, UNEP CAR-RCU and UNOPS)
ES	Environmental Status indicators
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GPA	Global Plan of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities
IA	Implementing Agency (UNEP and UNDP)
ISC	Inter-Sectoral Committee
IW	GEF International Waters
IW:LEARN	GEF International Waters: Learning Exchange and Resources Network
IWCAM	GEF Integrating Watershed and Coastal Areas Management in Caribbean SIDS
IWRM	Integrated Water Resource Management
LBS	Land-Based Sources Protocol under the Cartagena Convention
LME	Large Marine Ecosystems
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MEAs	Multi-lateral Environmental Agreements
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NEPA	National Environment and Planning Agency (Jamaica)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PCU	Project Co-ordination Unit
PI	Process Indicator
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RTAG	Regional Technical Advisory Group
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SRI	Stress Reduction indicator
STAP	GEF Scientific, Technical and Advisory Panel
THA	Tobago House of Assembly
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Executive Summary

Background

1. This report is the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the UNEP – UNDP GEF project Integrating Watershed & Coastal Areas Management in Caribbean (IWCAM) Small Island Developing States (SIDS).
2. Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS) have special conditions and needs that were identified for international attention in the Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States.
3. Key features of each regional SIDS International Waters (IW) project are expected to be improvements in integrated freshwater basin-coastal area management on each island of the regional groupings of SIDS, a multiple GEF focal area approach, testing of mechanisms to facilitate broad stakeholder participation, and a coordinated, approach among Executing and Implementing Agencies according to the comparative advantage of each agency.
4. The broad development environmental goal of this project is to achieve a sustainable balance between development and the protection/conservation of coastal and watershed resources by integration and coordination of management and planning approaches. Its goals also are consistent with those of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA) and support the principles of the Cartagena Convention and its protocol on Land-Based Sources (LBS).
5. The expected project outcome includes an overall national and regional reform in support of the IWCAM approach as a necessary and vital strategy for sustainable management and protection of coastal and watershed resources and to assist with LBS Protocol ratification/implementation.
6. The GEF-IWCAM project is wholly consistent with the International Waters Focal Area Strategy of GEF-4. The project is also consistent with GEF-4 Strategic Program 2: reducing nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion from land-based pollution of coastal waters in LMEs consistent with GPA as well as with Strategic Program No. 3 (Balancing Overuse and Conflicting Uses of Water Resources in Transboundary Surface and Ground Water Basins) through the improvement of IWRM and IWCAM protocols.
7. The GEF-IWCAM project is being implemented in partnership between UNEP and UNDP, and executed through the Caribbean Environmental Health Institute (CEHI), the Secretariat of the Cartagena Convention (UNEP CAR-RCU) and UNOPS.
8. The purpose of the MTE is to enable the Project Co-ordination Unit (PCU), the Executing Agencies, the Implementing Agencies and the thirteen participating governments to assess the progress and to take any necessary decisions on the emphasis of the project in its two remaining years.
9. By the Mid-Term Evaluation, the GEF-IWCAM project has:
 - Initiated 9 demonstration projects that will implement activities (including those related to stress reduction) for replication across the region;
 - Supported the on-going process of the ratification of the Land-Based Sources Protocol of the Cartagena Convention through a range of institutional

- strengthening (e.g. environmental monitoring and laboratory analysis), guidance (e.g. policy and legislation toolkit) and awareness raising activities;
- Developed a comprehensive series of indicators (process, stress reduction and environmental status) for use by the project;
- Established a well motivated and dedicated Project Co-ordination Unit to provide overall leadership to the GEF-IWCAM project and to offer regional guidance on the principles of the IWCAM concept that is recognised as an important asset across the region.

Conclusions and Ratings:

10. The GEF-IWCAM is a very significant project that will deliver important regional benefits and offer lessons to other SIDS globally. The integration of watershed and coastal area management is an innovative approach to GEF projects and is consistent with the objectives of the GPA and of the Cartagena Convention's LBS Protocol. The GEF-IWCAM project has been well designed and is being well implemented by a highly competent PCU with the support of the PSC and RTAG. The national demonstration projects, whilst delayed in their start, are mostly delivering expected work plans and are due for completion in June 2010. The participating countries are active in the PSC and the work of the Regional and national demonstration projects. The project has already generated good lessons applicable to other projects and programmes and the experience of two IAs working closely together could be an example for future partnership projects. The long-term perspective of the outputs and outcomes of this project are good with the reinforcing requirements of the LBS Protocol and the countries' National Environmental Action Plans.
11. The GEF-IWCAM project is rated overall as **Satisfactory**.
12. The project activities related to the relevance to global and regional priorities was considered to be **Highly Satisfactory**.
13. The implementation approach by the project, and specifically the work of the PCU, is rated as **Highly Satisfactory**.

Recommendations:

14. The GEF-IWCAM is a successful project at the time of the Mid-Term Evaluation (June 2009) and is expected to continue to be so. The project has already had a strong local / regional impact and received significant recognition for the work it is conducting. To-date most of the activity (as expected) has been devoted to establishing the project and implementing the key components which are now all established. In the 'second half' the focus of the project should move to the important issues of ensuring replication of the key successes in the region, assisting with the sustainability of the IWCAM 'concept' of integrating watershed and coastal area management and capturing the key lessons that have been learnt for other SIDS projects globally.
15. Twenty two recommendations are outlined and presented under the following headings:
 - Specific issues related to demonstration projects;
 - Replication and sustainability
 - Promoting IWCAM – regionally / globally
 - Other recommendations

1 Introduction and Background

16. This report is the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the UNEP – UNDP GEF project Integrating Watershed & Coastal Areas Management (IWCAM) in Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS).
17. The purpose of the MTE is to enable the Project Co-ordination Unit (PCU), the Executing Agencies (CEHI, UNEP CAR-RCU and UNOPS), the Implementing Agencies (UNEP and UNDP) and the thirteen participating governments to assess the progress and to take any necessary decisions on the emphasis of the project in its two and half remaining years. It is also an opportunity to begin the important process of capturing the good lessons learned and focusing the project on developing more detailed sustainability plans for the IWCAM activities.

1.1 Background to GEF-IWCAM

(i) Project rationale

18. Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS) have special conditions and needs that were identified for international attention in the Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States.
19. The overall objective of the IWCAM Project is to strengthen the commitment and capacity of the participating Caribbean countries to implement an integrated approach to the management of watersheds and coastal areas. The long-term goal is to enhance the capacity of the countries to plan and manage their aquatic resources and ecosystems on a sustainable basis. This will be addressed within the context of the currently limited economic opportunities, coupled with an urgent need for development and expansion of trade and commerce, within the Caribbean SIDS. In particular, project activities are focusing on improvements in integrated freshwater basin-coastal area management on each island of the regional grouping of Caribbean SIDS.
20. The project recognises the integrated and interlinked nature of watersheds and coastal areas in small islands and aims to develop a more sector-coordinated management approach, both at the national and the regional level, with a strong emphasis on an expanded role for all stakeholders within a participatory management framework. The project further recognises the constraints on such an integrated and sectoral-coordinated management approach within an environment which lacks applicable and cost-effective solutions to many of the primary threats and their root causes at the grass-roots level.
21. Paramount to addressing the lack of solutions available to SIDS on key issues such as island-based sources of pollution, water resource conservation and management, unsustainable land-use and inappropriate agricultural practices, etc. is the inclusion of a major project component delivering on-the-ground demonstrations targeted at national hotspots where specific threats to national, regional and global environmental amenities have been identified. These demonstrations stress the need for development of a cross- sectoral management approach and address the requirements for institutional and infrastructure realignment and policy reform; adoption of modalities for sectoral participation and coordination; capacity building; linkages to social and economic root causes of environmental degradation; and the overall need for sustainability. One of the critical requirements of these demonstrations is to develop

mechanisms for the replication of activities and for the transfer of best lessons and practices, both nationally and regionally.

22. In view of the urgency for policy and legislative reforms, alongside institutional improvements, the project is focusing one component specifically at these issues. In particular, high priority is being given to assisting the countries to meet the commitments required in the ratification process for important regional legal agreements such as the Cartagena Convention and its protocols (especially the Protocol on Land-Based Sources of Pollution).
23. Consequently, the project aims to demonstrate the development of an effective regional strategy for IWCAM, in parallel with demonstrating and replicating geographically targeted national solutions to common Caribbean SIDS issues, through a series of interconnected components that capture best practices and convert these into replicable actions.
24. The broad development environmental goal of this project is to achieve a sustainable balance between development and the protection/conservation of coastal and watershed resources by integration and coordination of management and planning approaches. Its goals also are consistent with those of the Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Activities (GPA)
25. The expected project outcome includes an overall national and regional reform in support of the IWCAM approach as a necessary and vital strategy for sustainable management and protection of coastal and watershed resources and to assist with LBS Protocol ratification/implementation.

(ii) Relevance to GEF Programmes

26. In its former Operational Programme 9: SIDS Component, the GEF recognised the unique water-related issues that are common to most SIDS, such as coastal area management and biodiversity, sustainable management of regional fish stocks, tourism development, protection of water supplies, land and marine-based sources of pollution, and vulnerability to climate change. Consequently, the GEF has agreed to support international waters projects that address the special conditions and needs of SIDS and include them. These projects are included in the operational programmes for the following reasons:
 - Integrated freshwater basin-coastal area management is essential for a sustainable future for these island states, and
 - This approach can produce benefits in other GEF focal areas, especially biodiversity, climate change and land degradation
27. The IWCAM project is wholly consistent with the International Waters Focal Area Strategy of GEF-4. It contributes to its Strategic Objective 1 (SO-1 – *To foster international, multi-state cooperation on priority water concerns*), and contributes to the initiation of actions consistent with its Strategic Objective 3 (SO-3), which seeks to play a catalytic role in addressing transboundary water concerns by, as mentioned above assisting countries to utilise the full range of technical assistance, economic, financial, regulatory and institutional reforms that are needed).
28. The project is also consistent with GEF-4 Strategic Program 2: (reducing nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion from land-based pollution of coastal waters in LMEs consistent with GPA) through (1) supporting national and local

policy, legal and institutional reforms to reduce land-based pollution and supporting key stakeholders with wastewater management therefore reducing stress onto coastal and marine environments and improving ecosystems functioning for increased livelihood of participating nations as well as with Strategic Program No. 3 (Balancing Overuse and Conflicting Uses of Water Resources in Transboundary Surface and Ground Water Basins) through the improvement of IWRM and IWCAM protocols.

29. The GEF-IWCAM is also an innovative test of the integration of coastal and freshwater management process across a large number of countries, which will provide examples of good practices and other lessons for replication.

(iii) Executing Arrangements

30. The project takes advantage of the opportunities for synergy and complementarity, recognising the comparative advantages of both Implementing Agencies, UNDP and UNEP. In particular, it takes advantage of the country presence of UNDP and the linkages between project activities and UNDP's country assistance strategies and the relationship between project activities and UNEP's Regional Seas Programme and International Environmental Conventions.
31. UNDP's specific expertise and value vis-à-vis its regional and country offices provides important support, especially to the Demonstration Projects. The project is co-executed by the Secretariat to the Cartagena Convention (UNEP CAR-RCU) and CEHI with the Secretariat assuming the role of lead Executing Agency.
32. The United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) also has an Executing Agency role in relation to the Demonstration Projects, on behalf of UNDP. The execution arrangements take advantage of the recognised expertise of CEHI in the field of freshwater resource management; and the Secretariat to the Cartagena Convention in matters related to the marine and coastal environment and in working in a multi-lingual environment. Both CEHI and CAR-RCU have long established relationships with the countries of the region. Sustainability of project benefits at the regional level will be enhanced through these arrangements.

(iv) Project Activities

33. The project duration was initially 60 months starting substantively in May 2006, when the Regional Project Coordinator assumed duties. The end date has been revised to be completed in July 2011.
34. The project has five components, which are outlined below together with the expected activities and outcomes (at the time of the approved Project Document):

Component 1: Demonstration, Capture and Transfer of Best Practices

- Implementation and management of 9 demonstration projects in 8 countries (see table below)
- Capture of lessons, best practices, alternative technologies from Demonstration Projects
- Development of national, regional and global replication strategies and mechanisms

Sub-component	Country	Title of demonstration project
A: Water Resource Conservation and Management	St. Kitts and Nevis	Rehabilitation and Management of the Basseterre Valley as a Protection Measure for the Underlying Aquifer
	St. Lucia	Protecting and Valuing Watershed Services and Developing Management Incentives in the Fond D'or Watershed Area of St. Lucia
B: Wastewater Treatment and Management	Antigua and Barbuda	Mitigation of Groundwater and Coastal Impacts from Sewage Discharges from St. John
	Bahamas - Exuma	Marina Waste Management at Elizabeth Harbour in Exuma, Bahamas
	Dominican Republic	Mitigation of Impacts of Industrial Wastes on the Lower Haina River Basin and its Coast
C: Land-use Planning, Zoning and Alternative practices	Bahamas - Andros	Land and Sea Use Planning for Water Recharge Protection and Management in Andros, Bahamas
	Trinidad and Tobago	Land-Use Planning and Watershed Restoration as part of a Focused IWCAM Demonstration in the Courland Watershed and Buccoo Reef Area
D: Targeted Model IWCAM	Cuba	Application of IWCAM Concepts at Cienfuegos Bay and Watershed
	Jamaica	An Integrated Approach to Managing the Marine, Coastal and Watershed Resources of east-central Portland

Outcomes: Demonstration of solutions/mitigations to specific threats to IWCAM. Distribution of best lessons/practices. Model guidelines for reforms. Replication in other hotspots.

Component 2: Development of IWCAM Process, Stress Reduction and Environmental Status Indicators Framework

- Review existing national and regional level indicator frameworks
- Development of template for national level Indicators
- Conduct hotspot diagnostic analyses at (non-demo) hotspots in each country
- Regional centre for storage of Indicator information and for Indicator training
- Pilot IWCAM process, stress reduction and environmental status indicators (1 country)

Outcomes: Process, stress-reduction, and environmental status indicators framework established. National and regional capacities for indicator monitoring enhanced.

Component 3: Policy, Legislative and Institutional Reform for IWCAM

- Review of national policy, legislation and institutional structures identifying barriers to IWCAM
- A set of regional guidelines for national policy, legislative and institutional reform
- Regional programme for amendment of national legislation and policy

Outcomes: National policies, legislation and institutional structures reformed to capture the requirements of regional and international MEAs and IWCAM in general.

COMPONENT 4: REGIONAL & NATIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING & SUSTAINABILITY for IWCAM

- National workshops on awareness and multi-sectoral sensitisation to IWCAM issues
- Stakeholder involvement in regional IWCAM
- Training and education activities
- A regional strategy for the sustainable promotion and implementation of IWCAM
- Project Networking
- A regional IWCAM Information Clearing House

Outcomes: Improved sensitisation, awareness and capacity toward IWCAM. A regional mechanism supporting IWCAM. Information networking plus a Partnership Forum to build working relationships. Information Clearing House. Stakeholders/civil society participation.

COMPONENT 5: PROJECT MANAGEMENT and COORDINATION

- Project Management by PCU
- Project Steering Committee to provide regional project policy level guidance
- National Inter-Sectoral Committees to capture IWCAM concepts at the national level
- Implementing Agency/Executing Agency Management Group
- Regional Technical Advisory Group (IWCAM technical advice to the PSC and PCU)
- Project Reporting on activities and outputs, and reviews of project work-plan and budget
- Project Evaluation ensure that indicators are measuring sustainable project success
- Develop an Information Management System for the project

(v) Budget

35. The total budget was US\$ 112.78M with US\$ 14.39M funded by the GEF Trust Fund and in-kind co-funding of US\$ 98.39M.

2 Scope, objectives and methods

36. This Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) has been addressed in accordance with the Terms of Reference (ToR) for this assignment (Annex 1). A mission was constructed by the GEF-IWCAM Project Co-ordination Unit (PCU) with the agreement of UNEP, UNDP, UNEP CAR-RCU and CEHI. The mission programme is included in Annex 2.
37. This report constitutes the combined outcome from discussions and meetings with a wide range of stakeholders (Annex 3) and reviews of project literature, including:
- Meetings with the Project Co-ordination Unit (PCU) in St Lucia;
 - Review of Project Steering Committee minutes, Regional Technical Advisory Group reports and project PIR/APR documents;
 - Visits to demonstration projects in St. Lucia, Jamaica and Trinidad & Tobago that were identified by the PCU and which were considered to be representative of the issues addressed by IWCAM
 - Interviews / email discussions with key stakeholders including project participants,
 - Discussions with IA staff from UNEP and UNDP;
 - Discussions with EA staff from CEHI, UNEP CAR-RCU and UNOPS
 - Discussions with GEF Secretariat
 - Review of available project literature (available on the IWCAM web site, www.iwcam.org) and correspondences (Annex 4).
 - A short email questionnaire distributed to all demonstration project managers and their responses (Annex 5).
38. The objective of this Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) was to assess operational aspects, such as project management and implementation of activities and the level of progress towards the objectives. The evaluation has assessed project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results.
39. The scope of the evaluation defined by the ToR was:
- Assessment of project assumptions, objectives and design
 - Project performance with respect to GEF Evaluation parameters
 - Attainment of objectives and planned results (progress to date)
 - Assessment of sustainability of project outcomes
 - Achievement of outputs and activities
 - Catalytic role and replication
 - Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system
 - Preparation and readiness
 - Country ownership / drivenness
 - Stakeholder participation / public awareness
 - Financial planning
 - Implementation approach
 - UNEP/UNDP supervision and backstopping
40. The results of the assessment of the above issues are summarised in a table and rated between Highly Satisfactory (HS) and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). In addition a performance table was prepared for the project (Annex 8) giving the objectives and outcomes, the indicators, and their means of verification (from the Project Logical Framework) with levels of performance for each category from HS

to HU. The expectation is that this performance table will be discussed and agreed during the next IWCAM Project Steering Committee¹ and will then be used as a rubric for assessing project performance during the Terminal Evaluation.

¹ The 4th PSC of IWCAM met on 15/16 October 2009 and agreed to refine the 'Rubric' through a small working group with a focus on addressing the only significant issue of LBS Ratification as an indicator of success. The PSC expects this to be completed by December 2009.

3 Project Performance and Impact with respect to GEF Evaluation Parameters

41. The following sections summarise the performance of the GEF-IWCAM project at the time of the MTE (May 2009). The complexity of the implementation and execution arrangements involving two IAs and three EAs, the co-ordination of 9 demonstration projects together with the involvement of 13 countries has already provided some important lessons.
42. The partnership between UNEP and UNDP on the implementation has been highly beneficial to the project. A key comparative advantage of UNEP has been the Regional Seas Programmes and providing the secretariat for the Cartagena Convention which is supported by the GEF-IWCAM activities but will also provide a mechanism to sustain the project's achievements in post-completion. UNDP's country assistance strategies and the presence of Country Offices have assisted with the implementation of the demonstration projects and in establishing inter-sectoral committees across the countries. These benefits of the two IAs being involved in this project are clear and an example for future collaborative projects.
43. The MTE reviewed the risks associated with the project and these are presented in Risk tables (Annex 11)

3.1 (A) Attainment of objectives and planned results (progress to date)

44. Overall the GEF-IWCAM project is progressing well with the only significant delay being the initial implementation of the 9 demonstration projects. These delays have largely been overcome and most projects are due for completion by June 2010 – one year before the end of GEF-IWCAM. The GEF-IWCAM project is rated **Satisfactory** with respect to attainment of objectives and planned results (planned to date).
45. The concept of IWCAM – integrating watershed and coastal area management – is highly innovative for GEF. Previous programmes addressed either river basins or coastal/marine management and integrating these is in-line with the *Global Programme of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-Based Activities* approach for reducing land-based pollution sources and their impacts on the marine environment. The project will provide valuable guidance to future GEF IW projects in general and to SIDS IW projects in particular. It will be important that these lessons are collected (from both the regional project and the local demonstration projects) and the benefits of integrating the management of fresh and coastal waters elaborated as a basis for future projects.
46. The project is closely aligned to, and supports the implementation of, the Cartagena Convention and especially the protocol on Land-Based Sources (LBS) of Pollution. This regional convention provides a strong framework to implement environmental management improvements and the success of the GEF-IWCAM project can be assessed against progress towards ratification of the LBS Protocol from the participating countries.

47. Specifically, the GEF-IWCAM project will assist with improved and integrated management of watershed and coastal areas, consistent with the LBS protocol. Progress has been made in the following key activities:

- **Component 1:** Demonstration projects have been implemented (8 from the planned 9 are well on course to be completed by June 2010). These projects are undertaking a range of activities that will provide stress reduction in the demonstration areas. It is important that these experiences are replicated elsewhere in the region and means to ensure the sustainability of the improvements are found in the second half of GEF-IWCAM. Two of the demonstration projects (Jamaica and St Lucia) have reported clear stress reduction (see demonstration project responses to questionnaire – Annex 5). The logframe presented in the Project Document (excerpt below) had anticipated that 5 (out of 9) demonstration projects would be able to show stress reduction by the MTE, however the significant delays in initiating the projects has resulted in this reduced number. It is anticipated that all demonstration projects will achieve the goal of showing clear stress reduction by the final evaluation of GEF-IWCAM.
- **Component 2:** Templates for utilising GEF indicators have been developed with the support of the participating countries. Workshops have been provided on the use of indicators. Indicator templates will be tested through demonstration projects. All the demonstration projects understand the need for and importance of the indicator concept and the need to show real Stress Reduction within the demonstration projects.
- **Component 3:** Policy, legislative and institutional reforms necessary to implement the IWCAM concept and the LBS Protocol have been assessed and a detailed 'road-map' for these reforms has been prepared. This is closely linked to assisting the participating countries with implementing IWRM and GEF-IWCAM has provided a structured framework for the region co-ordinating the on-going efforts from a range of donors related to IWRM.
- **Component 4:** Regional and national capacity building has strengthened the countries capability on monitoring and provided extensive awareness raising exercises on IWCAM related issues. A concept for the regional IWCAM Information Clearing House – an important part of the sustainability of the IWCAM 'concept' is in preparation.

3.1.1 Effectiveness

48. The overall objective of IWCAM is to assist the 13 participating SIDS of the Caribbean to improve their watershed and coastal management practices in support of sustainable development. The project is designed to strengthen institutional capacity at the national and regional level; to provide assistance to countries in understanding the linkages between, and the requirements for integrating management of watershed and coastal environmental problems; and to meet the national environmental priorities within a regional context.

49. The project has been effective in implementing the planned activities and, with the exception of the demonstration projects, according to planned timescale. An important benefit of this project is the ability to share experiences from 13 participating countries that is likely to be more cost-effective than implementing the project in individual countries. This is obviously highly relevant to the regional convention but also for the ability to disseminate (and hopefully replicate) the many successes from the demonstration projects that are providing real benefits to the environment locally.

50.

51. The following table (based on the overall objectives logframe presented in the Project Document) summarises key elements of progress identified by the MTE (shown in the fifth column). A more detailed update of the logframe is presented in Annex 8 in the 'Project Assessment Rubric' developed by the MTE. It is clear at the time of the MTE that the Environmental Stress Indicators suggested in the below table (e.g. measured improvements in water quality, coral diversity etc.) will not show change as a result of this project's interventions in the life of the GEF-IWCAM due to the slow response by the 'environment' to such changes. The Project Assessment Rubric (Annex 8) makes some suggestions for changes to these indicators and the overall logframe which should be agreed by the Project Steering Committee. However the original logframe is used below to illustrate the progress / attainment by the GEF-IWCAM project at the time of the MTE.

SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS	Progress / Assessment at MTE
PROJECT OUTCOMES: An overall national and regional reform in support of the IWCAM approach as a necessary and vital strategy for sustainable management and protection of coastal and watershed resources.	Reforms in policy, legislation and institutional arrangements in support of IWCAM. Effective regional cooperation and sharing of information and lessons on IWCAM. Development and transfer of more appropriate technologies and IWCAM-related techniques. Overall improvements in coastal and watershed status and related community welfare.	Environmental Stress Indicators show measurable improvements within the natural environment (water quality, coral diversity, mangrove cover, etc). Stress Reduction Indicators show measurable and successful efforts to control pollution and better manage potential threats. Process Indicators demonstrate measurable improvements at policy and legislative level, with associated supportive institutional modifications.	Indicator mechanisms successfully developed and deployed. National policy makers prepared to act on indicator results. Necessary incentives and support structure for regional cooperation. Sufficient political will and recognition of need to manage and protect coastal and watershed resources	A policy /legislation review has been conducted with a recommended roadmap for implementing reforms for each country to achieve IWCAM (and LBS Protocol) objectives. Indicator framework has been developed with support of countries and is being applied. Environmental monitoring is being supported
OBJECTIVE DESCRIPTION: Demonstrate environmental and developmental benefits of an integrated approach to watershed and coastal zone management in small islands developing states	Reduced environmental stress on watershed and coastal area resources	Mitigation/removal of threats (see threats and root causes analysis) confirmed through Environmental Stress Indicators. 5 out of 9 demo hotspots show significant improvements by mid-term evaluation. 20% improvement in ESIs as regional average by Final Project Evaluation.	Appropriate ESIs selected in parallel with existing databases, and mechanisms/capacity established for on-going monitoring	All demo projects are targeting to achieve SR improvements. At the MTE 2 projects showed clear SR. ES change will require post-project monitoring and reporting due to long lag time to detect improvements.
	Creation of a long-term mechanism for sustainable development in parallel with management and conservation of coastal and watershed resources	Equitable development and resource management/conservation adopted by all stakeholders and confirmed through Stress Reduction Indicators. 30% increase in positive SRI by Final Evaluation of project	Stakeholders support concepts of IWCAM (through training, education and awareness), and political will allows for participatory process. Correct SRIs established.	Demo projects have fully engaged local communities and are undertaking SR activities and are reporting SR indicators to the PCU

SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS	Progress / Assessment at MTE
	Integration and coordination of the resource management and planning process (including institutional realignment)	Adoption of national integrated and cross-sectoral management and planning processes confirmed through Process Indicators. 20% improvement (on average across region) in positive Process Indicators by Final Evaluation	Removal of cross-sectoral 'territorial' barriers driven by revised policies and legislation. Adequate capacity developed. Correct PI s established.	National intersectoral committees established for all demo projects. Active in assisting demo project's PSC.
	Demonstration of applied solutions and technology within selected hotspot and sensitive areas	Delivery of concrete solutions at geographical hotspots, capture of lessons and best practices, and replication through further examples. Replication of Demo lessons and practices at 7 other regional hotspots by Final Evaluation	Demonstration projects achieve their objectives. Effective mechanisms developed for capture and replication of lessons and practices.	Demo projects underway and are planning collection of lessons and replication with PCU assistance. Replication must be strongly encouraged by the GEF-IWCAM PSC.
	Adoption of appropriate policy and legislation in support of IWCAM objectives at the national and regional level	Capture of policy and legislative lessons from demos manifested through ratification of relevant MEAs, particularly the LBS protocol. 70% of countries (9) ratify LBS protocol by Final Evaluation	Political commitment toward need for policy and legislative reform. Recognition of importance of MEAs and need to encapsulate in national policies and legislation	Ratification is a political process and beyond the direct control of the project. The GEF-IWCAM is providing practical assistance and guidance towards this goal. This MTE is recommending that the project develops proxy indicators to demonstrate progress through the project's assistance towards ratification.

3.1.2 Relevance

52. The IWCAM objectives and expected outcomes are consistent with the GEF focal area/ operational strategies and the country priorities. The project also builds on the World Summit on Sustainable Development (Johannesburg 2002) Plan of Action for Small Island Development States.

53. GEF considered that IW projects address specific needs of SIDS including:

- Integrated freshwater basin – coastal area management is essential for a sustainable future for these island states, and
- The approach can produce benefits in other GEF focal areas, especially biodiversity, climate change and land degradation

54. The major areas of concern in the region include:

- Diminishing freshwater supplies
- Degraded freshwater and coastal water quality
- Unsustainable tourism
- Inappropriate land use
- Climate change
- Natural disasters
- Aquifer degradation
- Reduction of surface water quality and availability
- Loss of watershed and coastal biodiversity

- Land degradation and erosion

55. The GEF-IWCAM proposal addressed aspects of these priority issues focussing on the innovative aspects of integrating watershed and coastal area management.

3.1.3 Efficiency:

56. Despite the relatively low spend rate by the GEF-IWCAM project the main activities are understood to be on track. At the mid-term, approximately 30% of the GEF-UNEP budget has been spent. Assurances have been given by the PCU that the expected spend over the next months of the project (related to workshops, training programmes, consultancies etc.) is expected to make significant progress for the rest of 2009.

57. The GEF-UNDP demonstration projects have been slower than expected to begin but (with the exception of the Bahamas projects) are now under full implementation with completion scheduled by June 2010. Initial slow progress by some demonstration projects (Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas – Andros, Bahamas – Exuma, Cuba, Dominican Republic and, St Kitts and Nevis) was addressed by a formal letter sent, at the request of the PSC by UNDP to stimulate the demonstration project teams. A summary of the demonstration project spend (provided by UNOPS, May 2009) is given in Annex 7.

58. The GEF-UNDP demonstration projects have still to provide clear information regarding co-funding. This will be addressed by the reports due at the PCU in June 2009. This is essential information as the demonstration projects attracted significant co-funds at the PDF stage.

59. A summary of the outcomes and outputs achieved to date is included in Annex 10.

3.2 (B) Assessment of sustainability of project outcomes

60. Many of the activities of the GEF-IWCAM project have a clear route to sustainability or mechanism to encourage the longer-term usage of GEF-IWCAM products. The Project has been developing tools (such as the Clearing House Mechanism) that will aid the region with IWCAM principles and LBS ratification / compliance in the future. The second half of the GEF-IWCAM project should actively be identifying and supporting activities that further ensure the sustainability of the considerable achievements to-date as part of an 'exit strategy' of the project from the region. The GEF-IWCAM is planning a 'sustainability workshop' to assist with a wide range of issues that will help to assure sustainability of IWCAM principles. The GEF-IWCAM project is rated as **Likely – Moderately Likely** with regards to the *sustainability of project outcomes*.

61. The PCU (and the demonstration projects) all understand the importance of post-project sustainability to ensure that the IWCAM concept is *mainstreamed* in to environmental management policy. This will be achieved largely through the eventually ratification of the LBS Protocol, for which the GEF-IWCAM is highly supportive. The demonstration projects are already showing stress reduction at a local level and support from national authorities will be essential to further this work. It is very important that the project team devotes significant attention in its

final stages to develop a robust exit strategy including country specific recommendations on continuing the work of IWCAM.

3.2.1 Financial resources

62. The GEF-IWCAM project attracted considerable co-financing indicated in the Project Document. Whilst the majority of this co-financing still needs to be documented by the demonstration projects and other country activities, this does indicate willingness by countries to promote and replicate successful activities. It is important that this willingness is translated (with the assistance of all stakeholders) into real financial support for the principles of IWCAM and in assisting with the ratification process of the LBS protocol. Following ratification the tools that have been developed by IWCAM (e.g. IWRM Tool Kit, monitoring, laboratory strengthening, indicators, etc.) will continue to be sustained by the on-going commitments to the LBS protocol.

63. Further examples supporting financial sustainability of IWCAM principles include:

- Encouraging further private sector involvement. For example investigating means through financial inducements to encourage hotel complexes to invest in wastewater treatment;
- Promoting rain water harvesting to consumers and encouraging water supply companies to offer cost reductions due to lower demands from householders who have installed such facilities. It is clear that rainwater harvesting offers consumers independence from intermittent water supplies and, in the case of the St Lucia demonstration project, improved drinking water quality. However there are additional costs to the users (e.g. power, disinfection materials, maintenance, etc.). Further promotion of such approaches would be further advanced if savings could be obtained from water supply companies who would then be able to use their limited water resources elsewhere. This approach would require detailed discussions with water supply companies who may be reluctant to see consumer income potential drop when issues such as privatisation are being discussed.
- There are good examples (e.g. Cuba) where considerable local resources have been utilised to replicate training activities of the GEF-IWCAM project which is an important indicator of the future likely sustainability of the IWCAM principles.

3.2.2 Socio-political

64. The further ratification of the LBS protocol requires considerable political support and effort. The GEF-IWCAM has been assisting this process and more is expected to raise the political profile in the second half of the project. This political drive has been supported by significant awareness raising of the wider populations to the IWCAM principles and to environmental protection in general. There is still a need to further support the public access to environmental information across the region which is consistent with the requirements of the LBS Protocol (Annex X of the protocol).

65. Further examples supporting socio-political sustainability for GEF-IWCAM include:

- The formation of a watershed committee at the St Lucia demonstration site that will be transformed into a NGO continuing the work of IWCAM. The formation of the committee and the consideration of this moving to be a NGO post-project were initiated early in the demonstration project which is an important lesson for future projects.

- The assessment of the impact of the GEF-IWCAM project through a planned awareness assessment will establish where further resources have to be placed to better ensure the sustainability of IWCAM principles within communities.
66. The final ratification of the LBS Protocol is a political process and depends on issues beyond the control of the GEF-IWCAM project. However there is willingness in the region for the protocol and an expectation by UNEP CAR-RCU that this will be ratified by the project countries. The ratification of the protocol will, by necessity, continue many of the GEF-IWCAM activities aimed at reducing pollution from land-based sources.

3.2.3 Institutional framework and governance

67. The design of the GEF-IWCAM project took careful account of the post-project institutions and governance aspects to ensure sustainability of IWCAM principles. CEHI and UNEP CAR-RCU have key regional roles in promoting and supporting IWCAM activities, and the overarching Cartagena Convention and LBS Protocols provides a potential framework for the countries of the region to work under. Whilst the ratification of the LBS Protocol is considered to be an important indicator of project success, it is likely that the final signatures will be obtained after the project has been completed. However the project has clearly assisted with strengthening the countries towards ratification and assisting them with mechanisms to comply with Protocol post-project.
68. The IWCAM workshops on IWRM have been of significant help to the countries as these were made specific to the needs of the country and supported the process of accession/ratification of the LBS Protocol. These workshops served the needs of the GEF-IWCAM project and UNEP CAR-RCU's overall objectives towards the entry into force of the LBS Protocol and its implementation in the region.
69. Further examples supporting the institutional framework and governance for GEF-IWCAM include:
- The formation of watershed committees and transformation in to a NGO on St Lucia (see above).
 - The project has contributed to the identification of policy and legislative changes that are required to fully implement the principles of IWCAM and the LBS Protocol.
 - The concept of watershed management is well accepted in the region and in (for example, Jamaica) the concept of protecting regions before they become degraded has been endorsed by local communities and ministries.
 - The strengthening of NGOs in the execution of the demonstration projects, and in the case of Tobago, in managing the demonstration project.
 - Strong local institutions in the form of CEHI and UNEP CAR-RCU
 - The presence of the LBS Protocol and the countries' move to ratification of the protocol;
 - The formation of inter-sectoral committees across the region in support of the regional GEF-IWCAM and the demonstration projects has been an important tool in executing the project but could be a significant assistance to sustainability. The PCU and national demonstration projects have assisted the formation (where needed) of inter-sectoral committees (with support from UNDP Country Offices). Further support from the GEF-

IWCAM in developing the 'exit strategy' for the future operation of these committees will be beneficial;

- The establishment of the Clearing House Mechanism (planned through CEHI) to further promote IWCAM principles and assist the countries in the region will be of significant benefit.

3.2.4 Environmental

70. The project's contribution to environmental management is clear through the adoption of an innovative integrated approach to watershed and coastal water management. The benefits will be at local (e.g. reduced solid waste), national (IWRM roadmaps) and regional (assistance to the LBS Protocol) levels with regards environmental management. Climate change does pose a threat to some of the work being undertaken – for example the efforts to mitigate pollution of Buccoo Reef could be undermined by the impact of climate change on the reef.
71. The successes of the project will be sustained through the eventual ratification of the LBS Protocol, the implementation of the policy reforms identified, the strengthening of environmental monitoring capabilities and the commitment given by CEHI to maintain the knowledge base developed by the project through the Clearing House Mechanism.

3.3 (C) Achievement of outputs and activities

72. With the exception of the demonstration projects the main activities were started close to the planned date and have delivered the expected outputs. The demonstration projects were late in starting due to a variety of reasons (local administrative issues, lack of resources, recruitment problems with project managers). The problem was highlighted by the PSC and UNDP took appropriate actions to encourage the countries to progress the demonstration projects. With the exception of the Bahamas – Exuma all demonstration projects are planned to be completed by June 2010. During the MTE a recommendation was made to either accelerate the Bahamas- Exuma project or to cancel it.
73. The project was designed to develop guidance to assist the countries with the objectives of the LBS Protocol and a range of products have been prepared (e.g. IWRM road maps, Policy & legislation recommendations, indicators, etc.). The GEF-IWCAM has also undertaken a number of workshops to promote these products and to assist the countries to make the necessary changes to be consistent with the principles of IWCAM and the LBS Protocol. However the key indicator used for this progression, the ratification of the LBS Protocol, has shown little change (only St Lucia has ratified under this project to-date) in the life of the GEF-IWCAM project. Whilst the ratification of the protocol is a key outcome expected from the GEF-IWCAM it is likely it will take longer than the life of the project to achieve the required ratification and the entry into force of the Protocol is dependent on 9 countries in the region ratifying). It will be important in the second half of the GEF-IWCAM to further promote the LBS Protocol and to assist the countries move towards ratification.
74. The GEF-IWCAM project is rated **Satisfactory** with respect to achievement of *outputs and activities*.
75. The project has used a range of consultants and organisations to deliver the important assessments and guidance used by the countries under the direction of the PCU. The countries have been involved (e.g. through the PSC, technical workshops, inter-sectoral committees etc.) with steering the work and approving

the outputs with the support of the two technical regional EAs (CEHI and UNEP CAR-RCU). The demonstration projects work closely with the governments and in most cases the project managers of these demonstration projects are ex-employees of the government. This has helped to ensure good alignment of the work of the demonstration projects with the expectations of governments. An exception is the use of an NGO (Buccoo Reef Trust) in Tobago where there is a need to enhance the communications between the NGO and the Tobago House of Assembly; this concern does not extend to the technical work or the value of the work undertaken but simply to the need for improved understanding of the activities by the Tobago House of Assembly.

76. A table presenting the outcomes and outputs achieved (by June 2008, from the GEF-IWCAM APR/PIR) is presented in Annex 10. Reports from the demonstration projects provided to the MTE are presented in Annex 5.

3.4 (D) Catalytic role and replication

77. The GEF-IWCAM project promotes an integrated approach to watershed and coastal management that is consistent with the concepts of the GPA. Whilst this project has been undertaken in Caribbean SIDS and is therefore appropriate for replication in other SIDS, the principles behind integrated watershed and coastal management are applicable more widely. The GEF-IWCAM is also expected to replicate successful activities undertaken by the demonstration projects in other locations (ideally non-demonstration countries) in lifetime of the Project. The GEF-IWCAM project is rated **Satisfactory** with respect to *catalytic role and replication*.

78. The location of the PCU (within CEHI in St Lucia) was considered by UNEP CAR-RCU to be potentially of more catalytic benefit to the IWCAM concept than if it had been located within the UNEP regional offices in Jamaica. This was considered important in the design of the project by not concentrating all UNEP's management activities in the regional centre.

79. Further examples of catalytic actions and replication identified at the MTE include:

- Replication of IWCAM workshops across Cuba;
- The GEF-IWCAM project has revived interest in monitoring through training and workshops on IWRM, hot-spot assessment and analysis;
- The GEF-IWCAM project encouraged high level support for SIDS related water issues at the World Water Forum in Istanbul (2009). The project supported five countries to participate and lobbied for SIDS to be a special interest area at WWF and that SIDS were included in the conclusions from the Americas.
- The GEF-IWCAM has been invited to participate at the Caribbean Water & Wastewater Association regional bodies (along with CEHI and UNEP CAR-RCU) helping to ensure widespread awareness of the activities of the project and the potential benefits from replicating the concept throughout the region.
- The GEF-IWCAM project will have a greater focus on replication (and sustainability) in the final half of the project. It is important that the project, with the active support of the PSC, encourages the replication of the IWCAM concepts and the successes from the demonstration projects throughout the region.

3.5 (E) Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

80. The Project Document for the GEF-IWCAM contained an appropriate M&E plan to enable the future monitoring and evaluation of performance indicators. This plan is supported by an effective supervision process through the Project Steering Committee (PSC), joint meetings of the IAs and EAs and the Regional Technical Advisory Group (RTAG). The M&E plan proposed in the Project Document (including, indicators, management structure, committees, etc.) has been implemented by the regional project and performance indicators reported to the PSC. The MTE evaluates the M&E of the GEF-IWCAM project as **Satisfactory** with respect to *assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems*.

81. Under this MTE a 'Project Assessment Rubric' has been developed, based on the project log frame. This rubric is expected to be discussed and approved by the PSC and then used to assist the Terminal Evaluation of the GEF-IWCAM. The Project Assessment Rubric is included in Annex 8.

82. Most organisations utilise simplistic metrics, such as project expenditure, to monitor overall performance of activities. It is clear that indicators based on these parameters alone can suggest poor performance (where spending is slow) if the details of the activities are not fully investigated. Based on spend profile some demonstration projects (e.g. in Cuba, as viewed from a UNOPS disbursement perspective) could be rated poor if an understanding of the economic issues affecting the country are not also taken into account together with a realisation of the significant in-kind contribution from countries especially in the earlier stages of project implementation.

3.5.1 M&E design

83. The Project Document laid out an approach to Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) that has been implemented by the GEF-IWCAM project. The project logframe contained SMART indicators enabling progress of the project to be monitored and reported to the PSC and through the APR/PIR process. The indicators selected will ensure that the successes of the project will continue to be monitored post-project (indicators include environmental quality and the all-important ratification of the LBS Protocol which the GEF-IWCAM project is helping to drive forward).

84. The PCU, with the support of the two IAs has developed a 'combined' APR/PIR report which addresses both Agencies' needs and could be an example for future partnership projects.

85. The PCU (and the IAs) has taken corrective actions when needed and agreed by the PSC. An example is the actions taken to address the slow start of some demonstration projects. At the request of the PCU/PSC UNDP wrote to all demonstration projects (six projects were highlighted) that were behind schedule with a clear statement of the urgency and milestones that were required.

86. A baseline was included in the Project Document (but data was not available for many of the demonstration projects) and is used in reports to show progress of the performance indicators. The only key omission in this baseline is an assessment of awareness of 'integrated watershed and coastal area management' issues at the start of the project compared with an expected assessment towards the end.

87. The GEF-IWCAM also contained a significant component addressing indicators. This activity has already resulted in a detailed report and workshops and importantly gained the acceptance and understanding of GEF indicators by the demonstration projects and the countries. This work has suggested long lists of potential indicators for Process, Stress Reduction and Environmental Status that is an important contribution to the regional assessment of changes to the environment.

3.5.2 M&E plan implementation

88. The PCU is ensuring that the agreed M&E plan is implemented by the Regional Project and reported to the PSC and through the APR/PIR. The decision making process (the PSC with technical support from the RTAG) enables 'adaptive' management changes to be made to the work programme (for example, removal of the sampling ship and associated maintenance, less focus on hotspot identification, more emphasis on addressing hotspots, more laboratory strengthening, etc.).
89. APR/PIR reports are prepared and presented to the PSC. These reports contain a full list of the indicators with progress assessed and risks to the project evaluated.
90. Significant effort has been devoted by the Regional Project to the development of indicators and training in their use that will be applied post-project. The national demonstration projects have selected appropriate indicators from the indicators suggested, however more reporting (and assessment) of the demonstration project indicators is required.

3.5.3 Budgeting and funding for M&E activities

91. The funding of the Regional project's M&E activities is sufficient. The project has also spent considerable resources in developing detailed reports on indicators and assisting with national workshops to ensure these concepts are widely disseminated. The project assisted with environmental monitoring and training to ensure there is capacity in the longer-term to report environmental changes.
92. Monitoring by the demonstration projects is also evident (all projects are expected to deliver stress reduction in the course of their work) but whilst there has been wide acceptance of the indicator reports and workshops provided by the regional project it is unclear how this will be included in the countries activities post-project.

3.5.4 Long-term monitoring

93. The regional project and demonstration projects include indicators that will require long-term data sets to enable assessments to be made of environmental change. Whilst the MTE confirmed a willingness to continue environmental monitoring from selected demonstration projects visited there is still a need to get clear commitments from countries to continue this work. This commitment will come with the eventual ratification of the LBS Protocol and the obligation of the countries to report under the protocol.
94. The GEF-IWCAM project has assisted, through laboratory strengthening and environmental monitoring that will provide Environment Status indicator data, although it is recognised that these indicators are highly unlikely to show changes as a result of the project due to the relatively slow response of the environment

system to stress. All demonstration projects are expected to provide evidence of Stress Reduction activities by the end of the project.

95. The demonstration project in Tobago (implemented by the Buccoo Reef Association) is developing a long-term monitoring data-set on the condition of the reefs that will provide valuable baseline information for assessing the pollution impacts from land-based sources. This baseline will also be of value to assessing the impacts of climate change in the region.

3.6 (F) Preparation and readiness

96. The GEF-IWCAM project had a clear objective 'to strengthen the commitment and capacity of the participating countries to implement an integrated approach to the management of watersheds and coastal areas', and the four main project components were designed towards meeting this overall objective. The project's timeframe (60 months) is adequate to start the work towards this overall objective. The GEF-IWCAM project is rated as **Satisfactory** with respect to *preparation and readiness*.

97. The comparative advantages of UNEP and UNDP were highly relevant and beneficial to the project's objectives and in supporting the longer term sustainability (LBS Protocol) of the project's achievements in integrating watershed and coastal area management. UNEP (through CAR-RCU which co-executed the project) provided the expertise and experience of its Regional Seas Programme and the Secretariat of the Cartagena Convention. UNDP provided benefits through their Country Offices and Country Strategies.

98. The EAs (CEHI and UNEP CAR-RCU) had the appropriate technical and policy mandates to support the work of the PCU and the countries in meeting the project's objectives and their involvement since the Project Document approval has been beneficial.

99. Lessons from previous projects and regional MEAs (e.g. USAID 'Ridge to Reef', Cartagena Convention etc.) were considered at the project design phase.

100. Partnerships covering a wide range of stakeholders (Governments, NGOs, Private Sector, Funding Agencies, Development Banks, etc.) were included in the project design and have been involved throughout the project's execution.

101. The majority of the counterpart funding (from participating countries) is directed towards the demonstration projects. Whilst this has still to be quantified (information at the MTE on co-funding was extremely limited), it is clear that in the significant majority of cases the demonstration projects are proceeding and will be completed by June 2010 and are all expected to deliver stress reduction.

102. A key output of the GEF-IWCAM project has been a manual on policy and legislation changes that are required to be implemented by the countries to enable IWCAM principles to be met and to satisfy the expectations of the ratified LBS Protocol. Whilst the roadmap is presented and agreed by the countries there is (at the MTE) no information on the progress to implementing the required national reforms to policy and legislation.

103. The GEF-IWCAM established a PCU within CEHI's offices. This is well staffed and a highly competent management unit which communicated (both

internally within the PCU and with all stakeholders) in a very proactive way. In all discussions under this MTE the PCU was considered by interviewees to be a very responsive, aware of issues and a technically capable unit.

104. Whilst it would have been possible to implement the GEF-IWCAM by totally contracting CEHI directly from UNEP to undertake the specific tasks, involving them actively in the project management as a Executing Agency will assist with the ownership of the outputs and sustainability of outcomes from the project.

3.7 (G) Country ownership/drivenness

105. The GEF-IWCAM is highly relevant and in-line with national priorities within National Action Plans for the environment. The project has identified roadmaps for the revision of national policies and legislation to ensure that the principles of IWCAM are met and supporting the LBS Protocol at a regional level. The GEF-IWCAM project is rated as **Satisfactory** with respect to *country ownership/drivenness*.

106. The project has involved a wide range of stakeholders at regional and national level in the supervision and execution of the GEF-IWCAM.

107. The MTE mission established that IWCAM was developed in partnership and with full support of national administrations. Quantification of national co-funding has not been possible at the time of the MTE and this is an issue that has to be addressed by the project team as soon as possible.

3.8 (H) Stakeholder involvement

108. The GEF-IWCAM project involves a wide range of stakeholders at different levels. The PCU provides access to the information and progress of the project through the web site and a quarterly 'Caribbean Waterways' newsletter. The GEF-IWCAM project is rated as **Satisfactory** with regards to *stakeholder involvement*.

109. The demonstration projects have active stakeholder/outreach involvement in their work programmes ranging from briefings for the inter-sectoral committees to the organisation of local village meetings on IWCAM activities and concepts on improved environmental management.

110. The key stakeholders (at all levels) were adequately identified in the project preparation stage and highlighted in the Project Document.

111. The main project partners are involved with and collaborate at PSC meetings. There do not appear to be any problems with regards to the partners.

112. The effectiveness of the public awareness campaigns has yet to be established; this is due to be assessed in the latter part of the overall GEF-IWCAM project by evaluating the change in public perception to IWCAM issues in the region.

113. An innovative example of increasing the involvement of local participation has been seen in the Jamaica demonstration project, where the team involved a local 'animator' to stimulate the debates and to encourage local involvement.

3.9 (I) Financial planning

114. There are no significant issues or concerns associated with the financial management or planning of the GEF-IWCAM project. The PCU benefits from the inclusion of an experienced UNEP financial manager who is also available to assist CEHI where required. The GEF-IWCAM project is rated as **Satisfactory** with regards to *financial planning*.

115. Financial planning is under the supervision of the PSC who approve revisions to the budget. The PCU administered budget is subject to financial controls through UNEP IMIS mechanism which, whilst being slower to manage, is considered to be effective by the PCU. This decentralisation of the financial management (and other management activities) from the UNEP regional centre in Jamaica (CAR-RCU) is an important lesson to future projects within UNEP. This point was acknowledged as a benefit by the Co-ordinator of UNEP CAR-RCU as a means to further strengthen the capacities in the region and to improve the individual identity of the GEF-IWCAM project.

116. The sub-projects managed by CEHI (laboratory strengthening, IWRM activities) are under sub-contract arrangements from UNEP. There have been initial delays and some confusion in administration of these funds with regards to provision of adequate supporting information for disbursement approval. There do not seem to be any current problems.

117. The demonstration projects' budgets are administered through UNOPS. The only problems expressed with this by the demonstration projects have been associated with the recent changes by UNDP through the introduction of a new spreadsheet workbook designed to improve project management. Despite assistance from the PCU some demonstration projects (e.g. St Lucia) still expressed concerns about the level of work and the consequential delays in receiving funds for project activities (at the time of the MTE the demonstration project had exhausted available funds and had not been able to submit a successful application for additional funds for over 5 months). However the longer term benefits of improved project (and financial) management of this system are clear.

118. A summary of the GEF project spend (provided by UNEP fund manager) and the co-financing allocated to the project (May 2009) is given in Annex 7. At the time of the MTE (May 2009) it was not possible to confirm the level of national co-funding to the project (either through the demonstration projects or through other activities); this is a matter of priority for the PCU to address.

119. At the date of the MTE (May 2009) there had not been an audit of the GEF-IWCAM Project.

3.10(J) Implementation approach

120. This is a complex project with many IAs/EAs and other organisations involved through the demonstration projects. The PCU has effectively and efficiently organised a wide range of consultations and advisory meetings that has enabled the PCU to react to necessary changes. The GEF-IWCAM project is managed by the PCU under the supervision of the PSC and with advice from the joint IA/EA meetings and the Regional Technical Advisory Group (RTAG). The GEF-IWCAM project is rated as **Highly Satisfactory** with regards to *implementation approach*.

121. The PCU is well staffed with appropriate skills. Throughout the MTE positive messages were given from all interviewees about the responsiveness and the skills of the PCU.
122. To date the biggest challenge to the project has been establishing the demonstration projects and whilst the initiation of these has been slower than planned it is expected that most will be completed by June 2010 (the exception being Bahamas - Exuma – see comments and recommendations elsewhere in this report – Section 6). The PCU, with support from the PSC and the IA/EA meetings, has been proactive in seeking solutions to these delays.
123. The only significant other changes to the project document have been the cancellation of the vessel for monitoring (with subsequent savings on the operation and maintenance and the diversion towards laboratory strengthening) and the recommendations to utilise funds from additional hot-spot identification to more practical aspects associated with IWRM. Both changes have been made with the approval of the PSC, with the associated budget changes having been made in 2006 and 2008. These changes were in recognition of the evolving priorities of the region and illustrate the PCU ability to adapt their management plans.
124. The logframe developed in the Project Document is used by the project for M&E activities, in particular for reporting progress and achievement against indicators in the yearly PIR/APR.

3.11(K) UNEP/UNDP supervision and backstopping

125. The co-operation between the two IAs has proved to be very positive and has provided some lessons for future partnership projects. The complementary 'comparative advantages' of UNEP (with regional seas programme, and Cartagena Secretariat) and UNDP (Country Offices) is considered to be beneficial to the implementation of the GEF-IWCAM project and could serve as a model for future GEF projects. The GEF-IWCAM project is rated **Satisfactory** with respect to *UNEP/UNDP supervision and backstopping*.
126. The lessons for future GEF IW projects from the partnership between UNEP and UNDP include the importance of early agreement on reporting procedures (APR/PIR) and the strength of both the regional presence of UNEP and the national presence of UNDP.
127. The formation of the IA / EA meetings with the PCU is considered to be an important lesson for other complex projects.
128. The involvement of UNEP CAR-RCU as a co-executing agency is an important strength to the project potentially providing technical back-up and facilitating the sustainability of the IWCAM concept through its co-ordination of the Cartagena Convention and the LBS Protocol.

4 Conclusions and rating

4.1 Summary

129. The GEF-IWCAM is a very significant project that will deliver important regional benefits and offer lessons to other SIDS globally. The integration of watershed and coastal area management is an innovative approach to GEF projects and is consistent with the objectives of the GPA and of the Cartagena Convention's LBS Protocol. The GEF-IWCAM project has been well designed and is being well implemented by a highly competent PCU with the support of the PSC and RTAG. The national demonstration projects, whilst delayed in their start, are mostly delivering expected workplans and are due for completion in June 2010. The participating countries are active in the PSC and the work of the Regional and national demonstration projects. The project has already generated good lessons applicable to other projects and programmes and the experience of two IAs working closely together could be an example for future partnership projects. The long-term perspective of the outputs and outcomes of this project are good with the reinforcing requirements of the LBS Protocol and the countries' National Environmental Action Plans. The GEF-IWCAM project is rated overall as **Satisfactory**.

4.2 Evaluation Ratings

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
A Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		S
A1 Effectiveness	The GEF-IWCAM is expected to achieve the planned objectives and outcomes.	S
A2 Relevance	The project is very important and supportive to the ratification process of the Cartagena Convention's LBS Protocol. The project outcomes are highly relevant to the region and to GEF's IW activities on <i>integrating</i> watershed and coastal management, and to future SIDS programmes.	HS
A3 Efficiency	There have been delays in initiating the demonstration projects but these are mostly now on-track following appropriate interventions from the PSC. Progress towards all project outcomes has been made according to the agreed work programme.	S
B Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating)		L-ML

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
Sub criteria (below)		
B1 Financial	<p>The project has attracted significant co-funding at the proposal stage (the delivery of this is still to be established by the National Demonstration Projects). This will assist with the sustainability and ideally the replication of the positive interventions from the demonstration project</p> <p>The long term sustainability of many of the GEF-IWCAM activities will be assisted by the LBS Protocol ratification.</p>	L-ML
B2 Socio Political	<p>The Cartagena Convention's LBS Protocol ratification is being assisted by project activities but the final ratification is a political process and will depend on issues beyond the control of the project. However there is willingness in the region for the Protocol and an expectation by UNEP CAR-RCU that this will be ratified by the project countries.</p> <p>The ratification of the LBS Protocol will by necessity continue many of the GEF-IWCAM activities aimed at reducing pollution from land-based sources</p>	L-ML
B3 Institutional framework and governance	<p>The two Executing Agencies (UNEP CAR-RCU and CEHI) both have important future roles in the sustainability of the GEF-IWCAM activities. The Cartagena Convention and LBS Protocol (through the Secretariat at UNEP CAR-RCU) provides the overarching regional legal and institutional framework. CEHI as a regional centre of excellence on environment and with its commitment to maintain the project-developed Clearing House Mechanism for data and information also provides substantial institutional continuity to the GEF-IWCAM activities.</p>	L
B4 Environmental	<p>The risks of climate change impacts on, for example, reefs may make these less able to show any environmental</p>	L-ML

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
	improvements due to the reduction of pollutants.	
C Achievement of outputs and activities	<p>With the exception of a slow start to the demonstration projects (which has been clearly identified and the risks minimised by the PCU with the support of the PSC) the project is likely to achieve the required outputs. The demonstration projects are now on track and will be completed by June 2010.</p> <p>All other outputs have either already been delivered (e.g. Policy guidance for implementing the IWCAM concept, Indicator templates, IWRM support) or will be completed by the planned end of the project</p> <p>Whilst the project has delivered much guidance and support there is now a need to get the countries to implement these recommendations to achieve the goals of the GEF-IWCAM project and to assist the LBS Protocol process. The inter-sectoral committees can play an ever increasing role in ensuring that the agreed recommendations are translated in to actions at a state level.</p>	S
D Catalytic Role	<p>The concept of <i>integration</i> of watershed and coastal management within a GEF project is an innovative approach and is applicable widely and fully consistent with the GPA. The approach to the demonstration projects and the involvement of a large number of countries is applicable to other SIDS.</p> <p>Within the demonstration projects catalytic activities have been stimulated in Cuba (replicating the IWCAM workshops), in St Lucia (creation of a watershed committee that will be sustained as NGO post project), Jamaica (NEPA wish to replicate activities elsewhere to reduce land-based sources), etc.</p>	S
E Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		S

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
E1 M&E Design	The Project Document provided an appropriate design for M&E which was implemented by the PCU. The project included a major activity to design an indicator based monitoring system that was applicable to the demonstration projects and of interest to the national authorities.	S
E2 M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)	The PCU implementation of the M&E plan was satisfactory. Sufficient reviews (e.g. RTAG, IA/EA, and PSC meetings, and reports – APR/PIR) served to ensure that the decision making process and project progress was adequately controlled. Adaptive management changes to the project plan (for example, removal of the survey ship, less focus on hotspot identification, more emphasis on laboratories) were presented by the PCU to the PSC for approval.	S
E3 Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities	Sufficient resources are available within the regional project undertaking M&E activities. All required M&E activities were conducted in a timely fashion. Whilst the demonstration projects have developed M&E plans and have included long-term environmental status monitoring more still needs to be done and assurances sought from governments that this monitoring will be sustained in the longer term.	S
E4 Long-term Monitoring	The project has assisted through laboratory strengthening and environmental monitoring activities (both through the Regional project and the demonstration projects) that will provide long-term monitoring information on Environmental Status. This monitoring is expected to be continued post-project which will also assist with the implementation of the LBS Protocol.	S
F Preparation and readiness	The project was well conceived, designed and is being well	S

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
	implemented. Full use of previous projects (e.g. USAID Ridge to Reef – Jamaica) were considered in the preparation of the project. The project has a large number of IAs and EAs involved (total – 5) but the role and the benefits of all are clear.	
G Country ownership / drivenness	The project is of considerable interest and relevance to the participating countries and the regional agreements (e.g. LBS Protocol). The region is at risk from a wide number of environmental threats described in the Project Document and the GEF-IWCAM, with the active support of the countries, is addressing many of these threats.	S
H Stakeholders involvement	The project (through the web site, newsletters and a multiplicity of stakeholder engagements) has fully involved a wide range of interested parties from civil society (NGOs and the general public), private sector, and governmental organisations. This has included the inter-sectorial committees, PSC, regional and national workshops (e.g. indicators, monitoring, etc.), and local involvement in the national demonstration projects.	S
I Financial planning	<p>Project spend at the mid-term has been slower than could have been expected (estimated ~ 30%) due to delays (especially in establishing the demonstration projects), however this is considered to be on-track and is expected to make significant progress for the rest of 2009.</p> <p>The PCU benefits from having an experienced UNEP financial controller who is also available to assist CEHI when required with financial reporting.</p> <p>Co-financing from governments has not yet been assessed but this information is being requested by the PCU for APR/PIR.</p> <p>There are no issues apparent with regards to inappropriate financial management.</p>	S

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
J Implementation approach	Whilst this is a complex project with many IAs/EAs and other organisations involved through the national demonstration projects, the PCU has effectively and efficiently organised a wide range of consultations and advisory meetings that has enabled the PCU to react to any necessary changes.	HS
K UNEP /UNDP Supervision and backstopping	The co-operation between the two UNEP and UNDP has proved to be very positive and has provided some lessons for future partnership projects. The complementary 'comparative advantages' of UNEP (with regional seas programme, and Cartagena Secretariat through UNEP CAR-RCU) and UNDP (Country Offices) is considered to be beneficial to the implementation of the GEF-IWCAM project and could serve as a model for future GEF projects.	S
Overall Rating		S

5 Lessons learned

130. The GEF-IWCAM project has already identified a number of key lessons for other SIDS projects, projects working on integrating watershed and coastal area management and projects implementing legislative review and change.

131. The key lessons are presented from:

- Demonstration projects
- Management
- LBS Protocol / IWCAM Concept
- IAs / EAs

Demonstration Projects

- All the demonstration projects have taken longer to establish than expected. There have been a range of issues but the demonstration projects have been largely in the control of national authorities who were also responsible for selection of the project managers. The appointment of the project managers has been key (as would be expected) to the successful implementation. Future programmes that anticipate a large number of demonstration activities should not underestimate the time needed to establish the projects or, as in the case where the resource pool is relatively small, the difficulty of recruiting an appropriately qualified project manager.
- The demonstration project in St Lucia established a local Watershed Committee to oversee and, to a large extent, execute the project. At a very early stage in the project the Watershed Committee reviewed means to ensure their sustainability post-project in the form of establishing an NGO which would continue the work. A key lesson for such demonstration activities is to identify options for sustainable operations early in the project.
- The Jamaica demonstration project elected to use a professional 'animator' to engage town meetings. This proved to be very effective in reaching a wide audience with the IWCAM approach to watershed and coastal management and ensuring good local communications of the demonstration project's activities. Future projects should consider using innovative / creative means to convey key project messages to a wider public audience.
- Part of the success of the demonstration project in Jamaica is attributed to building on a previous USAID 'Ridge to Reef' project that encompassed many of the ideals of GEF-IWCAM. This shows the benefits of extending previous project activities to further enhance national capacities and provide long-term commitments to environmental improvements. Where possible, GEF projects should build on progress made by prior interventions.
- In the Dominican Republic, the UNDP Country Office has a proactive role in assembling all UNDP projects for quarterly meetings to exchange information and share experiences between project managers. This is a valuable lesson of one of the benefits of UNDP's 'comparative advantages' and is particularly of interest in smaller countries (for example in SIDS) where skilled project teams are limited and where such meetings

provide an opportunity for developing project management skills and exchanging information with the assistance of UNDP staff. Future UNEP GEF projects in SIDS should consider working closely with the UNDP Country Offices to facilitate the exchange of information and to share experience among project managers.

Management

- It may be obvious that a strong PCU is more likely to lead to a successful project but the MTE believes this is worth emphasising here as a lesson. The GEF-IWCAM has a strong PCU with excellent internal communications and a good awareness of the needs of all the main stakeholders of the project. The importance of careful selection of the Project Manager and all the PCU staff can not be overstated and the benefits come from the success of the project and the catalytic benefits of the project being seen to be successful.
- A key output of the PCU was to prepare a guidance manual on project management for the demonstration projects, containing information on reporting (progress and financial). This was considered to be of high benefit by the demonstration projects interviewed. In complex multi-country / multi-site projects the preparation of guidance manuals facilitates effective and consistent project management.
- UNDP introduced a new operational work plan to assist demonstration projects with overall financial management and reporting. Whilst this has created difficulties for some demonstration projects, the future benefits of improved planning and financial control must be also considered. The PCU will provide additional training to project managers to assist with this and other management activities. The lesson here is that when new systems or requirements are introduced the PCU (and in this case IAs) should not underestimate the need for support to national project managers, especially as this new work plan approach was introduced part way through the life of the demonstration projects when previous procedures had already been adopted (see above). More effort is needed at conveying the strengths (and benefits to Project Managers) when new approaches are introduced.
- An important lesson from the GEF-IWCAM is the need to extract more of the national experiences from the demonstration projects than are routinely reported. Through the GEF-IWCAM newsletter (Caribbean Waterways) the PCU has been able to highlight successes from the demonstration projects and to bring these to a much wider audience within the region. This is also a lesson for organisations such as GEF IW:LEARN to gather information on activities from the demonstration projects individually.
- The Project Document provided little specific information about activities under IWRM leaving the PCU to respond proactively to the needs of the different countries. This has enabled a detailed and country specific roadmap to be developed ensuring that gaps in knowledge could be addressed. The PCU in collaboration with the Executing Agencies also showed 'adaptive management' approaches by recommending to the PSC that less emphasis is placed on hotspot analysis (where sufficient information was considered available) and more emphasis on laboratory strengthening. This adaptation of the management plan was taken in consultation with countries, the RTAG and PSC. This may indicate the

benefits of less detail at the Project Document stage and providing more time for projects to better define the activities when PCUs are established with approval of the work plan provided by the PSC.

LBS Protocol / IWCAM Concept

- Regional projects are potentially greatly assisted by the existence of an overarching legal framework as a means to assist with driving the project. The regional convention is also assisted by the project providing resources for the implementation of the agreement. Here the LBS Protocol provides a framework in the form of supporting IWRM, coastal management implementation and reducing land-based pollutants which is consistent with the objectives of the IWCAM project. This lesson has been shown before to assist projects in achieving their goals by supporting the larger regional agreement which has high governmental support in most cases. This lesson parallels those experienced by the GEF Danube Projects which supported the Convention in that region and suggests that whenever possible, GEF IW projects should be designed to assist the implementation of existing legal frameworks (e.g. regional conventions).

IAs/EAs

- The GEF-IWCAM is a complex project and this complexity is added to by the involvement of a partnership between two Implementing Agencies (UNEP and UNDP) and three Executing Agencies (CEHI, UNEP CAR-RCU and UNOPS). However, this is also a strength of the project and in particular an aid to the successful sustainability of IWCAM concept through the development and implementation of activities within the framework of the LBS Protocol (under UNEP CAR-RCU) and more generally through CEHI. This project has generated some important lessons about such partnerships of IAs and EAs.
 - Agreements on reporting: UNEP and UNDP have collaborated together to ensure that a common APR/PIR is prepared by the project for submission to GEF. This agreement should be replicated from the start of future partnership projects. Ideally all EA and IA reporting needs should be established prior to the start of the project so that there is a clear and common understanding of the requirements throughout the project team – especially when the team is as large as within IWCAM involving 9 demonstration projects.
 - Close working relationship between EA and PCU. Both Executing Agencies have a close working relationship with the PCU on different complementary activities. This helps to assure that the experiences and lessons from the GEF-IWCAM are readily assimilated by the on-going work of the Executing Agencies.

6 Recommendations

132. The GEF-IWCAM is a successful project at the time of the Mid-Term Evaluation (June 2009) and is expected to continue to be so. The project has already had a strong local / regional impact and received significant recognition for the work it is conducting. To-date most of the activity (as expected) has been devoted to establishing the project and implementing the key components which are now all established. In the 'second half' the focus of the project should move to the important issues of ensuring replication of the key successes in the region, assisting with the sustainability of the IWCAM 'concept' of integrating watershed and coastal area management and capturing the key lessons that have been learnt for other SIDS projects globally.

133. The recommendations are presented under the following headings:

- Specific issues related to demonstration projects;
- Replication and sustainability
- Promoting IWCAM – regionally / globally
- Other recommendations

Specific issues related to demonstration projects

- **Bahamas – Exuma:** This project has been severely delayed in execution. With only one year left to complete a three year project it is important that a decision is taken by the PCU quickly to either; (i) suspend this project and utilise the resources elsewhere (see below) or; (ii) to further encourage the Exuma project team to accelerate their implementation providing a clear commitment to complete the project within the remaining time of the GEF-IWCAM.

If the decision is taken to cancel this project then alternative options for utilising the funds need to be reviewed by the PCU and presented to the PSC (September 2009) as a matter of **urgency**. The MTE considered this to be an opportunity to replicate successful activities from an existing project in another (ideally non-demonstration country) location. This would provide a powerful proof of the success of the project beyond that which is already planned

Recommendation: The PCU resolves the issue over the late starting of this demonstration project. If the decision is taken to proceed with the existing project, then assurances need to be established that the work can be successfully implemented in one year. If the decision is to cancel the project then the PCU should identify and recommend alternative strategies to utilise the funds and to obtain PSC approval for this change.

- **Tobago:** The implementation of the Buccoo Reef Project is progressing generally well (and indeed the results of the monitoring will have significant regional importance with regards to baseline information with relevance to climate change). However the MTE highlighted some communication issues between the NGO executing the project and the Tobago House of Assembly and the need to review the proposed stress reduction activity of the THA which is co-funding to the project.

- i. The THA believes that there is insufficient project control over the demonstration project. As a strong supporter of the

demonstration project and an important partner in ensuring the sustainability of the IWCAM activities it is important that any perceived communication issues between the THA and the Tobago project team are overcome. Recommendation: The PCU needs to convene a meeting with the THA and Buccoo Reef Trust to review the project activities and to confirm the future steps towards replication and sustainability. This meeting should be considered a matter of urgency. The results of these discussions should be reported to the PSC (September 2009).

- ii. The stress reduction that this project is expected to deliver is delayed. The Tobago House of Assembly is currently proposing a scheme to eliminate surface wastewater from drains by discharging these into the underlying coral base. Whilst this removes the surface discharges of wastewater the coral base will provide limited nutrient (or bacteria) reduction prior to acting as a diffuse source directly to the sea. **Recommendation:** The Buccoo Reef Trust together with the PCU should review the scope of the proposed THA project to ensure that it has a positive impact on the environment. If this activity is not sufficiently beneficial in providing Stress Reduction or the activities will not deliver stress reduction in the lifetime of the demonstration project then alternative and rapid actions should be identified that will achieve the necessary SR. (Report to the PSC September 2009).
- All the demonstration projects have been informed by the PCU about the need for, and importance of, clear Stress Reduction for these projects to be seen as successes. In addition the MTE is **recommending** that success criteria developed by the PCU should also include the development of clear replication and sustainability action plans by the demonstration projects and the capturing of the lessons learned for inclusion on the GEF IW:LEARN (and other) web sites from all the demonstration projects. In addition there should be a requirement on the national projects to assist with promoting and sharing the success within their respective countries. (Report to PSC 2010).
 - The MTE has highlighted difficulties in establishing the actual resources committed by co-financed activities. Whilst this applies to the project as a whole it is clear that the main source of co-funds is from the governments of the region for the demonstration projects. The Project Document indicated that the governments would commit 82.899 M USD as co-funding towards the GEF-IWCAM. It is imperative that the resources that are clearly already committed by governments for the demonstration projects (and for core project activities, such as IWRM and legislative review) are documented. **Recommendation:** With the support of the PCU, demonstration projects and government focal points collectively identify national in-kind and cash contributions to the GEF-IWCAM. The PCU could consider adding a session to the proposed workshop on Project Management to assist with ensuring a common approach to identifying the co-funds provided. (Report to PSC 2010)

Replication and Sustainability

To date the main activities of the demonstration project (and the PCU) has been focused on the need to implement their work programmes. Now, in the latter half of the GEF-IWCAM project, it is important that the attention switches to capturing the lessons learned, developing concrete replication plans and assisting the sustainability of the IWCAM concept in support of the LBS Protocol and the ratification of this protocol. The following recommendations are focused on these issues.

- The PCU has already initiated discussions to assist the demonstration projects (and the core activities undertaken by the PCU) with the identification of lessons learned and developing replication strategies. A number of options exist on how to ensure that this information is extracted and presented in a user-friendly way. These include holding workshop(s) with the demonstration projects (and to include the non-demonstration countries) and by the PCU visiting the projects, for example. The advantage of holding workshops (and the recommendation would be to consider two workshops – an initial meeting to provide guidance and then a final workshop to present / review all experiences and lessons) or by visiting the projects (either the PCU or through an external professional writer) should be assessed by PCU and the most appropriate approach agreed as a matter of urgency. This process should link in with the development of the Clearing House Mechanism (see below) and co-ordinate with IW:LEARN. **Recommendation:** The PCU review the options against the constraints of time and budget and present a detailed approach for endorsement to the next PSC (September 2009).
- The GEF-IWCAM project attracted significant country co-funding at the Project Document stage. At the MTE it has not been possible to establish the quantity of resources that has been contributed by the countries within the GEF-IWCAM (see recommendation above). A key element to replication of project activities and an important aspect to sustainability of the IWCAM concepts is the replication within the participating countries of the experiences from the demonstration projects funded from national sources. This would be a very positive sign of national support for these activities (which are consistent with the LBS Protocol) and a clear proof of the project success to the GEF. **Recommendations:** The PSC agree to identify activities to be replicated within the region using national resources within the life of the GEF-IWCAM project and to actively seek governmental commitment and support for this replication. A minimum of six demonstration activities should be initiated before the end of the GEF-IWCAM. (Report to the PSC in 2010).
- Private sector engagement: The private sector and, specifically the hotel and tourism sector, is a key beneficiary to improvements in the environment. To date their involvement has been relatively limited (some positive examples include the FairTrade participation in the St Lucia demonstration and the role of the tourism industry on the inter-sectoral committee in Trinidad and Tobago). It would be desirable in the latter stages of the GEF-IWCAM to consider more active engagement to stimulate the private sector ideally leading to possible private sector replication of some activities. **Recommendation:** The PCU to consider preparing literature on IWCAM aimed at the hotel/tourist industry (for example) to explain the benefits of

environmental improvements and how IWCAM approaches can assist the private sector implement these improvements. (Agreement at PSC 2009 with material available by January 2010)

- **Clearing House Mechanism:** The CHM will be an important tool for dissemination and sustainability of the project ideas. Currently the budget allocated to this activity is considered by the MTE to be too small. In addition the future management and operation of the CHM has to be assured. CEHI has indicated that this would be a role that they are willing and able to adopt. **Recommendation:** The PCU should prepare a budget revision for approval by the PSC (September 2009) and request that CEHI provides the CHM support. CEHI should be asked to commit sufficient resources (money and skills) to ensure the success of this important tool for five years. Further support and coordination at the Wider Caribbean level is expected to take place through UNEP CAR/RCU and the framework of the Cartagena Convention.
- The rainwater harvesting project in St Lucia has developed considerable support and interest from the local community. Whilst the prime motivator in the community for implementing rainwater harvesting is related to drinking water quality improvement and to a lesser extent, to security of supply, there is an operational cost to users (e.g. purchase of filters, power, disinfection etc.). It would be interesting for the demonstration project to whether the water supply organisation would offer financial discounts in the cost of mains water to those households with 'alternative' sources of drinking water. Not only would this encourage more households to adopt rainwater harvesting but it would reduce the overall demand for mains water. Such financial discounts could help offset the costs of installation and maintenance by users of rainwater harvesting. **Recommendation:** St Lucia demonstration project (with the support of the PCU) to explore options (including alternative mechanisms) for financial inducements with the water supply company to encourage replication of the approach to water harvesting. (Report to PSC 2010). This should take account of any local policies (for example privatisation discussions) that will impact water supply issues.
- The demonstration projects should be encouraged to further promote the use of M&E procedures and in particular, the indicators developed under GEF-IWCAM post-project. **Recommendations:** The PCU with the demonstration projects to identify appropriate means (e.g. additional training) to further utilise the M&E practices developed as part of an 'exit strategy'. (Report to PSC 2010).

Promoting IWCAM – regionally / globally

The GEF-IWCAM project has been an innovative test by the GEF of a project developing an *integrated* approach to watershed and coastal area management. At the MTE there are already some lessons learned for SIDS programmes elsewhere and for further promoting the strengths of integrated water management (fresh and sea water). For the second half of the GEF-IWCAM project the following recommendations are made.

- Whilst climate change impacts and adaptation were not explicitly included in the project document, it is clear that many of the activities undertaken on IWRM, rainwater harvesting, river bank restoration, monitoring (and especially reef monitoring) etc. are of interest to the current climate

discussions. It is highly appropriate for the GEF-IWCAM to strengthen its links with regional and national centres addressing climate change to share activities and lessons learned. **Recommendation:** PCU, together with UNEP CAR-RCU and CEHI, to develop stronger links and to share information from the GEF-IWCAM project with the Regional Climate Change Centre in Belize and other relevant regional Climate Change Projects for SIDS. (Report PSC 2010)

- The future promotion of the IWCAM concept involving IWRM and coastal management will fall to UNEP CAR-RCU and CEHI post project. It is important that these organisations, with the support of the PCU, develop a strategy to continue the promotion. **Recommendation:** The PCU to assist CAR-RCU and CEHI develop a strategy to continue the work of the GEF-IWCAM project by continuing to promote an integrated approach to watershed and coastal management. This can be considered to an important element of the GEF-IWCAM 'exit strategy'. (Report to PSC 2010)
- The GEF-IWCAM project is an important vehicle assisting the LBS Protocol ratification process. Whilst the success of the GEF-IWCAM project can not be simplistically tied to the Protocol's ratification there is a need for the project to clearly show the contribution of the GEF-IWCAM to the LBS Protocol ratification process. This will assist with showing the important contributions to regional and global agreements through the assistance provided by the GEF and other donors. **Recommendations:** The PCU should summarise the assistance that the GEF-IWCAM has given to the ratification and/or implementation of the LBS Protocol (for example, using proxy indicators – e.g. through IWRM and LBS Promotional workshops, strengthening of laboratories and monitoring, sensitizing of high level policy and decision makers; etc.). This recommendation should also be extended to other relevant regional and global agreements that the GEF-IWCAM project can show contributions towards (e.g. CBD, MDGs, CC, etc.). This information will form an important and lasting indication of the significant contributions that GEF-IWCAM has made to environmental management and protection in the region. (Report to PSC 2010)
- The GEF-IWCAM has effectively established national Inter-sectoral Committees (ISC) across the countries involved in the project that are integral components of the demonstration projects. Balanced with further public awareness of IWCAM issues these ISC provide a strong political basis for the sustainability of the IWCAM concept. **Recommendation:** The GEF-IWCAM should further encourage (e.g. by summarising the achievements and the national benefits to date) the ISC and to promote the benefits and successes of these committees at regional intergovernmental meetings (e.g. CARICOM) after the end of the project. This will be a key means to implement the LBS Protocol. (Report to PSC 2010)
- The GEF-IWCAM has established an important network of 'National Focal Points' (NFPs) in governmental organisations across the region who are now familiar with the IWCAM concept. The Cartagena Secretariat (UNEP CAR-RCU) also maintains a network of NFPs to assist with the LBS Protocol ratification and implementation. It would be beneficial if the links between these two sets of NFPs were strengthened to ensure sharing of information between these highly linked activities in the region. **Recommendation:** The PCU together with UNEP CAR-RCU to

encourage NFPs (e.g. by gaining government approval for the implementation of the LBS Protocol) to further co-operate to enhance the work of both GEF-IWCAM and the LBS Protocol activities. (Report to PSC – 2010)

- The GEF-IWCAM has developed a toolkit for national assessment of policies and legislation addressing IWCAM concepts. This toolkit was further refined to be specific to assist countries with the LBS Protocol ratification process and the suggestion of UNEP CAR-RCU, showing the added benefit of the active involvement of this EA and the synergy between the work of the GEF-IWCAM project and the overarching goal of the Cartagena Convention and the Protocol on Land Based Sources. **Recommendation:** The PCU and UNEP CAR-RCU develop a strategy for the final part of the project to continue to assist and support countries implement the roadmap detailed in the guidance to further promote the LBS Protocol ratification. (Report to PSC 2010)
- A major activity of the GEF-IWCAM project has been the development and implementation of a set of 'GEF' indicators covering Process, Stress Reduction and Environmental Status. This work has resulted in an extensive list (or templates) of potential indicators for adoption by the demonstration projects. This activity has been undertaken with the full support and participation of government representatives who have endorsed the approach. This has assisted with the indicators having a wider use within the region and potentially aiding the longer-term use of indicators for monitoring the impacts of the project. At the STAP review of the IWCAM proposal a suggestion was made to consider post-project monitoring of impacts and outcomes of the project. This is especially important in such a project where it is unlikely that any Environmental Status Indicators would report any changes as a result of the project activities. It was recognised at the STAP review, that as projects end, so do their budgets. The MTE considers post project monitoring to be an essential element for GEF to assess the real benefits of such interventions and that some form of reporting of environmental improvements should be considered in future. **Recommendation:** The PCU with the support of the demonstration project's experience to develop a strategy to further mainstream the use of the GEF indicators by the governments and to report on these indicators to the Clearing House Mechanism post-project. Further the recommendation is for the manager of the Clearing House Mechanism (ideally CEHI) with the support of UNEP CAR-RCU and UNDP to report indicators to the GEF (through for example IW:LEARN) after 5, 10 and 15 years. This time period should enable the (anticipated) environmental improvements to be detected. (Report to PSC 2010)

Other Recommendations

- The MTE has suggested through the Project Assessment Rubric (Annex 8) a number of revisions to the project logframe proposed in the Project Document. This should be closely reviewed and discussed by the PSC and if agreed included for review during the Final Evaluation of the GEF-IWCAM project. The PCU, with the assistance of other project partners, should ensure that the data required to report against this rubric is collected. **Recommendation:** The PSC to review the Project

Assessment Rubric and to make recommendations for modifications and approval. (PSC 2009).²

- There is a need to encourage wider access to environmental information throughout the civil society and to motivate governments (showing both the mechanisms and benefits) to enable this information to be made available to the public in a timely way. The GEF-IWCAM project is undertaking important activities with local communities through the demonstration projects, but access to information has received little attention so far. Whilst this may be beyond the scope of the current project this is an important element in water governance that should be strengthened. This is especially important as the Annex X of the LBS Protocol states that governments should '*promote public access to relevant information and documentation concerning pollution of the Convention area from land-based sources and activities and the opportunity for public participation in decision-making processes concerning the implementation of this Protocol.*' This need for public access to information was also highlighted in the toolkit for institutional, policy and legislative improvements in support of the IWCAM approach in Caribbean SIDS report. **Recommendation:** The PCU should encourage the countries (e.g. by demonstrating the clear benefits of the IWCAM approach and showing how this will assist with LBS Protocol implementation) further on this issue and identify means (with the support of UNEP CAR-RCU) to seek additional resources to fund future activities on access to environmental information. (Report to PSC 2010)
- Despite the GEF-IWCAM project operating for 3 years there is still apparently confusion in the countries on the roles and responsibilities of all the agencies and other organisations involved. It would be beneficial to refresh the understanding at the country level of the roles of GEF, UNEP, UNDP (Country Offices and Regional Centre), UNEP CAR-RCU, CEHI, UNOPS and the PCU. **Recommendation:** The PCU to prepare (or update) a brief summary of the roles and responsibilities of all the main organisations involved in this complex project. (Present to September 2009 PSC)

² The 4th PSC of IWCAM met on 15/16 October 2009 and agreed to refine the 'Rubric' through a small working group with a focus on addressing the only significant issue of LBS Ratification as an indicator of success. The PSC expects this to be completed by December 2009.

ANNEXES

Annex 1 TERMS OF REFERENCE

**Mid-Term Evaluation of the GEF project
“Integrating Watershed & Coastal Areas Management in Caribbean SIDS”
GFL/6030-05-01**

1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

Project rationale

Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS) have special conditions and needs that were identified for international attention in the **Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States**.

Key features of each regional SIDS International Waters project are expected to be improvements in integrated freshwater basin-coastal area management on each island of the regional groupings of SIDS, a multiple GEF focal area approach, testing of mechanisms to facilitate broad stakeholder participation, and a coordinated, approach among Executing and Implementing Agencies according to the comparative advantage of each agency.

The overall objective of the IWCAM Project is to strengthen the commitment and capacity of the participating Caribbean countries to implement an integrated approach to the management of watersheds and coastal areas. The long-term goal is to enhance the capacity of the countries to plan and manage their aquatic resources and ecosystems on a sustainable basis. This will be addressed within the context of the currently limited economic opportunities, coupled with an urgent need for development and expansion of trade and commerce, within the Caribbean SIDS. In particular, project activities are focusing on improvements in integrated freshwater basin-coastal area management on each island of the regional grouping of Caribbean SIDS.

The project recognises the integrated and interlinked nature of watersheds and coastal areas in small islands and aims to develop a more sector-coordinated management approach, both at the national and the regional level, with a strong emphasis on an expanded role for all stakeholders within a participatory management framework. The project further recognises the constraints on such an integrated and sectoral-coordinated management approach within an environment which lacks applicable and cost-effective solutions to many of the primary threats and their root causes at the grass-roots level.

Paramount to addressing the lack of solutions available to SIDS on key issues such as island-based sources of pollution, water resource conservation and management, unsustainable land-use and inappropriate agricultural practices, etc. is the inclusion of a major project component delivering on-the-ground demonstrations targeted at national hotspots where specific threats to national, regional and global environmental amenities have been identified. These demonstrations stress the need for development of a cross- sectoral management approach and address the requirements for institutional and infrastructure realignment and policy reform;

adoption of modalities for sectoral participation and coordination; capacity building; linkages to social and economic root causes of environmental degradation; and the overall need for sustainability. One of the critical requirements of these demonstrations is to develop mechanisms for the replication of activities and for the transfer of best lessons and practices, both nationally and regionally.

In view of the urgency for policy and legislative reforms, alongside institutional improvements, the project is focusing one component specifically at these issues. In particular, high priority is being given to assisting the countries to meet the commitments required in the ratification process for important regional legal agreements such as the Cartagena Convention and its protocols (especially the Protocol on Land-Based Sources of Pollution).

Consequently, the project aims to demonstrate the development of an effective regional strategy for IWCAM, in parallel with demonstrating and replicating geographically targeted national solutions to common Caribbean SIDS issues, through a series of interconnected components that capture best practices and translate these into replicable actions.

The Project consists of 5 components. These will undertake regional management, coordination and evaluation of IWCAM objectives; demonstrate technological and management approaches and policy and legislative reforms within selected hotspots; identify impact indicators for measuring IWCAM efficacy and implement a programme of measurement and monitoring which will drive policy reforms; and establish networking, sharing of knowledge, and partnerships within the Caribbean SIDS for IWCAM.

Relevance to GEF Programmes

In its Operational Programme 9: SIDS Component, the GEF recognised the unique water-related issues that are common to most SIDS, such as coastal area management and biodiversity, sustainable management of regional fish stocks, tourism development, protection of water supplies, land and marine-based sources of pollution, and vulnerability to climate change. Consequently, the GEF has agreed to support international waters projects that address the special conditions and needs of SIDS and include them. These projects are included in the operational programmes for the following reasons:

1. Integrated freshwater basin-coastal area management is essential for a sustainable future for these island states, and
2. This approach can produce benefits in other GEF focal areas, especially biodiversity, climate change and land degradation

The IWCAM project is wholly consistent with the International Waters Focal Area Strategy of GEF-4. It contributes to its Strategic Objective 1 (*SO-1 – To foster international, multi-state cooperation on priority water concerns*), and contributes to the initiation of actions consistent with its Strategic Objective 3 (SO-3), which seeks to play a catalytic role in addressing transboundary water concerns by, as mentioned above *assisting countries to utilize the full range of technical assistance, economic, financial, regulatory and institutional reforms that are needed*).

The project is also consistent with GEF-4 Strategic Program 2: (reducing nutrient over-enrichment and oxygen depletion from land-based pollution of coastal waters in LMEs consistent with GPA) through (1) supporting national and local policy, legal and institutional reforms to reduce land-based pollution and supporting key stakeholders with wastewater management therefore reducing stress onto coastal and marine environments and improving ecosystems functioning for increased livelihood of participating nations as well as with Strategic Program No. 3 (Balancing Overuse and Conflicting Uses of Water Resources in Transboundary Surface and Ground Water Basins) through the improvement of IWRM and IWCAM protocols.

Executing Arrangements

The project takes advantage of the opportunities for synergy and complementarity, recognising the comparative advantages of both Implementing Agencies, UNDP and UNEP. In particular, it takes advantage of the country presence of UNDP and the linkages between project activities and UNDP's country assistance strategies and the relationship between project activities and UNEP's Regional Seas Programme and International Environmental Conventions.

UNDP's specific expertise and value vis-à-vis its regional and country offices provides important support, especially to the Demonstration Projects. The project is co-executed by the Secretariat to the Cartagena Convention (UNEP CAR/RCU) and CEHI with the Secretariat assuming the role of lead Executing Agency.

The United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), also has an Executing Agency role in relation to the Demonstration Projects, on behalf of UNDP. The execution arrangements take advantage of the recognised expertise of CEHI in the field of freshwater resource management; and the Secretariat to the Cartagena Convention in matters related to the marine and coastal environment and in working in a multi-lingual environment. Both CEHI and CAR/RCU have long established relationships with the countries of the region. Sustainability of project benefits at the regional level will be enhanced through these arrangements.

Project Activities

The project duration was initially 60 months starting substantively in May 2006, when the Regional Project Coordinator assumed duties. The End Date has been revised to be completed in July 2011 (according to UNDP). The timeframe is shown below:

Project timeframe:

Date of Entry into Work Programme	May 2004	Planned Project Duration	60 months
<i>Revised</i> Project Document Signature Date	25 July 2006 (UNDP); 23 May 2005 (UNEP)	Original Planned Closing Date	December 2009 (UNDP); July 2010 (UNEP)
Date of First Disbursement	25 July 2006	Revised Planned Closing Date	July 2011 (UNDP); revision for UNEP currently being processed

The project had five components, which are outlined below:

COMPONENT 1: DEMONSTRATION, CAPTURE AND TRANSFER OF BEST PRACTICES

- ❖ Implementation and management of demonstration projects in 9 countries (see table below)
- ❖ Capture of lessons, best practices, alternative technologies from Demonstration Projects
- ❖ Development of national, regional and global replication strategies and mechanisms

SUB-COMPONENT	COUNTRY	TITLE OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT
A: Water Resource Conservation and Management	St. Kitts and Nevis	Rehabilitation and Management of the Basseterre Valley as a Protection Measure for the Underlying Aquifer
	St. Lucia	Protecting and Valuing Watershed Services and Developing Management Incentives in the Fond D'or Watershed Area of St. Lucia
B: Wastewater Treatment and Management	Antigua and Barbuda	Mitigation of Groundwater and Coastal Impacts from Sewage Discharges from St. John
	Bahamas - Exuma	Marina Waste Management at Elizabeth Harbour in Exuma, Bahamas
	Dominican Republic	Mitigation of Impacts of Industrial Wastes on the Lower Haina River Basin and its Coast
C: Land-use Planning, Zoning and Alternative practices	Bahamas - Andros	Land and Sea Use Planning for Water Recharge Protection and Management in Andros, Bahamas
	Trinidad and Tobago	Land-Use Planning and Watershed Restoration as part of a Focused IWCAM Demonstration in the Courland Watershed and Buccoo Reef Area
D: Targeted Model IWCAM	Cuba	Application of IWCAM Concepts at Cienfuegos Bay and Watershed
	Jamaica	An Integrated Approach to Managing the Marine, Coastal and Watershed Resources of east-central Portland

Outcomes: Demonstration of solutions/mitigations to specific threats to IWCAM. Distribution of best lessons/practices. Model guidelines for reforms. Replication in other hotspots.

COMPONENT 2: DEVELOPMENT OF IWCAM PROCESS, STRESS REDUCTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS INDICATORS FRAMEWORK

- ❖ Review existing national and regional level indicator frameworks
- ❖ Development of template for national level Indicators
- ❖ Conduct hotspot diagnostic analyses (HSDA) at (non-demo) hotspots in each country
- ❖ Regional centre for storage of Indicator information and for Indicator training
- ❖ Pilot IWCAM process, stress reduction and environmental status indicators (1 country)

Outcomes: Process, stress-reduction, and environmental status indicators framework established. National and regional capacities for indicator monitoring enhanced.

COMPONENT 3: POLICY, LEGISLATIVE AND INSTITUTIONAL REFORM FOR IWCAM

- ❖ Review of national policy, legislation and institutional structures identifying barriers to IWCAM
- ❖ A set of regional guidelines for national policy, legislative and institutional reform

- ❖ Regional programme for amendment of national legislation and policy

Outcomes: National policies, legislation and institutional structures reformed to capture the requirements of regional and international MEAs and IWCAM in general.

COMPONENT 4: REGIONAL & NATIONAL CAPACITY BUILDING & SUSTAINABILITY FOR IWCAM

- ❖ National workshops on awareness and multisectoral sensitisation to IWCAM issues
- ❖ Stakeholder involvement in regional IWCAM
- ❖ Training and education activities
- ❖ A regional strategy for the sustainable promotion and implementation of IWCAM
- ❖ Project Networking
- ❖ A regional IWCAM Information Clearing House

Outcomes: Improved sensitisation, awareness and capacity toward IWCAM. A regional mechanism supporting IWCAM. Information networking plus a Partnership Forum to build working relationships. Information Clearing House. Stakeholders/civil society participation.

COMPONENT 5: PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND COORDINATION

- ❖ Project Management by PCU
- ❖ Project Steering Committee to provide regional project policy level guidance
- ❖ National Intersectoral Committees to capture IWCAM concepts at the national level
- ❖ Implementing Agency/Executing Agency Management Group
- ❖ Regional Technical Advisory Group (IWCAM technical advice to the PSC and PCU)
- ❖ Project Reporting on activities and outputs, and reviews of project work-plan and budget
- ❖ Project Evaluation ensure that indicators are measuring sustainable project success
- ❖ Develop an Information Management System for the project

Budget

The total budget was US\$ 112.78M with US\$ 14.39M funded by the GEF Trust Fund and in-kind co-funding of US\$ 98.39M.

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION

1. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation

The objective of this Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to assess operational aspects, such as project management and implementation of activities and the level of progress towards the objectives. The evaluation will assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. **It will focus on identifying corrective actions needed for the project to achieve maximum impact. Evaluation findings will feed back into project management processes through specific recommendations and 'lessons learned' to date.** Building on the PIR risk table, the risks to achievement of project outcomes and objectives will also be appraised by the evaluator (see **Annex 6**).

2. Methods

This Mid-Term evaluation will be conducted as an in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager, the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor, key representatives of the executing agencies and other relevant staff are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation. The consultant will liaise with the UNEP/EOU, the UNEP/DGEF Task Manager and UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor on any logistic and/or methodological issues to properly conduct the review in as independent a way as possible, given the circumstances and resources offered.

The findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
 - a. The project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports to UNEP, UNDP and GEF annual Project Implementation Review reports) and relevant correspondence.
 - b. Notes from the Steering Committee meetings.
 - c. Other IWCAM-related material produced by the project staff or partners.
 - d. Relevant material published on the project web-site: www.iwcam.org.
2. Interviews with project management and technical support including the current IWCAM team based in St. Lucia and key actors involved in the regional and demonstration project components. The list of possible interviewees includes: Nelson Andrade, Coordinator, UNEP CAR/RCU, Jamaica; Patricia Aquino, Executive Director, CEHI, St. Lucia; All Demo Project Managers; All GEF-IWCAM National Focal Points; Sarah George, OPAAL Project Manager, OECS/ESDU, St. Lucia; Jacob Opadeyi, Caribbean Waternet Secretariat, Trinidad; Robin Mahon, CERMES/UWI, Barbados; Richard Huber, OAS, Washington; Antonio Villasol, CIMAB, Cuba; Commodore Anthony Franklin, IMA, Trinidad
3. Interviews and telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project, including NGOs, in the participating countries and international bodies. The Consultant shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of donor agencies and other organisations. As appropriate, these interviews could be combined with an email questionnaire.

4. Interviews with the UNEP/DGEF project Task Manager and Fund Management Officer, the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinator, and other relevant staff in UNEP, UNDP and UNOPS dealing with International-Waters related activities as necessary. The Consultant shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant GEF Secretariat staff.
- 5 The Consultant will visit demonstration sites in St Lucia, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago. The consultant will also visit Washington to meet with the UNEP/GEF Task Manager and Panama to meet with the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor. The Consultant will attend a Regional Technical Advisory Group or other Project Meeting in mid 2009 to present the Mid Term Evaluation findings and help advise on necessary corrective actions.

Key Evaluation Principles

In attempting to evaluate any outcomes and impacts that the project may have achieved, evaluators should remember that the project's performance should be assessed by considering the difference between the answers to two simple questions "*what happened?*" and "*what would have happened anyway?*". These questions imply that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. In addition, it implies that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the project.

Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases, this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluator, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance. At Mid-Term, impacts are unlikely; however, every effort should be made to assess the project's progress towards the intended outcomes.

Scope of the evaluation

3. Assessment of project assumptions, objectives and design

The evaluation will examine the following:

Project theory

Assessment of the assumptions and of the theory of change (causal pathways) underpinning the project idea and design, including its coherence, internal and external validity.

Project objectives and Logical Framework

Analysis of the project Logical Framework and variations over time if any, including:

- the links and causal relationships between inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and impact (specific and development objectives);
- relevance and appropriateness of indicators;
- validity of assumptions and risks
- existence of formal approvals to any modifications of the logical framework

Project design

Analysis of the project strategy and structure including:

- approach and methodology;

- time frame and resources;
- institutional set-up;
- management arrangements;
- stakeholders and beneficiaries identification.

4. Project Performance with respect to GEF Evaluation Parameters

A. Attainment of objectives and planned results (progress to date):

The assessment of project results seeks to determine the extent to which the project objectives have been, or are expected to be achieved, and assess whether the project has led to any other positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project's progress towards the intended outcomes / objectives as stated in the project document (PD), the evaluation will also indicate if there were any changes to the outputs and performance indicators in the PD and whether those changes were approved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established (or simplifying assumptions used). 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 of behaviour), and transformed policy frameworks.

- *Effectiveness*: Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives will be met, taking into account the "achievement indicators" specified in the project document and logical framework.
- *Relevance*: Are the project's actual or intended outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities? Ascertain the nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the wider GEF International Waters portfolio.
- *Efficiency*: Includes an assessment of *outcomes* achieved to date in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Is the project cost-effective? How does the cost-time vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Has the project implementation been delayed? Is it on track?

B. Assessment of Sustainability of project outcomes:

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. ***At mid-term, identification of any likely barriers to sustaining the intended outcomes of the project is especially important.*** Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, e.g. stronger institutional capacities or better informed decision-making, legal frameworks, socio-economics incentives or public awareness.

Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes. The evaluation should ascertain to what extent follow-up work has been initiated and how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time. In this case, sustainability

will be linked to the likelihood of continued use and influence of best practices promoted by the project to plan and manage aquatic resources and ecosystems on a sustainable basis.

Four aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks and governance, and environmental. The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

- *Financial resources.* To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support? What is the likelihood that any required financial resources will be available to sustain the project outcomes/benefits once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market trends that support the project's objectives)?
- *Socio-political:* To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on socio-political factors? What is the likelihood that the level of stakeholder ownership will allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- *Institutional framework and governance.* To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? While responding to these questions consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.
- *Environmental.* Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits?

C. Achievement of outputs and activities:

- Delivered outputs: Assessment of the project's success in producing each of the programmed outputs to date, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness.
- Assess the soundness and effectiveness of the methodologies used for developing the technical documents and related management options in the participating countries.
- Assess to what extent the designed demonstrations have the weight of scientific authority / credibility, necessary to influence policy and decision-makers, particularly at the national level and suggest any possible improvements.

D. Catalytic Role and Replication

The mid-term evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. What examples are there of replication and catalytic outcomes which suggest increased likelihood of sustainability? 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).).

If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out, or possible strategies for this purpose.

E. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

- **M&E design.** Does the project have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? The Mid-term Evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the application of the Project M&E plan (Minimum requirements are specified in Annex 5). The evaluation shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART (see Annex 5) indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified based on results based management principles.
- **M&E plan implementation.** Is an M&E system in place and does it facilitate tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period. Are Annual project reports complete, accurate and with well justified ratings? Is the information provided by the M&E system used to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs? Does the project have an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?
- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.** Were adequate budget provisions for M&E made and are such resources made available in a timely fashion during implementation?
- **Long-term Monitoring.** Is long-term monitoring envisaged as an outcome of the project? If so, comment specifically on the relevance of such monitoring systems to sustaining project outcomes and how the monitoring effort will be sustained.

F. Preparation and Readiness

Are the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place?

G. Country ownership / drivenness:

This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. Examples of possible evaluative questions include: Was the project design in-line with the national sectoral and development priorities and plans? Are

project outcomes contributing to national development priorities and plans? Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, involved in the project? Did the recipient government maintain its financial commitment to the project?

H. Stakeholder participation / public awareness:

Does the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing, consultation and by seeking their participation in project's design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation? For example, does the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns? Does the project consult and make use of the skills, experience and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, NGOs, community groups, private sector, local governments and academic institutions in the design, implementation and evaluation of project activities? Are perspectives of those that would be affected by decisions, those that could affect the outcomes and those that could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Are the relevant vulnerable groups, the supporters and the opponents, of the processes properly involved? Specifically the evaluation will:

- Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders in each participating country and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of any various public awareness activities that have been undertaken during the course of implementation of the project thus far.

I. Financial Planning

Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allowed management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds. Specifically, the evaluation should:

- Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables throughout the project's lifetime.
- Present the major findings from the financial audit if one has been conducted.
- Did promised co-financing materialize thus far? Identify and verify the sources of co- financing as well as leveraged and associated financing (in co-operation with the IA and EA).
- Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

The evaluation should also include a breakdown of actual expenditures of GEF and co-financing for the project to date prepared in consultation with the relevant UNEP/DGEF Fund Management Officer and UNDP/UNOPS Officers (**table attached in Annex 3**)

J. Implementation approach:

This includes an analysis of the project's management framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management. The evaluation will:

- Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed. In particular, assess the role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable the implementation of the project.
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels.
- Assess whether the logical framework was used during implementation as a management tool and whether feedback from M&E activities more broadly was used for adaptive management.

K. UNEP/UNDP Supervision and Backstopping

- Assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP/DGEF and UNDP/DGEF. Did they identify problems in a timely fashion and accurately estimate the seriousness? Did they provide quality support and advice to the project, approve modifications in time and restructure the project when needed? Did they provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, frequency
- Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project.

The **ratings will be presented in the form of a table**. Each of the eleven categories should be rated separately with **brief justifications** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The following rating system is to be applied:

HS	= Highly Satisfactory
S	= Satisfactory
MS	= Moderately Satisfactory
MU	= Moderately Unsatisfactory
U	= Unsatisfactory
HU	= Highly Unsatisfactory

Wherever possible, the consultant will provide recommendations for improvement of project performance in each of the eleven categories above, so that the project could incorporate them into the implementation of the remaining duration of the project

In addition, the evaluator should prepare a draft 'performance table' for the project. This table should specify, for each of the main objectives and outcomes in the project logical framework, levels of performance (and their means of assessment) using the six performance categories above (HS to HU). This performance table will be

discussed and finalised during the next Project Steering Committee Meeting and will be used as a rubric for assessing project performance in the Terminal Evaluation of the project. An example is shown in **Annex 2**.

5. Evaluation report format and review procedures

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the evaluation took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate clear managerial responses.

The evaluation will rate the overall implementation success of the project and provide individual ratings of the eleven implementation aspects as described in Section 4 of this TOR. ***The ratings will be presented in the format of a table with brief justifications based on the findings of the main analysis.***

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. Any dissident views in response to evaluation findings will be appended in an annex. The evaluation report shall be written in English, be of no more than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- i) An **executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- ii) **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the evaluated project, for example, the objective and status of activities, it's relevance and project theory / intervention logic;
- iii) **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the evaluation's purpose, the evaluation criteria used and questions to be addressed;
- iv) **Project Performance and Impact** providing factual evidence relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report and should provide a commentary on all evaluation aspects (A – K above).
- v) **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the evaluator's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given evaluation criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative;
- vi) **Lessons learned** presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on good practices and successes or problems and mistakes. Lessons should have the potential for wider application and use. All lessons should 'stand alone' and should:
 - Specify the context from which they are derived
 - State or imply some prescriptive action;
 - Specify the contexts in which they may be applied (if possible who when and where)
- vii) **Recommendations**. High quality recommendations should be *actionable* proposals that are:

- Implementable within the timeframe and resources available
 - Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
 - Specific in terms of who would do what and when
 - Contain results-based language (i.e. a measurable performance target)
 - Include a trade off analysis, when its implementation may require utilizing significant resources that would have otherwise been used for other project purposes.
- viii) **Annexes** include Terms of Reference, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, brief summary of the expertise of the evaluator / evaluation team, a summary of co-finance information etc. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an annex.

Examples of UNEP GEF Mid-term Evaluation Reports are available at www.unep.org/eou

Review of the Draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report

The Draft report shall be submitted to the Chief of Evaluation and Oversight Unit UNEP. The Chief of Evaluation and Oversight Unit UNEP will share the report with corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor, as well as the Co-Implementing Agency, UNDP, for initial review and consultation. The UNDP, DGEF staff, Executing Agency staff and all other stakeholders can comment on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. UNEP EOU will collate the review comments and provide them to the evaluator for consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

All UNEP GEF Evaluation Reports are subject to quality assessments by UNEP EOU. These incorporate GEF Office of Evaluation quality assessment criteria and are used as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluator (see Annex 4).

6. Submission of Final Terminal Evaluation Reports.

The final report shall be written in English and submitted in electronic form in MS Word format and should be sent directly to:

Segbedzi Norgbey, Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit
 UNEP, P.O. Box 30552-00100
 Nairobi, Kenya
 Tel.: (254-20) 7624181
 Fax: (254-20) 7623158
 Email: segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org

The Chief of Evaluation and Oversight will share the report with the following individuals:

Maryam Niamir-Fuller
 Director
 UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination
 P.O. Box 30552-00100
 Nairobi, Kenya

Tel: + 254-20-7624686
Fax: + 254-20-623158/4042
Email: maryam.niamir-fuller@unep.org

Isabelle Vanderbeck
Task Manager GEF Projects in Latin America and the Caribbean
1889 F Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Room 723
Tel: +1-202-458-3772
Fax: +1-202-458-3560
Email: isabelle.vanderbeck@unep.org or UNEPRep@oas.org

Takehiro Nakamura
UNEP/GEF SPO International Waters
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF)
PO Box 30552-00100
Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: 254 20 7623886
Fax: 254 20 7624041
Email: takehiro.nakamura@unep.org

[Andrew Hudson](#)
[Principal Technical Advisor, International Waters](#)
[United Nations Development Programme \(UNDP\)](#)
[FF-914, 1 United Nations Plaza](#)
[New York, NY 10017](#)
[Tel : 1 212 906 6228](#)
[Fax : 1 212 906 6998](#)
[Email : andrew.hudson@undp.org](#)

[Paula Caballero](#)
[Regional Technical Advisor for International Waters](#)
[UNDP-GEF](#)
[UN House, City of Knowledge](#)
[Clayton, Panama City](#)
[Panama](#)
[Tel: + 507 302 4571](#)
[Fax: + 507 302 4549](#)
[Email: paula.caballero@undp.org](#)

The final Mid-Term Evaluation report will be considered as an ‘internal document’ with the circulation of the report to be determined by DGEF management and UNDP.

7. Resources and schedule of the evaluation

This Mid-Term Evaluation will be undertaken by an international evaluator contracted by the UNEP/EIU. The contract for the evaluator will begin on 1 May 2009 and end on 30 September 2009 (10 weeks) spread over 5 months (including 15 days of travel, to St. Lucia, Jamaica, Trinidad & Tobago, Washington and

Panama). The evaluator will submit a draft report on 30 June 2009 to UNEP/EOU. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP / EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant by 20 July 2009 after which, the consultant will submit the final report no later than 30 September 2009. The consultant will present the findings of the evaluation to a meeting of stakeholders to be organised by the project team.

The evaluator will have an initial telephone briefing with UNEP/EOU, UNEP/DGEF and UNDP-GEF then travel to St Lucia, Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, Washington and Panama. In accordance with UNEP/GEF policy, all GEF projects are evaluated by independent evaluators contracted as consultants. The evaluators should have the following qualifications:

- ❖ The evaluator should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief Evaluation and Oversight Unit UNEP.
- ❖ The evaluator should be an international expert in environmental science with a sound understanding of watershed and coastal area management. The consultant should have the following minimum qualifications: (i) experience in GEF indicators development; (ii) experience with management and implementation of multi-country projects and in particular with policy-related monitoring and assessments that generate knowledge and information relevant to decision-making; (iii) experience with project evaluation. Knowledge of UNEP and UNDP programmes and GEF activities is desirable. Fluency in oral and written English is a must.

8. Schedule Of Payment

The consultant shall select one of the following two contract options:

Fee-only Option

The evaluator will receive a payment of 40% of the total amount upon submission of a satisfactory draft report. Final payment of 60% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual SSAs of the evaluator and is NOT inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses. Ticket and DSA will be paid separately by UNEP.

When submitting the Travel Claim upon completion of travel, kindly note some of the following points: that UNON's primary operating currency is the US Dollar and reimbursements are made at the USD equivalent at the ruling UN exchange rate and not necessarily the currency of expenditure. If the consultant wishes to be paid in any other currency other than USD the consultant should indicate on the Travel Claim and special arrangements can be made with UNON's bank. The UN has standard rules for reimbursement of travel expenses and UNON enforces compliance on behalf of UNEP. Taxis to and from Hotel to Airport/Train/Bus station are covered by terminal allowances and the maximum reimbursable is USD 38.00. Taxis from Hotel to meeting venues as well as local telephone calls are covered by the Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA).

9. Proviso

In case, the evaluator cannot provide the products in accordance with the TORs, the timeframe agreed, or his/her products are substandard, the payment to the evaluator could be

withheld, until such a time the products are modified to meet UNEP's standard. In case the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the evaluator may not constitute the Mid Term Review report.

Annex 1. OVERALL RATINGS TABLE

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
A. Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
A. 1. Effectiveness		
A. 2. Relevance		
A. 3. Efficiency		
B. Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
B. 1. Financial		
B. 2. Socio Political		
B. 3. Institutional framework and governance		
B. 4. Environmental		
C. Achievement of outputs and activities		
D. Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)		
D. 1. M&E Design		
D. 2. M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)		
D. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities		
E. Catalytic Role		
F. Preparation and readiness		
G. Country ownership / drivenness		
H. Stakeholders involvement		
I. Financial planning		
J. Implementation approach		
K. UNEP Supervision and backstopping		
Overall rating		

RATING OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

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.

Please note: Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results **may not be higher** than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for

outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

- A. Sustainability will be understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The Mid-Term Evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-economic incentives /or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes..

Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

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.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E

Monitoring is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation may involve the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, and an assessment of actual and expected results.

The Project monitoring and evaluation system will be rated on 'M&E Design', 'M&E Plan Implementation' and 'Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities' as follows:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

“M&E plan implementation” will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on “M&E plan implementation.”

All other ratings will be on a six point scale:

HS	= Highly Satisfactory
S	= Satisfactory
MS	= Moderately Satisfactory
MU	= Moderately Unsatisfactory
U	= Unsatisfactory
HU	= Highly Unsatisfactory

Annex 2 – Project Performance Rubric

Project proposal Logframe			Agreed Project performance indicators and targets					
<u>Overall Objectives</u>	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Means of Verification (Monitoring focus)	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Highly Unsatisfactory
Outcomes								
								<p>No project countries have formally endorsed the SAP</p> <p>No project countries have formal national and donor commitments to finance the SAP endorsed the SAP</p> <p>A mechanism to objectively measure management actions is in not place or used by countries</p>
Outputs								

Annex 3. Co-financing and Leveraged Resources

Co-financing (basic data to be supplied to the consultant for verification)

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other* (mill US\$)		Total (mill US\$)		Total Disbursement (mill US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
- Grants										
- Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate)										
- Credits										
- Equity investments										
- In-kind support										
- Other (*)										
-										
-										
-										
Totals										

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

Leveraged Resources

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

Table showing actual project expenditure by activity to be supplied by the UNEP Fund management Officer. (insert here)

Annex 4

Review of the Draft Report

Draft reports submitted to UNEP EOU are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DGEF staff and senior Executing Agency staff provide comments on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. UNEP EOU collates the review comments and provides them to the evaluators for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report. General comments on the draft report with respect to compliance with these TOR are shared with the reviewer.

Quality Assessment of the Evaluation Report

All UNEP GEF Mid Term Reports are subject to quality assessments by UNEP EOU. These apply GEF Office of Evaluation quality assessment and are used as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluator.

The quality of the draft evaluation report is assessed and rated against the following criteria:

GEF Report Quality Criteria	UNEP EOU Assessment	Rating
A. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable?		
B. Was the report consistent and the evidence complete and convincing and were the ratings substantiated when used?		
C. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes?		
D. Were the lessons and recommendations supported by the evidence presented?		
E. Did the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?		
F. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of the project M&E system and its use for project management?		
UNEP EOU additional Report Quality Criteria	UNEP EOU Assessment	Rating
G. Quality of the lessons: Were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
H. Quality of the recommendations: Did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can they be implemented? Did the recommendations specify a goal and an associated performance indicator?		
I. Was the report well written? (clear English language and grammar)		
J. Did the report structure follow EOU guidelines? Were all requested Annexes included?		
K. Were all evaluation aspects specified in the TORs adequately addressed?		
L. Was the report delivered in a timely manner		

GEF Quality of the MTE report = $0.3*(A + B) + 0.1*(C+D+E+F)$

EOU assessment of MTE report = $0.3*(G + H) + 0.1*(I+J+K+L)$

Combined quality Rating = $(2* \text{'GEF EO' rating} + \text{EOU rating})/3$

The Totals are rounded and converted to the scale of HS to HU

Rating system for quality of terminal evaluation reports

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.

Annex 5 GEF Minimum requirements for M&E

Minimum Requirement 1: Project Design of M&E3

All projects must include a concrete and fully budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan by the time of Work Program entry (full-sized projects) or CEO approval (medium-sized projects). This plan must contain at a minimum:

- SMART (see below) indicators for project implementation, or, if no indicators are identified, an alternative plan for monitoring that will deliver reliable and valid information to management
- SMART indicators for results (outcomes and, if applicable, impacts), and, where appropriate, corporate-level indicators
- A project baseline, with:
 - a description of the problem to address
 - indicator data
 - or, if major baseline indicators are not identified, an alternative plan for addressing this within one year of implementation
- An M&E Plan with identification of reviews and evaluations which will be undertaken, such as mid-term reviews or evaluations of activities
- An organizational setup and budgets for monitoring and evaluation.

Minimum Requirement 2: Application of Project M&E

- Project monitoring and supervision will include implementation of the M&E plan, comprising:
- Use of SMART indicators for implementation (or provision of a reasonable explanation if not used)
- Use of SMART indicators for results (or provision of a reasonable explanation if not used)
- Fully established baseline for the project and data compiled to review progress
- Evaluations are undertaken as planned
- Operational organizational setup for M&E and budgets spent as planned.

SMART INDICATORS GEF projects and programs should monitor using relevant performance indicators. The monitoring system should be “SMART”:

1. **Specific:** The system captures the essence of the desired result by clearly and directly relating to achieving an objective, and only that objective.

³ <http://gefweb.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/MEPTools/meptstandards.html>

2. **Measurable:** The monitoring system and its indicators are unambiguously specified so that all parties agree on what the system covers and there are practical ways to measure the indicators and results.
3. **Achievable and Attributable:** The system identifies what changes are anticipated as a result of the intervention and whether the result(s) are realistic. Attribution requires that changes in the targeted developmental issue can be linked to the intervention.
4. **Relevant and Realistic:** The system establishes levels of performance that are likely to be achieved in a practical manner, and that reflect the expectations of stakeholders.
5. **Time-bound, Timely, Trackable, and Targeted:** The system allows progress to be tracked in a cost-effective manner at desired frequency for a set period, with clear identification of the particular stakeholder group to be impacted by the project or program.

ANNEX 6 RISK FACTOR TABLE

*Evaluators will use this table to summarize risks identified in the **Project Document** and reflect also **any new risks** identified in the course of the evaluation in regard to project implementation. The Notes column should be used to provide additional details concerning manifestation of the risk as relevant.*

INTERNAL RISK Project management										
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	NOTES
Management structure	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems							
Governance structure	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs	Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate	Members lack commitment (seldom meet) and therefore the Committee/body does not fulfil its function							
Internal communications	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment / factions							
Work flow	Project progressing according to work plan	Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall implementation	Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation							
Co-financing	Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time	Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic	A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize							
Budget	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget							
Financial management	Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds							
Reporting	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting							

	complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	analysis of progress and implementation issues								
Stakeholder involvement	Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners	Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners	Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders							
External communications	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident							
Short term/long term balance	Project is meeting short term needs and results within a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected							
Science and technological issues	Project based on sound science and well established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and /or technological uncertainties							
Political influences	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives							
Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary										

Annex 7

List of intended recipients for the Terminal Evaluation (to be completed by the IA Task Manager)

Name	Affiliation	Email
Aaron Zazueta	GEF Evaluation Office	azazueta@thegef.org
Government Officials		
GEF Focal Point(s)		
Executing Agency		
Implementing Agency		

Annex 2 Mission programme

Itinerary, GEF-IWCAM Mid-Term Evaluation, May-Sep 2009					
Date	Task	Time	Location	Contacts	Comments
Late April/Early May	Desk Review	N/A	UK	N/A	
03 May 2009	Travel to St. Lucia				
4-5 May	Meeting with PCU & CEHI	All day	Castries	VS	Meetings with RPC and other PCU staff
06 May 2009	Meeting with SLU Demo Project	Morning	Fond D'Or	VS	Meetings with Demo Project Manager; site visit and meetings with Watershed Committee members and beneficiaries
06 May 2009	Travel to Kingston, Jamaica	Afternoon			Depart from Vieux Fort
07 May 2009	Meeting with UNEP CAR/RCU & NEPA	All day	Kingston	CJC	Meeting with UNEP CAR/RCU AMEP Programme Officer, Chris Corbin; meeting with NFP, Winsome Townsend
08 May 2009	Meeting with Jam Demo Project	All day		LK	Visit watershed and meet with stakeholders
09 May 2009	Travel to Tobago				
11 May 2009	Meeting with Demo Focal Point	All day	Crown Point	LB	Meetings with governmental representatives
12 May 2009	Meeting with T&T Demo Project	Morning	Buccoo Bay	ST	Meetings with BRT, Sandra Timothy and visit to site (Buccoo Reef)
12 May 2009	Travel to Panama	Evening			COPA Airlines

13 May 2009	Meeting with UNDP Task Manager	Morning	Panama City	PC	Meetings at UNDP, City of Knowledge ⁴
13 May 2009	Travel to Jamaica	Afternoon			COPA Airlines
14 May 2009	Meeting with UNEP CAR/RCU Coordinator	Morning	Kingston	NAC	Meeting with UNEP CAR/RCU Coordinator, Nelson Andrade
14 May 2009	Travel to Washington, DC	Evening			
15 May 2009	Meeting with UNEP Task Manager	Morning	DC	IV	Meetings at OAS
15 May 2009	Meeting with GEF	Afternoon	DC	IZ	
16 May 2009	Travel to UK				

CJC Chris Corbin, UNEP CAR/RCU
 IV Isabelle Vanderbeck, UNEP DGEF
 PC Paula Caballero, UNDP GEF
 VS Vincent Sweeney, PCU
 BRT Buccoo Reef Trust
 LB Linford Beckles, NFP, T&T
 ST Sandra Timothy, Demo PM, Tobago
 LK Lisa Kirkland, Demo PM, Jamaica
 IZ Ivan Zavadsky (GEF)
 NAC Nelson Andrade Colmenares (UNEP CAR RCU)

⁴ This meeting was undertaken by phone post-mission

Annex 3 IWCAM – Persons met/interviewed

PCU and CEHI

Vincent Sweeney
Una McPherson
Donna Spencer
Sasha Beth Gottlieb
Magnalia Goldson
Patricia Aquing
Chris Cox
Chris Roberts

UNEP CAR/RCU – Kingston, Jamaica

Nelson Andrade
Nadia-Deen Ferguson
Chris Corbin

GEFSEC

Ivan Zavadsky

UNEP

Isabelle Vanderbeck

UNDP

Paula Caballero – RTA
Maria Eugenia Morales CO Dominican Republic
Margaret Jones Williams CO – Jamaica
Nicole Brown – CO – Jamaica

UNOPS

Andrew Menz

St Lucia – Demonstration Project

Cornelius Isaac – Project Manager
Urban Glace – Chairman, Watershed Management Committee
Angelina Polius – Secretary, Watershed Management Committee

Jamaica

NEPA

Mrs Winsome Townsend – NFP
Lisa Kirkland – Demonstration Project Manager

Demonstration project

Beverley Carr – Fairy Hill Home makers
Joseph Pennant – Water Resources Authority (WRA)
Selvyn Thompson – NEPA
Horace Roper – WRA
Caryl Grant – IWCAM
Tracey Edwards – IWCAM
Nelsa English IWCAM

Michael Johnson IWCAM
Juliet Bailey – Principal Fair Prospect Primary School
Elaine Robinson – Rural Hill Primary School
Kamipn Simpson – Rural Hill Primary School
Brian Worghs – Farmer
Orlando Smith – Fisherman
George Williams – Fisherman
Donald Chin – Met office
Delroy Tomlinson - met office
Omar Doyley – Community member
Annetta Russel – Community member
Sandrin Fuller – Reach Falls – Urban Development Corporation
Oliver Hendricks – Small grants beneficiary
Dorette Martin – Sherwood Food
Mrytte Lawrence – Fairy Hill community

Trinidad & Tobago

Secretary Hilton Sandy - Tobago House Assembly
Linford Beckles – National Focal Point

Demonstration Project

Sandra Timothy – IWCAM Demo Project Manager (Buccoo Reef Trust)
Barry Lovelace – IWCAM Demo Education outreach (Buccoo Reef Trust)
Cherece Wallace - IWCAM Demo GIS Officer (Buccoo Reef Trust)
Juel Paul - IWCAM Demo GIS Officer (Buccoo Reef Trust)
Richard Parkinson - IWCAM Demo – Scientific Officer (Buccoo Reef Trust)
Dave Elliott - IWCAM Demo – Video Production Officer (Buccoo Reef Trust)
Dianna Melville - IWCAM Demo – Education and Research Officer (Buccoo Reef Trust)
Todd Denoon - IWCAM Demo – Education and Research Officer (Buccoo Reef Trust)
Gerald MacFarlane – Director – Buccoo Reef Trust
Kaye Trotman – Director – Buccoo Reef Trust
Richard Langton - Director – Buccoo Reef Trust
Lyndon Glasgow – President Anse Fromager Ecological Protection Organisation
Laura Williams – Secretary, Anse Fromager Ecological Protection Organisation

Annex 4 Documents and sources of information

The main source of documents for this MTE was the GEF-IWCAM website (www.iwcam.org).

The following key documents were utilised

1. Project Executive Summary
2. Project Document (and Annexes)
3. APR/PIR 2008
4. PSC minutes
5. RTAG meeting reports
6. Demonstration Project reports
7. Project reports:
 - a. Toolkit for Institutional, Policy and Legislative improvements in Support of the IWCAM Approach in Caribbean SIDS
 - b. IWCAM Indicator Mechanism and Capacity Assessment
 - c. Laboratory Assessment Reports
 - d. Road-map for IWRM implementation (Barbados)
8. Caribbean WaterWays Newsletter

Annex 5 Demonstration Project Questionnaire and Responses

Demonstration project – status summary

As part of the mid-term evaluation of the GEF-IWCAM Project, the implementation status of each demonstration project is being assessed and your support in providing this limited information will be greatly appreciated.

Brief responses to the following 7 questions regarding the implementation of your project would be very helpful in providing an overall assessment of the GEF-IWCAM demonstration activities. The focus of these questions is on establishing progress on activities, illustrating how the demonstration projects are achieving their important objectives of sustainability and replication, and highlighting some key lessons learnt.

1. Please provide a simple assessment of progress (%age achieved, plus any comments) against each of the original outputs (if these have changed since the proposal, please comment briefly, and give new outputs).

Output	% achieved	Comments

2. Please describe in a few sentences how the activities of the demonstration project will be sustained in the country and how these activities support the implementation of the LBS protocol of the Cartagena Convention.
3. What has been done (or is planned to be done) to replicate the activities of the demonstration project elsewhere in the country (or region)?
4. Please provide estimates of Stress Reduction (SR) that have been, and/or will be, achieved by the demonstration activities. Where possible give quantifiable estimates of SR.
5. What are the key lessons learnt from the implementation of the demonstration project activities? Please give at least three examples.
6. Please summarise in a table the co-funding that the project has received to-date and also the amount expected by the end of project (please indicate the source and the amount of co-funding)
7. Any other comments?

The responses from the **(all)** demonstration projects are presented in the following order.

1. Antigua and Barbuda
2. Bahamas (Andros and Exuma)
3. Cuba
4. Dominican Republic
5. Jamaica
6. St Kitts and Nevis
7. St Lucia
8. Trinidad and Tobago

1 Antigua and Barbuda
Demonstration project – status summary

1. Please provide a simple assessment of progress (%age achieved, plus any comments) against each of the original outputs (if these have changed since the proposal, please comment briefly, and give new outputs).

Output	% achieved	Comments
<i>Project Management</i>	<i>On going</i>	<i>The staff has been hired and the project is being managed</i>
<i>Public Awareness and Training</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>PR activities have been done and continue to be completed</i>
<i>Collection of baseline information: Data capture, Analysis, interpretation and presentation</i>	<i>90</i>	<i>Final database being developed</i>
<i>National Sewage and Wastewater Management Strategy Developed</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>The final strategy document has been presented however it is seen as being inadequate and is thus currently being revisited</i>
<i>Environmental Impact assessment conducted for a central sewage system for the Demo Project area</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>Study currently being conducted</i>
<i>Feasibility Study conducted for a central sewage system in St. John's</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>Study currently being conducted</i>
<i>Street level wastewater management demonstration in Mckinnons</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>TORs developed and are being reviewed. To be advertised shortly</i>
<i>Development of a GEF MSG proposal for the development of low cost and environmentally friendly options for the Parish of St. Johns</i>	<i>0</i>	<i>TORs being developed</i>

2. Please describe in a few sentences how the activities of the demonstration project will be sustained in the country and how these activities support the implementation of the LBS protocol of the Cartagena Convention.
The demonstration project will be managed by APUA once it is completed. It will contribute to the implementation of the LBS protocol in that similar systems will be considered for implementation throughout the country to effectively manage sewage and wastewater that in most cases flow either directly or indirectly into the sea.
3. What has been done (or is planned to be done) to replicate the activities of the demonstration project elsewhere in the country (or region)? ***Similar systems will be looked at for implementation throughout the country.***

4. Please provide estimates of Stress Reduction (SR) that have been, and/or will be, achieved by the demonstration activities. Where possible give quantifiable estimates of SR. ***It is anticipated that the system will lead to a reduction in pollution levels of sewage going into the Mckinnons pond.***
5. What are the key lessons learnt from the implementation of the demonstration project activities? Please give at least three examples.
 - a. ***It is very difficult to get suitably qualified consultants to do the required consultancies.***
 - b. ***Government and policy makers need quantifiable proof in order to make acceptable changes to existing policies.***
 - c. ***The economic conditions over a five year period can have a great impact on the funding for a project.***
6. Please summarise in a table the co-funding that the project has received to-date and also the amount expected by the end of project (please indicate the source and the amount of co-funding)

Co-Funding Amount	Funding Agency
US\$150,000	Government of Antigua and Barbuda
US\$ 50,000	APUA

7. Any other comments?

2 Bahamas

Demonstration project – status summary

1. Please provide a simple assessment of progress (%age achieved, plus any comments) against each of the original outputs (if these have changed since the proposal, please comment briefly, and give new outputs).

Output	% achieved	Comments
Exuma: Steering Committee, Technical site Assessment	n/a	
Andros: Data Collection begun by TNC	n/a	

2. Please describe in a few sentences how the activities of the demonstration project will be sustained in the country and how these activities support the implementation of the LBS protocol of the Cartagena Convention.

It is envisioned that the Exuma Demo project will be sustained through the establishment of the Elizabeth Harbour Management Committee that will be organized in the same way as the steering committee, and this committee will work in corporation with the office of the local government administrator. The Andros project proposals will be promoted by the BEST Commission, and Demo facilities will be similarly administered through the office of the local government administrator.

3. What has been done (or is planned to be done) to replicate the activities of the demonstration project elsewhere in the country (or region)?

The Nature Conservancy, the Andros project partner will hold responsibility for demonstrating how replication can be accomplished elsewhere, in Exuma the BEST Commission, and Water and Sewerage Corporation (WSC) will submit to government a replication report, based on priority in other islands of the Bahamas (such as the Abaco's which has already been proposed as a site of urgent need by WSC consultant.

4. Please provide estimates of Stress Reduction (SR) that have been, and/or will be, achieved by the demonstration activities. Where possible give quantifiable estimates of SR.

Not Available

5. What are the key lessons learnt from the implementation of the demonstration project activities? Please give at least three examples.

As projects remain in their implementation phase, response to this question is premature.

6. Please summarise in a table the co-funding that the project has received to-date and also the amount expected by the end of project (please indicate the source and the amount of co-funding)

Not Applicable to date.

7. Any other comments?

3 Cuba

Demonstration project – status summary

1. Please provide a simple assessment of progress (%age achieved, plus any comments) against each of the original outputs (if these have changed since the proposal, please comment briefly, and give new outputs).

Output	% achieved	Comments
Establishment of the Local Authority for IWCAM	70	The working place is almost finished and the design and definition of missions, goals and financial requirements and management regime were discussed and approved already. The last 30% is referred to the implementation activities included the GIS for environment at province level.
Establishment of a Water Quality Monitoring Program	70	All monitoring programs are working (bay and watersheds). The staff is working on the design of proper indicators and assessment model. It were developed two workshops to discuss those aspects.
Establishment of demonstration pilot areas for implementing best forest practices	40	The indicators are defined and all farmers work in the proper plan. Three of the selected forests farms are almost finish the house for the family.
Establishment of demonstration pilot areas for implementing best agricultural practices	40	The two farms are working in the planned activities. Two formation activities were developed last quarter. The farmers have received several furniture supported by the project, they are very happy.
Establishment of a demonstration pilot (targeting a sugar mill) for implementing a program to diminish water consumption, with the reuse of wastewater in sugar cane irrigation and other process waste.	40	The output Design the main components taking into account a mass balance of product to be reuse, as wastewater and bio-solid, is almost finished but the implementation is delayed due to investment in the industry is also delayed.
Development and strengthening domestic wastewater management in	40	They have been defined the polluting and classified main

the watershed and coastal areas (IWCAM)		focuses the same ones for type and it loads. At the moment the theoretical inventory is upgraded and starting from laboratory rehearsals.
Establishment of a public awareness and capacity building Program within IWCAM concepts.	80	The establishment an Environmental Education Program, within the concepts of the IWCAM, for promoting awareness and capacitating of tourism sector and decision makers, is already working with successful.

2. Please describe in a few sentences how the activities of the demonstration project will be sustained in the country and how these activities support the implementation of the LBS protocol of the Cartagena Convention.

All the activities that it develops the project guarantee the implementation of the protocol LBS of the Convention of Cartagena. The activities that are developed in the forest and agroecological farms guarantee a model to reply for the reduction of the polluting load that the bad practices can generate. The formation of the human resources in function of the integrated management of basins and coastal areas guarantees an approach adapted by each one of the actors that participate in the administration of these. The establishment of a Local Authority for the IWCAM is essential to harmonize all the actions for the implementation of this approach. The survey of point source of pollution and estimation of loads discharges is included in the social activities of Environmental Studies Centre of Cienfuegos that support the LBS protocol of the Cartagena Convention. The monitoring program of Cienfuegos bay, the monitoring program for quality of the beach and all water supplied for people are working and supported by the government.

3. What has been done (or is planned to be done) to replicate the activities of the demonstration project elsewhere in the country (or region)?

The establishment of local authority at local level is discuss and it indicated by Science and Environment Ministry to implement for Santiago de Cuba, Varadero Beach and other counties.

4. Please provide estimates of Stress Reduction (SR) that have been, and/or will be, achieved by the demonstration activities. Where possible give quantifiable estimates of SR.

?...

5. What are the key lessons learnt from the implementation of the demonstration project activities? Please give at least three examples.

- *The community work and the formation of human resource in relation to the integrated management of basins and coastal areas.*
- *The design and implementation of monitoring programs of the quality of the basins and coastal areas.*
- *The design and implementation of a structure that it guarantees sustainability in the management of the basins and coastal areas.*

6. Please summarise in a table the co-funding that the project has received to-date and also the amount expected by the end of project (please indicate the source and the amount of co-funding)

Organization	Destiny	Co-funding
IRD – France	Component 2 Monitoring Program	18000 USD
IAEA	Lab equipment support.	800000 USD

Expected by the end of project: 250 000USD

7. Any other comments?

It is very little time to be able to evaluate the impact of the project, for what I recommend the execution of the Plan of Work it is evaluated that guarantees the foreseen results they are reached.

4 Dominican Republic

Demonstration project – status summary

As part of the mid-term evaluation of the GEF-IWCAM Project, the implementation status of each demonstration project is being assessed and your support in providing this limited information will be greatly appreciated.

Brief responses to the following 7 questions regarding the implementation of your project would be very helpful in providing an overall assessment of the GEF-IWCAM demonstration activities. The focus of these questions is on establishing progress on activities, illustrating how the demonstration projects are achieving their important objectives of sustainability and replication, and highlighting some key lessons learnt.

-
8. Please provide a simple assessment of progress (%age achieved, plus any comments) against each of the original outputs (if these have changed since the proposal, please comment briefly, and give new outputs).

Output	% achieved	Comments
Establishment of project management and administrative Unit	100%	Executing Unit established and working properly. All staff contracted and working. Project office established. Regular meetings of the Steering Committee. Reports sent according requirements,
Establishment of a management infrastructure and strategy for the Haina River Basin	50%	Haina River Basin Management Committee (HRBMC) established. Regular meetings are done from Dec.08. An effective monitoring and compliance capacity guided by the HRBMC has not been started.
Legislative and policy review to provide incentives for reductions in discharges and emissions, and to establish responsibility for monitoring and compliance	25%	A survey of existing discharges, solid wastes disposal and air emissions practices is being conducted at Haina industries (75% achieved). Baseline data collection and analysis for water is being done (based on another government institutions like INDRHI and CAASD. At this moment we are

		establishment the sampling point at Haina river basin and its coast in order to test water samples according IWCAM indicators.
--	--	--

9. Please describe in a few sentences how the activities of the demonstration project will be sustained in the country and how these activities support the implementation of the LBS protocol of the Cartagena Convention.

During the project development, project activities will be sustained by means funds donated by GEF and the Dominican Republic government, and after that we hope that the sustainable mechanism (one of the project outputs) to be adopted after June 2010, could support the project activities in addition to some funds which could be done for the industrial sector.

This activities support the LBS protocol because they will control a land based point source of contamination as they are the industries of Haina river basin.

10. What has been done (or is planned to be done) to replicate the activities of the demonstration project elsewhere in the country (or region)?

We plan to replicate this project in another hydrographical basin which is contaminated by industries wastes in the Dominican Republic.

11. Please provide estimates of Stress Reduction (SR) that have been, and/or will be, achieved by the demonstration activities. Where possible give quantifiable estimates of SR.

We hope to achieve SR indicators as follows:

- a) Increase in industrial solid waste reused, recycled and adequate managed.**
- b) Reduction in no treated industrial liquid discharge volume.**
- c) Increase of installed filter at industries in order to reduce atmospheric contaminants.**

12. What are the key lessons learnt from the implementation of the demonstration project activities? Please give at least three examples.

- a) A considerable number of industries do not classify hazards materials from domestic and manage them in the same manner that domestic wastes.**
- b) Local government at Haina river basin manages solid wastes at the municipal dump, in a very risk condition because domestic waste comes together with hazardous materials from the industrial sector.**
- c) People of Haina river basin is highly exposed to toxics due to toxic fumes that mix with air, when the municipal dump (no sanitary fill) get into fire.**

13. Please summarise in a table the co-funding that the project has received to-date and also the amount expected by the end of project (please indicate the source and the amount of co-funding)

FUNDS DONOR	2007 (US\$)	2008 (US\$)	2009	2010	TOTAL EXPECTED
GEF Funding	40,000	146,148.86			US\$520,470.00
DOM. REP GOV Funding	—	58,689.96			US\$642,750.00 (Funds and in kind)

14. Any other comments?

Implementation of the project "*Mitigation of impacts of industrial wastes on the lower Haina river basin and its coast*" is very complex due to the diversity of industries located at the area. The river looks very affected by the contamination from industries and the population.

Time to implement this project is too short to get the planned outcomes, so it will be necessary to continue with this project to get gradually changes from industry sector.

Mercedes Socorro Pantaleon
IWCAM RD Project Manager

Santo Domingo
Dominican Republic
July 02, 2009

5 Jamaica

Demonstration project – status summary

1. Please provide a simple assessment of progress (%age achieved, plus any comments) against each of the original outputs (if these have changed since the proposal, please comment briefly, and give new outputs).

Output	% achieved	Comments
Grant Programme	70%	All projects should end by the end of June. Challenges encountered with rain and other obstacles.
Water Quality Monitoring	90%	Ongoing, programme should end in August and final report produced
Accountable Body	90%	Identified and ongoing capacity building taking place

2. Please describe in a few sentences how the activities of the demonstration project will be sustained in the country and how these activities support the implementation of the LBS protocol of the Cartagena Convention. There are essentially three ways (local level, state agency level and national level) . Ongoing monitoring, stations will be handed over to relevant agencies. These will be incorporated in agencies system (state level). NEPA's Ecosystems Branch will use Watershed Model to implement change in the remaining 25 Jamaica WMU (national level). Output from the Project will be deposited at the local level DAC who will continue to build on and disseminate information (local level). These "activities " are all aim at watershed management, using an integrated approach which results in reduction of land base pollution amongst other things.
3. What has been done (or is planned to be done) to replicate the activities of the demonstration project elsewhere in the country (or region)? We hope to use the Watershed Model. Currently plans are in place to have a "Watershed Exchange" this essential involves the exchange of ideas, best management practices and meetings amongst watershed Groups in and outside the Project area. Two sets of exchanges have already taken place.
4. Please provide estimates of Stress Reduction (SR) that have been, and/or will be, achieved by the demonstration activities. Where possible give quantifiable estimates of SR. 12 garbage facilities constructed and placed (currently 9 completed), 8 Community Clean up days resulting in some 30 truck loads of garbage removed. 25 Stakeholders introduced to constructed wetland technology. 5 schools sanitation system improved. 12 Farmers Training Days conducted. 500 coconut seedling, 400 pieces of cassava sticks and 1000 fruit and timber seedlings planted. 600 pineapple setts and 12 bags of grass used for soil conservation and approx. four plots of stone and lime grass constructed. 498 bags of organic fertilizers distributed.

5. What are the key lessons learnt from the implementation of the demonstration project activities? Please give at least three examples. (1) It is very important to engage all relevant stakeholders from the onset of the Project this will ensure "buy-in" and maximum participation. Eg. We did this from the onset and community support has been excellent so far. (2) Advance participatory methods is a crucial facilitation tool to ensure understanding every step of the way, moreover, stakeholders know that their input is valued, they are therefore more relaxed and able to get along with each other and get more work done. (3) If at all possible Community members should be incorporated in monitoring programme. E.g. Water quality monitoring. Community members were trained to collect water samples.
6. Please summarise in a table the co-funding that the project has received to-date and also the amount expected by the end of project (please indicate the source and the amount of co-funding)

Co-Funding

Amount to date	US\$	Source	Cash	Kind
37,460.00		GOJ	a.	
591,880		NEPA		b.

7. Any other comments?

6 St Kitts and Nevis

Demonstration project – status summary

1. Please provide a simple assessment of progress (%age achieved, plus any comments) against each of the original outputs (if these have changed since the proposal, please comment briefly, and give new outputs).

Output	% achieved	Comments
1. Development of Water Resource Management Plan for the Basseterre Valley Aquifer	78	All activities have been executed in accordance with Project Work Plan
2. Development of National Park Management Plan for the Protected Area	70	All activities have been executed in accordance with Project Work Plan

2. Please describe in a few sentences how the activities of the demonstration project will be sustained in the country and how these activities support the implementation of the LBS protocol of the Cartagena Convention.

The activities of the demonstration project will be sustained through the anticipated support from the Government and its adoption of the IWCAM recommendations as policy.

It is also anticipated that the Government would introduce waste management and pollution reduction measures in order to educate and sensitize citizens about the impact of pollution on the physical environment and most importantly water resources.

This would be achieved through the introduction of national education awareness programmes and projects along with the building of human capacity and professional competency in protected areas conservation management.

Whereas the Government of St Kitts-Nevis is a party to the Cartagena Convention it has not yet acceded to the LBS Protocol. The activities of the demonstration project do however support the implementation of the said protocol which provides a mechanism for regional cooperation and coordination to effectively address pollution from land-based sources. Acceding to the LBS Protocol can also derive support in for Government in its efforts at mobilizing financial resources, training and capacity building, public awareness and education also the sustainable development of the project.

3. What has been done (or is planned to be done) to replicate the activities of the demonstration project elsewhere in the country (or region)?

In light of the significant delay in the start-up of the project the Request for Proposals and the Contract for Services were not concluded until November 2008 the terms of which are ten (10) months from the notice to

proceed. Once the water resource management process has been successfully demonstrated it is planned that the project will report back to Government and will submit a proposed model for future replication.

Experiences in community involvement and stakeholder participation as well as the lessons and practices derived from policy reform, changes in land-use practices and incentives for water conservation will be captured. The project will highlight the cost of implementing and maintaining similar management strategies in other watersheds and where feasible it will identify locations in St Kitts and Nevis where similar management approaches should be developed.

Of maximum importance though in terms of replicability will be the transfer of lessons and practices learnt from this demonstration to the main IWCAM Project for dissemination throughout the other Caribbean SIDS.

4. Please provide estimates of Stress Reduction (SR) that have been, and/or will be, achieved by the demonstration activities. Where possible give quantifiable estimates of SR.

For reasons outlined at (3) above estimates of Stress reduction cannot be provided at this time. The following are however anticipated:

- 100% increase of total land area in the Basseterre Valley Aquifer placed under a protective management plan that ensures its proper utilization and appropriate development.
- 50% increase in well-head protection zones for the underlying aquifer in the Basseterre Valley.
- 100% reduction in livestock farming (cattle, pigs and goats) in the Basseterre Valley Aquifer Area.
- 50% increase in the number of water loss prevention/water use efficiency initiatives adopted by the Water Services Department.
- 100% reduction of pollution from fertilizer applications through a revision of agricultural practices in the Basseterre Valley Aquifer Area.
- 50% reduction in threats of contamination to the aquifer from domestic sewage and waste water.

5. What are the key lessons learnt from the implementation of the demonstration project activities? Please give at least three examples.

Notwithstanding the reasons as outlined at (3) above implementation of the demonstration project activities thus far has been expedited as a result of the background knowledge and experience in the Public Service of the Project Manager.

The Multi-Electrode Electrical Resistivity (MER) has exposed the Water Services Department to a geophysical method of mapping of the subsurface geology which has identified gaps in the hydrogeologic data base that have to be filled in order to attain a thorough understanding of the Basseterre Valley Aquifer Area.

The implementation of activities to date has also underlined the need for an all inclusive approach to the development, planning, management and protection of vital water resources and ecosystems on a sustainable basis.

6. Please summarise in a table the co-funding that the project has received to-date and also the amount expected by the end of project (please indicate the source and the amount of co-funding)

Details of Expenditure	Co-Funding Allocated	Source of Co-Funding
Rental of Office Space	US\$ 18,000.00	Government Revenue
Procurement of Vehicle	5,000.00	" "
Office Supplies et al	5,758.34	" "
Expenditure (To Date)	US \$28,758.34	Government Revenue

Co-Funding Amount Budgeted For Project	US\$217,280.00	Government Revenue
---	-----------------------	---------------------------

7. Any other comments?

There is a definite need for the development of an appropriate mechanism to ensure continuity upon conclusion of the demonstration project activities as stipulated in the approved work plan. The countries participating in GEF-IWCAM Demonstration Project should therefore collectively formulate a strategy for the continuing development of the recommended plans and processes.

7 St Lucia

Demonstration project – status summary

1. Please provide a simple assessment of progress (%age achieved, plus any comments) against each of the original outputs (if these have changed since the proposal, please comment briefly, and give new outputs).

The following is an excerpt from correspondence sent to UNOPS on changes made to outputs;

Explanation for Changes to Work Plan and Budget

There was a need to make changes to the way the plan is presented with minimal changes to the content, and no changes to the total amount. This was necessary given the dispersal of related components and the constant need to search and interpret the intended use for budget line items. Therefore, what is attempted here is to provide a plan which is more coherent and clearly identify the essentials needed to produce a sustainable and participatory watershed model. The vision here is that the project does not wait until the last year to put the participatory model together, but seeks to establish the process from the beginning. This gives us the opportunity to implement the system, test or pilot vital parts of it, and do necessary modifications to ascertain its viability after the demonstration project ends.

Please observe that the 2007 plan was presented under the following headings:

- A. Project Management and Administration
- B. Developing Watershed Management Capacity
- C. Promoting Information and Awareness
- D. Identifying and Implementing Mechanisms for Sustainable Resource Protection and Conservation
- E. Sustainability and Replication of Lessons and Practices
- F. Project Closure

The 2008 plan is presented under the following headings:

- A. Project Management and Administration
- B. Integrated Watershed Management Plan
- C. Institutional Framework
- D. Sustainable Funding Mechanism
- E. Lessons Learnt and Replication
- F. Project Closure

The model that we want in place after the project ends was not easily seen in the 2007 plan. With the 2008 plan, one can identify components **b**, **c** and **d** as critical parts of the model through which we can immediately begin channeling resources.

Output	% achieved	Comments
--------	------------	----------

<p>1. Development and pilot testing of various critical components of an integrated watershed management plan; 1) Compensation for environmental services (CES), 2) Establish Long term watershed monitoring program (LTWMP), 3) Establish an Awareness and education program (AEP), 4) Develop a Capacity building program (CBP), 5) Develop Land use proposals (LUP), 6) Develop a Water conservation program (WCP), 7) Develop a Soil conservation program of activities (SCP), 8) Develop a Drainage and flood mitigation strategy (DFMS), 9) Develop and implement an Integrated watershed management strategy</p>	CES; 50%	Target; At least one transfer market functional by December 2009. A comprehensive study was done by the sustainable Development Unit of the University of the West Indies. Two local consultants are currently engaged in attempting to implement the approach.
	LTWMP; 70%	An appropriate and low cost program fully tested and functional by June 2010. These include chemical, physical and biological parameters in the watershed. Two systematic river water testing exercises are conducted monthly. One by an accredited lab and one with a low cost field kit. Correlation analysis will be done this summer with a view that the field kit will become the preferred method.
	AEP; 100%.	Most of the methods proposed in the communication strategy and plan developed in n2008 has been applied.
	CBP; Program fully established and is being implemented.	This program which was developed in 2007 consist is three components; Natural Resource Management, Environmental Management, and Enhancing Policy and Institutional Frameworks. 70% of the first two have been implemented while only 10% of the latter have been done. The project will be giving more focus to the later given the important issue of continuity.
	LUP; Completed in December 2008.	Land Use proposals included the thematic maps of current, proposed and areas with conflicting uses.

and plan (IWMSP)	<p>WCP; (1) A comprehensive water use and conservation plan is being developed and is expected to be completed by September, 2009. The water use and conservation plan is 90% completed</p> <p>(2) Water demand of population within watershed better addressed (through efficiency and increased supply such as RWH):</p>	<p>All field exercises have been completed. GIS works were completed and submitted to consultant. A draft report is expected soon.</p> <p>Submitted a proposal to BNTF in August 2008 for the construction of a 3500 feet water reticulation system at Gadette to 50 households with safe potable water. Works contract has been signed.</p> <p>31 (50-1000 gal tanks) rain water harvesting systems (RWH) were installed in June 2008. Recipients have benefited from three RWH management workshops.</p>
	SCP; 30% completed	Establishment of a functional soil conservation demonstration farm. All works to be completed by October, 2009. A description of works has been completed. 50% of contour drains have been constructed. Locations for stone barriers have been lined.
	DFMS; 10%	The key activities of this component are; (a) Evaluation of the effectiveness of the current drainage system within the Fond D'Or watershed, (b) Design and prioritize river and drainage works towards improving the efficiency of the system, (c) Assessment of the technological and material requirements to implement the works, and (c) Assess the operation and maintenance requirements of the rehabilitated system. Expected to be completed by December, 2009. This is beyond the financial capacity of the GEF-IWCAM Demo and therefore external collaboration has to be sourced. Proposal was developed in 2008 and submitted to SFA2003 for funding. It was also sent to two Universities for consideration. At this point, there are no favorable responses.

	IWMSP; 50%	The main purpose of the exercise is to formulate a Spatial Development Plan (SDP) which will include the above mentioned components amongst others, to guide the optimal and sustainable use of land and coastal resources using the watershed as the planning unit of assessment. Completion date is set for October 2009. A TOR has been developed and a proposal call has been sent to local newspapers for publishing.
2. Development of an institutional framework for integrated watershed and coastal area management.	50%.	An Interim Watershed Management Committee has been established. A process to transform it into an NGO that will be sustained after project life has begun.
3.) Development of a funding mechanism to ensure sustainability of integrated watershed and coastal area management	10%.	Part of the training towards the formation of the NGO will include Funding.
4. Lessons learnt document, including recommendations for replication prepared	20%	Care is taken to document all activities, towards the provision of support for sustainability and replication of watershed model. Document to be developed in 1 st quarter of 2010.

2. Please describe in a few sentences how the activities of the demonstration project will be sustained in the country and how these activities support the implementation of the LBS protocol of the Cartagena Convention.

- A) The project regularly reports on its activities to several forums;
- The NIC; comprise of representatives of Government and Non-Government agencies which operate at a national level. This is also the forum responsible for promoting the LBS.
 - PSC; comprise of representatives of all departments within the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries. This ministry is the National Focla Point for the GEF_IWCAM
 - WMC; comprise of representatives of organisation and interests operating at the Demonstration site level.
- B) The WMC is in the process of being transformed into an NGO with IWCAM and LBS objectives.
3. What has been done (or is planned to be done) to replicate the activities of the demonstration project elsewhere in the country (or region)?

Some activities have been promoted through national television and print media, hosting of groups from other regions, and through national exhibitions. It is anticipated that the development of a lessons learnt document will assist the project to articulate and mainstream core achievements using the above mentioned forums as platforms.

4. Please provide estimates of Stress Reduction (SR) that have been, and/or will be, achieved by the demonstration activities. Where possible give quantifiable estimates of SR.

Output	Stress Reduction INDICATORS
Development and implementation of an Integrated and Watershed Management strategy and plan	Water conservation program - Improvement in potable water facilities: Assist the Gardette Community Development Committee with sourcing of funds to provide residents of Au Bas Cacao which comprises of 50 households, with 3500 feet of mains to distribute potable water. Works contract has been signed.
	- Installation of improved Rain Water Harvesting Systems (RWH): Thirty RWH Systems were installed (water pumps, water level devices, first flush, water tanks, filters, and non-return valves). A tool was developed to monitor user preference, water quality, and economic impact. 100% completed
	- Construction of wetlands: Four demonstration wetlands have been constructed within the Au Leon settlement to treat effluent from septic tanks before discharging into the waterways. One more is planned

5. What are the key lessons learnt from the implementation of the demonstration project activities? Please give at least three examples.

- It was necessary to provide tangible benefits to connect with community in promoting IWCAM.
- Focussing on the River and not just potable Water made it easier to build awareness about collective responsibility.
- Ministries of Government needs to establishment macro environmental policies for individual sectors instead of Department level policies. This helps with both horizontal and vertical integration of processes.

6. Please summarise in a table the co-funding that the project has received to-date and also the amount expected by the end of project (please indicate the source and the amount of co-funding).

Output	Activities	Co-Funding Source	
		(USD)	Donor

A. Project Management and Administration	a1	Establishment of Watershed management mechanism: Administrative support to Mechanism	(48,000)	GOSL
	a2	Establishment of PMU	14391	GOSL
	a3	Project Office facilities established & maintained	26,046	GOSL
	a4	Acquisition and Maintenance of equipment	4,428	GOSL
	a5	Stakeholder meetings(NIC, WMC, PSC)	885	GOSL

B. Integrated Watershed Management Plan	b1.	Compensation for environmental services	36,900	EU/SFA
	b2.	Establish Long term watershed monitoring		GOSL
	b3.	Establish an Awareness and education program	46,000	CSEA
	b6	Develop a Water conservation program		
		Ti Gadette pipeline	92250	GOSL/B NTF
		Ground water research	10,000	EU/SFA
		Rain Water Harvesting	93,496	EU/SFA
		Constructed Wetlands (small scale funding agreement (SSFA)	12,000	UNEP
TOTAL			324,396	

(XX) proposed

7. Any other comments?

8 Trinidad and Tobago

Trinidad and Tobago Demonstration Project

OUTPUT	PERCENTAGE ACHIEVED	COMMENTS
Activity 1: Establish Project Management Board (PMB) and recruit project staff	100	Name change from PMB to National Intersectoral Committee
Activity 2: Establish GIS Unit and multisectoral data collection and sharing programme and undertake training in GIS and IWCAM	80	Training in GIS and IWCAM was rescheduled for later in the project to allow for adequate data collection and analysis on the focus area. Training is now scheduled for September 2009
Activity 3: Data collection programme in target area	80	Data on road network and fresh water quality outstanding. Roads will be completed by August '09 and fresh water quality will commence June '09 and continue to the end of the project.
Activity 4: Public Awareness and Participation	75	At present films produced are dependent on television programming for airing. Films need to be aired for viewing on a regular basis. However, there is no budget available to air film nationally.
Activity 5: IWCAM Workshops and Development of recommendations	30	One IWCAM workshop was held in Trinidad with over 20 Government Ministries in attendance. The other IWCAM workshops are based on project progress to demonstrate the IWCAM approach. Workshops are due later this year and first quarter in 2010
Activity 6: Design and Scheduling of reforestation and land restoration in Courland watershed	30	Consultant to be assigned to do design by July '09. Reforestation started but did not progress as anticipated due to lack of labour
Activity 7: diversion of artificial drainage pattern in	-	An alternative site (Bon Accord drain) was selected

Buccoo Village into adjacent wetland		as there was a change in the developer's priority due to the economic downturn.
Activity 8: Upgrade Land-Use Plan in Target Area and improve EIA process	40	Town and Country Planning Department has completed digitized mapping of information for Tobago and development plan for South-West Tobago. Stakeholders' meeting is to be held later this year to advice on the revision of the Land-use Plan. Collection of environmental data to be done. Full project completion is estimated to be May 2010 including revised plan to be laid in Parliament.
Activity 9: Development of draft Policy Paper for IWCAM in Tobago	-	To be done March 2010
Activity 10: Replication of lessons and practices	-	To be done jointly with the PCU, work on this begins in July '09

1. Please describe in a few sentences how the activities of the demonstration project will be sustained in the country and how these activities support the implementation of the LBS protocol of the Cartagena Convention.

c. Activity support beyond project life

- i. The IWCAM education and awareness will be absorbed into the Buccoo Reef Trust's educational package for children and young adults.
- ii. A proposal is now being drafted for funding from the government's Green Fund Programme to enable the continuation of the reforestation programme started in the Courland watershed. The objective of the green fund is to support remediation, reforestation and conservation of the environment.
- iii. The marine monitoring programme will be dovetailed into the Tobago Reef Check Programme. A community-based monitoring programme using diver operators and tour guides is planned and this will be coordinated and executed by the Buccoo Reef Trust. Other scientific monitoring will be done in collaboration with the Institute of Marine Affairs (IMA). The IMA is state agency mandated under the law to monitor the coastal environment.

d. Supporting the implementation of the LBS

The demonstration project has supported the LBS protocol in the following ways:

- i. Reduction in soil erosion and subsequent sediment deposit in the coastal waters
 - ii. Reduction in nutrient outflow into the marine environment
 - iii. By Intensifying awareness and public knowledge on recycling and proper garbage disposal and general watershed management among communities
 - iv. Reduction in fertilizers and chemical run off into water courses
 - v. By providing readily available baseline information necessary for decision and policymaking as they relate to activities that impact the land-base and sea.
 - vi. Using GIS to confirm correlation on how actions on land impact the marine areas
 - vii. The LBS protocol committee agreed in principle to promote the use of the LBS protocol as the vehicle to achieve the legislative and policy agenda of IWCAM.
- 2. What has been done (or is planned to be done) to replicate the activities of the demonstration project elsewhere in the country (or region)?
 - i. The ICRAN funded Coastal & Marine Management and Education in the Southeastern Caribbean programme executed by the BRT is presently using the IWCAM approach in the villages of Delaford to Speyside, located at the Eastern end of the Tobago. The aim is to prevent the degradation of the reef by starting proper watershed practices. The Speyside reef is purported to be home to the largest brain coral in the western hemisphere, and its water home over 300 different species of corals
 - ii. The Toco Foundation has shown interest in the IWCAM approach and work will be done to replicate some activities in Toco (North-East Trinidad).
- 3. Please provide estimates of Stress Reduction (SR) that have been, and/or will be, achieved by the demonstration activities. Where possible give quantifiable estimates of SR.
 - e. Three activity are planned for SR
 - i. Diversion of the Bon Accord drain
 - ii. Reforestation in Courland
 - iii. Construction of Contour drains by hillside farmers
 - iv. Silt trap construction at Buccoo bay area
- 4. What are the key lessons learnt from the implementation of the demonstration project activities? Please give at least three examples.
 - v. When government is partner for implementation, activities move based on government's priority which is outside of the project management control, resulting in the timing for implementation of activities not synchronizing with the project cycle.
 - vi. Project contingency fund must be built into the project (15-20% of overall budget) to cover inflation and other activities that were not

catered for, but will come up when the project is up and running, and are necessary for the success of the project.

- vii. National Intersectoral Committee to be recognized through instruments of appointment to effectively function.
 - viii. A memorandum of understanding is needed between government and NGO; to provide a platform for a working relationship among ministries and divisions. Also it helps to ensure commitment on the part of government and allows the NGO to execute activities that are co-dependent on government to be done.
 - ix. Formation of strong partnerships at all levels is important for the progress of the activities.
 - x. Power of networking with CBOs and NGOs
 - xi. The ability to catalyze and strengthen community groups within the network to implement environmental related activities.
- 5.
6. Please summarise in a table the co-funding that the project has received to-date and also the amount expected by the end of project (please indicate the source and the amount of co-funding)

The table below summaries the in-kind co-funding received to date:

Co-funding Agency	Amount (\$USD)
Tobago House of Assembly	45,720.94
Buccoo Reef Trust	36,546.43
Coral Cay Conservation (TCEMP Project)	59,152.20
Water and Sewage Authority (Wastewater Treatment Plant)	5,065,680.95

Expected funding from the THA for the following (cannot be quantified immediately):

- Construction of diversion drain
- Provision of trees for planting
- Technical assistance for reforestation
- Assignment of OJTs for surveys

Annex 6 Summary of the evaluator's expertise

The Mid-Term Evaluation was conducted by Dr Peter Whalley.

Dr Peter Whalley is a physical chemist who has been working in international water management for the last 19 years. He has extensive experience of developing appropriate water monitoring networks, implementing training programmes and providing trans-boundary support in a range of countries including, the Danube Basin, China, Taiwan, EECCA, Egypt, Kuwait and Ghana. He is currently Project Manager (Chief Technical Advisor) of the UNDP/GEF funded project in the Tisza River Basin leading to the development of an integrated river basin management plan addressing both water quantity and quality. He has recently been the Environmental Specialist / Deputy Project Manager on the UNDP/GEF funded Danube Regional Project. The final phase of this project has a budget of over 12 MUSD and he has been responsible for the technical activities undertaken, from designing project activities in discussions with beneficiary representatives and the International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River, preparing Terms of References, estimating budgets for undertaking the work, managing consultants, reporting, developing a UNDP/GEF M&E procedure etc. A total of over 150 contracts for consultant support have been prepared in this phase of the UNDP/GEF DRP. He has extensive experience of working with DG Environment on the implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive both as a consultant and as a partner in the Danube Basin initiative. He has been responsible for a range of training activities to assist beneficiaries (particularly the non-EU countries) with the WFD. He has undertaken mid-term evaluations of previous GEF projects (e.g. Lake Peipsi) and terminal evaluation (e.g. The role of coastal ocean in the disturbed and undisturbed nutrient and carbon cycle).

Annex 7 Project Financing and Co-financing

Project Co-financing

Source		Type	Planned M USD	Actual (May 09) M USD
IA Co-financing				
	UNEP	Cash/in-kind	0.116	n/a
	UNDP	Cash/in-kind	1.771	n/a
EA Co-financing				
	CEHI	Cash/in-kind	1.908	0.1713 ⁵
	UNEP CAR-RCU	Cash/in-kind	3.075	1.75 ⁶
Governments		Cash / in-kind	82.899	6.39 ⁷
NGOs		Cash / in-kind	7.091	n/a
Private Sector		Cash / in-kind	1.409	n/a

⁵ CEHI co-funding up to end 2007 only

⁶ Personnel: US\$250,000; IT/GIS: US\$25,000; SPAW sub-programme US\$150,000; AMEP sub-programme: US\$1,250,000; CETA sub-programme: US\$75,000

⁷ Based on demonstration project questionnaire – Annex 5 of MTE report

Summary of Project Expenditure provided by UNEP Fund Manager

Expense Heading		Original Budget	Budget Rev. 2	Total UNEP CAR-RCU (June 2009)	Total CEHI sub-component (March 2009)	Grand total	% spend (budget Rev 2)
Project Personnel Component							
Project Personnel		2075000	2429400	1208936	321263	1530199	63
Consultants		288500	324300	34600	3727	38327	12
Administrative support		125000	154000	51393	39317	90710	59
Travel		21000	163000	43810	19878	63688	39
Sub-total		2509500	3070700	1338739	384185	1722924	56
Sub-Contract Component							
Co-operating Agencies		1228000	933500	152184	0	152184	16
Commercial		943300	489200	24905	0	24905	5
Sub-total		2171300	1422700	177089	0	177089	12
Training Component							
Fellowship		0	84600	0	0	0	0
Group training		1288450	1469250	417449	19087	436536	30
Meetings/conferences		814200	779200	311730	0	311730	40
Sub-total		2102650	2333050	729179	19087	748266	32
Equipment Component							
Expendable Equipment		56000	82900	5112	1324	6436	8
Non-Expendable Equipment		167000	349000	43922	107836	151758	43
Premises		10000	10000	0	0	0	0
Sub-total		233000	441900	49034	109160	158194	36
Miscellaneous Component							
O&M Equipment		547500	525000	0	4262	4262	1
Reporting costs		20000	134600	3540	2725	6265	5
Sundry		36500	67000	3559	980	4539	7
Evaluation		50000	50000	32944	0	32944	66
Sub-total		654000	776600	40043	7967	48010	6
TOTAL		7670450	8044950	2334084	520399	2854483	35

Disbursements to demonstration projects (UNOPS May 09)

Country	Payment no.	Payments made		Total
		Date	Amount	
Antigua and Barbuda	Payment 1	17/11/2006	\$40,000.00	\$298,255.00
	Payment 2	28/03/2007	\$108,900.00	
	Payment 3	26/06/2008	\$37,338.75	
	Payment 4	18/08/2008	\$112,016.25	
Bahamas Andros	- Payment 1	21/02/2007	\$40,000.00	\$182,930.00
	Payment 2	08/04/2009	\$142,930.00	
Bahamas Exuma	- Payment 1	21/02/2007	\$40,000.00	\$40,000.00
Cuba	Payment 1	12/12/2008	\$192,000.00	\$232,000.00
	Payment 2	11/06/2008	\$40,000.00	
Dom Rep	Payment 1	07/06/2007	\$40,000.00	\$186,148.66
	Payment 2	17/10/2008	\$146,148.66	
Jamaica	Payment 1	17/11/2006	\$40,000.00	\$424,708.04
	Payment 2	14/08/2007	\$63,616.00	
	Payment 3	31/01/2008	\$188,634.67	
	Payment 4	03/12/2008	\$30,000.00	
	Payment 5	12/02/2009	\$102,457.37	
Saint Lucia	Payment 1	20/11/2006	\$40,000.00	\$288,372.53
	Payment 2	08/08/2007	\$102,167.80	
	Payment	21/01/2008	\$95,052.00	

Country	Payment no.	Payments made		Total
		Date	Amount	
	3 Payment 4	22/08/2008	\$51,152.73	
Saint Kitts and Nevis	Payment 1	09/01/2007	\$40,000.00	\$440,584.18
	Payment 2	02/12/2008	\$63,487.82	
	Payment 3	29/01/2009	\$337,096.36	
Trinidad and Tobago	Payment 1	26/10/2006	\$40,000.00	\$429,701.44
	Payment 2	23/05/2007	\$192,800.00	
	Payment 3	05/11/2008	\$196,901.44	

Annex 8 Draft Project Assessment Rubric98

To be agreed by the GEF IWCAM Project Steering Committee

Project proposal Logframe			Agreed Project performance indicators and targets (by Final Evaluation)					
	Objectively Verifiable indicators	Means of Verification (Monitoring focus)	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Highly Unsatisfactory
Overall Objectives An overall national and regional reform in support of the IWCAM approach as a necessary and vital strategy for sustainable management and protection of coastal and watershed resources	Reforms in policy & legislation in support of IWCAM concept Effective regional co-operation and sharing of information & lessons Development and transfer of technologies & IWCAM related techniques Overall improvement in coastal and watershed status and related community welfare	Process Indicators – demonstrate measurable improvement at policy & legislation level with associated supportive institutional modifications Stress Reduction Indicators – measurable and successful efforts to control pollution and better manage potential threats Environmental Status Indicators – measurable improvements within the natural environment (water quality, coral diversity, mangrove cover etc.) Socio-Economic Indicators – measurable improvement of communities	All countries reform policy & legislation necessary to support the IWCAM process and LBS Protocol implementation LBS Protocol in-force in all countries All demonstration projects report successful stress reduction and approaches replicated Monitoring programmes to report future environmental status implemented in all countries and preliminary indications demonstrate	>75% countries reform policies /legislation to support of IWCAM and LBS protocol LBS Protocol in-force in 9/12 countries >75% of demonstration projects show successful stress reduction. Replication initiated in at least 5 countries Monitoring programmes to report future environmental status implemented in >75% of the countries and planned in the rest	Over half countries demonstrate clear policy/legislation on reforms. LBS Protocol in-force in 6/12 countries At least 50% demonstration projects show stress reduction. Replication initiated in >3 countries Monitoring programmes initiated in >50% of countries and planned in rest.	<4 countries make changes to policy / legislation LBS Protocol implementation ongoing in >50% of countries and planned in the rest 2 demonstration projects show stress reduction. Minimal replication Monitoring programmes initiated in >25% of countries and planned in >50% of countries	<4 countries make changes to policy / legislation LBS Protocol implementation ongoing in <50% of countries and planned for rest 1 demonstration project shows stress reduction. No replication Monitoring programmes planned in <50% of countries	No improvement to policy or legislation No increase in number of countries signing, ratifying or implementing LBS protocol. No stress reduction achieved by demonstration projects No environmental monitoring planned No improvement to the livelihoods of local communities through IWCAM activities

Project proposal Logframe			Agreed Project performance indicators and targets (by Final Evaluation)					
	Objectively Verifiable indicators	Means of Verification (Monitoring focus)	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Highly Unsatisfactory
			improvements as result of stress reduction in at least two countries					
Outcomes								
Outcome 1: Successful demonstration of concrete solutions and mitigations to specific threats to IWCAM. The development and distribution of best lessons and practices arising from these demonstrations. Models and guidelines for policy, legislative and institutional reform available to countries. Best lessons and practices being effectively replicated in other hotspots and critical areas	Completed demonstration projects Transfer of lessons – replication inter and intra countries Support to LBS implementation – practical and legislation reform Documentation of lessons	Reports from all demonstration projects. IWCAM strategy adopted nationally and regionally LBS protocol implementation Lessons learned from demonstration projects included in national strategies to address national issues (pollution hot spots, water shortages, etc.)	All demonstration projects completed successfully meeting expected objectives LBS protocol adopted in all countries Clear practical replication of experiences in all countries Excellent documentation of lessons (all demonstration project experiences captured and uploaded to web, IWLEARN experience notes completed.	Most (>80%) projects completed successfully meeting expected objectives LBS protocol supported in >80% of countries Replication of demo project in most countries Good documentation of lessons	50% of projects completed LBS protocol supported in >50% countries Replication initiated in >50% countries Fair documentation of lessons	40% of projects completed LBS planned / supported in 40% countries Replication planned or initiated in 40% countries Good documentation of lessons by completed projects only	30% projects completed LBS planned / supported in some countries (<30%) Minimal replication of demonstration projects Poor documentation of lessons	< 20% projects completed IWCAM has not encouraged LBS implementation Poor documentation of lessons
Outcome 2: Process, stress-reduction, and environmental status	Indicator Monitoring and developed as part of	Specialist evaluation of indicator mechanism & framework	Successful review and recommendati	Accepted recommendations on	Most countries accept recommendati	Half countries accept recommendati	Most countries reject recommendati	No review of indicators No model or

Project proposal Logframe			Agreed Project performance indicators and targets (by Final Evaluation)					
	Objectively Verifiable indicators	Means of Verification (Monitoring focus)	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Highly Unsatisfactory
indicators framework established and national and regional capacities for indicator monitoring enhanced.	demonstration projects and through other project components. One country demonstration and development undertaken to produce indicator framework model Transfer of model to all countries and establishment of an indicator network and data storage facility	Lessons from demonstrations captured in framework Single demonstration of development and use of indicators (e.g. in policy reforms) successfully completed All countries adopt standard model/framework for indicator mechanism and establish protocol for information transfer and accessibility within regional storage centre	ons on indicator framework utilising experiences from demonstration projects All countries accept and adopt indicator framework All countries implement data collection to monitor indicators Successful demonstration of indicators in specific project with results replicated by countries Agreement by all countries on use of indicators and the transfer of information. Implementation of a regional storage centre for IWCAM related information including sustainability of centre	indicator framework Most (>9) countries adopt indicators concept and implement procedures to record / share indicators Successful completion of single demonstration project Agreement to establish regional data storage facility	ons on indicator framework. Agreement on future adoption of indicator strategy Completion of single demonstration project Discussions in progress to establish regional storage centre	ons on indicator framework Single demonstration project not completed Planned discussions for agreeing regional data storage centre	ons on indicator framework Failure of single demonstration project No plans for regional storage centre	framework for indicator use available. Single demonstration project not implemented due to failure to agree location and framework for indicators Countries do not accept indicator concept No agreement on regional storage centre or information transfer
Outcome 3: National policies, legislation and institutional	IWCAM policy and legislative reforms adopted to reflect a	Countries amend national policy and legislation addressing IWCAM issues	IWCAM policies and legislative	IWCAM policies and legislative	IWCAM policies and legislative	IWCAM policies and legislative	Limited adoption and acceptance for	No adoption or acceptance of IWCAM policy

Project proposal Logframe			Agreed Project performance indicators and targets (by Final Evaluation)					
	Objectively Verifiable indicators	Means of Verification (Monitoring focus)	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Highly Unsatisfactory
structures reformed and realigned to reflect the objectives of IWCAM and to capture the requirements of the more pertinent regional and international MEAs.	more integrated and intersectoral approach to coastal and watershed management, and to emphasise the IWCAM priorities	Revised policy and legislation to reflect requirements of regional and international MEAs. Institutional realignment and reallocation reflects new policies and supports requirements of newly ratified regional and international MEAs.	reforms adopted in all countries. All countries ratify LBS protocol and establish mechanisms for implementation IWCAM practices reflected in improved management of coastal and watershed management Intersectoral committees operational and valued by countries	reforms adopted in >9 countries Most (>9) countries ratify LBS protocol IWCAM practices adopted for implementation for coastal and watershed management. Intersectoral committees adopted in >9 countries	reforms adopted in at least 50% of countries and accepted for adoption in the remainder of countries. LBS Protocol ratified by 50% countries Management practices for integrated coastal and watershed management accepted in >50% countries Intersectoral committees established in >50% countries	reforms accepted for adoption in <50% of countries. LBS Protocol ratified by 3 countries Management practices for integrated coastal and watershed management accepted in <50% countries Intersectoral committees established in <50% countries	reform of policy and legislation with regards to IWCAM concept Limited progress but no additional countries ratify LBS protocol Limited changes in management practices to integrate coastal and watershed management Intersectoral committees in <5 countries	and legislative reforms in any country No progress to LBS Protocol ratification Failure to adopt integrated approach to coastal and watershed management Failure to adopt intersectoral approach to water management
Outcome 4: Improved sensitisation, awareness and capacity throughout all sectors with respect to IWCAM. An active, long-term, sustainable regional mechanism supporting IWCAM. Effective networking to share information alongside a Partnership Forum acting to build working relationships within	Measurable improvement in awareness at street level Measurable heightening of sensitivity of policy makers within public and private sector in support of IWCAM approaches and concerns Adoption of long-term (5 – 10 year with reviews) IWCAM regional mechanism with	Awareness, sensitivity and educational polling show positive improvements with feedback from polls into on-going awareness and education programmes Stress Reduction Indicators show improvements to controls over major impacts on coastal and watershed environment Process indicators show support and reform at policy level towards IWCAM	Clear positive results from poll (>90%) showing impacts of IWCAM at all levels of society. All Process, Stress Reduction and Environmental Status indicators show improvements. IWCAM	Polls indicate that >75% of responsive indicate that IWCAM has had positive impact Positive response from most indicators. Environmental Status indicator monitoring in place IWCAM	Polls indicate that >50% of responsive indicate that IWCAM has had positive impact Some positive signs from indicators. Environmental monitoring planned IWCAM approaches adopted >50% countries	Polls indicate that >30% of responsive indicate that IWCAM has had positive impact Limited positive response from agreed indicators. IWCAM approaches adopted by < 50% countries Regional	Polls indicate that that IWCAM has had limited impact Limited positive responses from indicators. No environmental data expected Limited acceptance of IWCAM Limited acceptance of	No impact of IWCAM identified No positive response from indicators to IWCAM activities No acceptance of IWCAM No acceptance of Regional Partnership Forum No support

Project proposal Logframe			Agreed Project performance indicators and targets (by Final Evaluation)					
	Objectively Verifiable indicators	Means of Verification (Monitoring focus)	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Highly Unsatisfactory
IWCAM. An active Clearing House to share and disperse information. Fully involved stakeholders and improved civil society.	associated supportive regional agreements and institutes Establishment of a regional Partnership Forum for IWCAM related issues with strong input from private sector and other potential funding partners. Stakeholder participation is institutionalised and adopted as policy within IWCAM.	Environmental Status indicators support overall picture of improvement reflecting awareness and education success Regional IWCAM strategy / mechanism adopted through regional agreement and reflected in national policies and institutions. Regional partnership forum active and showing major positive changes to IWCAM issues through both private and public sector Private sector taking greater responsibility for cost of IWCAM including transfer of benefits and greater investment in reduction of impacts and mitigation of threats	approaches adopted by all countries Regional partnership forum active with all countries participating and financially supporting Active involvement and financial support for IWCAM in all countries by the private sector	approaches adopted by >9 countries Regional Partnership Forum Supported by the majority of countries. Funding still to be agreed Active involvement and financial support for IWCAM >50% countries by the private sector	Regional Partnership Forum supported by 50% countries. No funding considered Private sector engaged in discussion but yet to financially contribute to IWCAM concepts	Partnership Forum accepted by <50% of countries Private sector is aware but yet to become active in IWCAM discussions	Regional Partnership Forum Limited interest in IWCAM concept from the private sector	from the private sector for IWCAM concept
Outcome 5: Effective project management at the national and regional level. National Intersectoral Committees capturing and promoting IWCAM best practices. Project evaluations reflecting successful and sustainable project objectives. An active and effective sustainable regional information management system in place.	Regional IWCAM strategy in place Appropriate regional institution(s) adopt(s) the function of the project management structure Regional and National Intersectoral Committees (PSC and NICs) given permanent status and responsibility for regional and national level IWCAM strategy and	Final and Post Project Evaluations reports positive Regional IWCAM related institutions physically in place and funded with clear mandates for responsibility Permanent regional and national bodies established ex-project with cross-sectoral participatory IWCAM Regional Centre dealing with IWCAM information storage and dissemination in place and sustainable All of these to be	Project Management Unit established and successfully completes all aspects of the project ensuring good replication of IWCAM concept and sustainability within the region Completion with positive	Project Management Unit established and successfully completes all aspects of the project ensuring good replication of IWCAM concept and sustainability within the region Completion with positive	Project Management Unit established and successfully completes most aspects of the project ensuring limited replication of IWCAM concept and sustainability within the region Completion of	Project Management Unit established. Some replication of IWCAM concept within the region Completion of evaluations >50% of countries support the establishment of a regional institution National	Project Management Unit established. Completion of evaluations < 50% support the establishment of a regional institution. Limited national support for intersectoral committees. Countries expressed	Project Management Unit fails or fails to implement IWCAM No evaluations No regional institutions established No acceptance of Regional or National intersectoral committees No political or financial

Project proposal Logframe			Agreed Project performance indicators and targets (by Final Evaluation)					
	Objectively Verifiable indicators	Means of Verification (Monitoring focus)	Highly Satisfactory	Satisfactory	Moderately Satisfactory	Moderately Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Highly Unsatisfactory
	co-ordination Permanent and sustainable institutionalisation fro regional IWCAM information storage and transfer	sustainable politically and through identified funding by closure of the project	assessment of Evaluations Regional IWCAM institutions established and fully functional with support from all countries All countries adopt and support Regional and National Intersectoral committees Regional centre for information established, financially supported and active for IWCAM related data and information. Long-term political and financial support for centre	assessment of evaluations Regional institutions established with support of all countries, some funding issues to be resolved Most countries adopt and support Regional and National Intersectoral committees Regional centre for information established, financially supported and active for IWCAM related data and information	evaluation Regional institution created with support of al countries. Funding to be discussed <50% countries establish National Intersectoral committees. Support for creation of regional intersectoral committee Regional centre for information established, financially supported and active for IWCAM related data and information	instersectoral committees functioning in >50% countries no regional committees Agreement to establish regional centre for information – however mechanism for funding post-project unresolved	wish to establish regional centre for information.	support to establish a regional centre

Annex 9 Project Progress (APR/PIR 2008)

Project Objective and Outcomes	Description of Indicator ⁸	Baseline Level ⁹	Target Level ⁴ /Expected Completion Date	Level ⁴ at 30 June 2008 ¹⁰ (including % completion) ¹¹
Objective: An overall national and regional reform in support of the IWCAM approach as a necessary and vital strategy for sustainable management and protection of coastal and watershed resources	1. Reforms in policy, legislation and institutional arrangements in support of IWCAM take place in all 13 participating countries	IWCAM-specific policy, legislation and institutional arrangements exist in no countries	All 13 countries refocus or create legislation to specifically address IWCAM	In none of the participating countries is there a legal instrument that deals explicitly with integrated watershed and coastal areas management or specifically sets out the linkages that exist between the management of watersheds and coastal areas and the prevention or control of pollution of coastal areas. Nevertheless, Grenada has introduced a water policy which considers Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) approaches. Antigua & Barbuda is actively pursuing development of a similar water policy, and St. Vincent & the Grenadines is actively considering development of an IWRM Roadmap, which is expected to shape IWRM planning and hopefully lead to new policy and legislation. Project has prepared and inventory of relevant legislation, policy & institutional structures and a Toolkit for Harmonizing Laws & Institutions which will hopefully trigger more IWCAM reforms (10% completion)

⁸ This should describe the quantitative indicator

⁹ No reliable baseline information existed in the Project Document; PCU had to come up with baseline based on text within the Project Document. Due to time lag between project elaboration and actual implementation, the baseline conditions may have changed, requiring a reassessment of the baseline conditions

¹⁰ Provide a narrative of progress made towards meeting the project objective(s). Describe any **significant** environmental or other changes attributable to project implementation. Also, please discuss any major challenges to meet the **objectives** or specific project **outcomes**

¹¹ Comments if variance. Describe any problems in delivering outputs

	2. Effective regional cooperation and sharing of information and lessons on IWCAM	Limited recognition of the need for an integrated approach, therefore no cooperation, concrete lessons or information available	A strong regional network in existence which provides routine information on IWCAM lessons and approaches	<p>The IWCAM PIMS will be an important part of this network - the physical centre or repository for data and info on and related to the approach will be available for reference after the project has ended. At June 08, the website, which is to be the gateway to the PIMS is already in existence but being redesigned and upgraded.</p> <p>The IWRM Informal Working Group for the Caribbean, being facilitated by the IWCAM PCU has continued to function and coordinate activities. The IWCAM PCU convened a meeting of this Working Group in October 2007 and through the Group, has been able to coordinate interventions in countries such as Dominica, Grenada, and Barbados (in July 2008). Additionally, the IWCAM PCU has continued to generate quarterly bulletins containing information on IWCAM lessons. The IWCAM project has also supported networking and cooperation through the CWWA Conference and the Caribbean Environmental Forum. Staff of the PCU have used many opportunities to share information and lessons on IWCAM through regional and international meetings, workshops and conferences. (35% completion)</p>
--	---	---	---	---

Annex 10 Project Outcomes / Outputs (APR/PIR 2008)

Project Outputs (From APR/PIR June 2009)

Project Outcomes	Key Outputs as of June 2008
Outcome 1: Successful demonstration of concrete solutions and mitigations to specific threats to IWCAM. The development and distribution of best lessons and practices arising from these demonstrations. Models and guidelines for policy, legislative and institutional reform available to countries. Best lessons and practices being effectively replicated in other hotspots and critical areas	1. Demo projects trained in communications and indicators 2. Baseline information/indicators prepared for 5 demonstration projects (note, while 5 countries have defined their indicators, due to the paucity of data in the region, some are now working on determining the baseline) 3. Project Managers recruited for 7 demonstration projects (note, since the resignation of the Demonstration Project Manager for the Bahamas in September 2007, a new manager has not yet been appointed) 4. Quarterly Operating Reports and 6-monthly reports received by PCU from all 9 demo projects
Demo 1: Management and protection of a critical aquifer and well-field (in St. Kitts) through a parallel process of A. Mitigation of threats from contaminants, B. On-the-ground protection, and C. Improved user-resource management.	1. Demo Project Manager recruited (due to start in August 2008) 2. Recruitment efforts have begun in order to fill the position of Administrative Assistant. 3. Draft RFPs prepared for much of the work that will be contracted
Demo 2: Establishment of a model approach to participatory watershed management within a specific watershed complex in Fond D'Or, St. Lucia	1. Payment for Environmental Services activities underway 2. Monitoring programme developed and underway 3. Ongoing meetings of the Watershed Stakeholder Management Committee 4. Installation of thirty rainwater harvesting units
Demo 3: Resolution of coastal sewage and wastewater pollution through retroactive fitting of street level treatment systems, St. John's Antigua . Production of an overall plan for a cost effective solution to the problem of sewage throughout the entire City, and nationwide.	1. Project Coordinator recruited & PMU established 2. TOR for preliminary consultancies prepared and consultants hired. Consultancies are progressing as envisaged 3. Data collection for the establishment of a long-term indicator program and monitoring has begun. Data is collected on a monthly basis. 4. Public awareness "jingle" prepared for the demo project. Pamphlets and flyers for students prepared and information sessions have been held at five schools thus far. Radio and TV programs are currently being aired.
Demo 4: Retroactive installation and sustainable management of marina facilities that resolve concerns from sewage discharge and other recreational boat	1. Site visits conducted by the Project Coordinating Unit to assist in preparation of Work Plan and budget 2. Steering committee meeting periodically 3. Mooring and anchorage sites identified.

Project Outcomes	Key Outputs as of June 2008
impacts, Exuma, Bahamas	4. Pump-out sites identified
Demo 5: Reduction of contamination by industry in an important river basin in the Dominican Republic , through recycling and re-utilisation mechanisms. Collection of data and indicators on heavy metal contamination to guide policy and strategic planning. Overall integrated management programme for basin.	1. Project Management Unit Staff recruited
	2. Indicators developed
	3. N/A
	4. N/A
Demo 6: Active groundwater recharge area protection (in Andros, Bahamas) through the development of a Land and Sea Use Plan supported by an on-the-ground monitoring, surveillance and compliance mechanism. Reduction of water wastage and increase water use efficiency within the private and public sectors	1. Site visits from the BEST Commission and the Nature Conservancy.
	2. Project Steering Committee Meetings.
	3. N/A
	4. N/A
Demo 7: Reduced siltation and (in coordination with other initiatives) wastewater discharges to Buccoo Reef, Tobago . Improved water quality and general habitat and biodiversity welfare on reef (particularly coral cover and diversity). IWCAM Models for reduction in siltation and erosion effects within the watershed on the coastal environment	1. Ongoing public awareness activities (television, radio, brochures, flyers, exhibitions, videos, website)
	2. Monitoring stations established at 13 reef sites with transects covering a total of 720 meters around the island. Weekly water quality monitoring done at these sites using standard parameters
	3. Initiation of and support for reforestation activities
	4. Training workshop in IWCAM indicators for national level government officials
Demo 8: The application of the IWCAM concepts to demonstrate an integrated approach to watershed and coastal management centred around a provincial authority in Cuba with participatory management mechanisms targeting community involvement. Best practices will have be demonstrated in critical areas of concern (agriculture, waste reduction, recycling, soil conservation, etc) through a sustainable management infrastructure.	1. Initiation of marine monitoring programme in the Cienfuegos Bay.
	2. Laboratory assessments of labs in Cienfuegos conducted by CEHI and recommendations for capacity building prepared
	3. N/A
	4. N/A
Demo 9: Effective capture of	1. Establishment and regular meetings of stakeholders with 4 accompanying Committees

Project Outcomes	Key Outputs as of June 2008
existing best practices and lessons learned through other coastal, watershed and community management initiatives within Jamaica . An effective Watershed Management mechanism for Eastern Portland. Effective transfer methodologies adopted by Jamaica for the replication of these lessons to neighbouring Watershed Management Units (WMU).	<p>2. The procurement of stream flow and weather equipment has begun; water sampling have been conducted at 23 sites.</p> <p>3. Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices survey instruments designed, Training of 60 community members planned to administer survey</p> <p>4. Grant Programme underway with 17 grants received in various areas related to the IWCAM approach.</p>
Outcome 2: Process, stress-reduction, and environmental status indicators framework established and national and regional capacities for indicator monitoring enhanced.	<p>1. Regional Indicators workshop convened, in collaboration with IABIN</p> <p>2. IWCAM Indicators template finalized</p> <p>3. Initial collaboration regarding the application of the indicators template in a pilot country</p>
Outcome 3: National policies, legislation and institutional structures reformed and realigned to reflect the objectives of IWCAM and to capture the requirements of the more pertinent regional and international MEAs.	<p>1. Regional legal workshop convened in Nov '07 including representatives from AG's Chambers</p> <p>2. Consultants prepared Legislative Toolkit which provides models to assist countries in drafting IWCAM-relevant legislation (s.a. LBS Protocol)</p> <p>3. Grenada prepares National Water Policy, based on Situation Analysis and Road Map prepared by IWCAM</p> <p>4. IWRM Inception Workshops held in Antigua & Dominica</p>
Outcome 4: Improved sensitisation, awareness and capacity throughout all sectors with respect to IWCAM. An active, long-term, sustainable regional mechanism supporting IWCAM. Effective networking to share information alongside a Partnership Forum acting to build working relationships within IWCAM. An active Clearing House to share and disperse information. Fully involved stakeholders and improved civil society.	<p>1. Training in Community-Based Resource Assessment conducted in Dominica and WQ Monitoring equipment provided</p> <p>2. Laboratory assessments conducted in Antigua/Barbuda, Jamaica, Cuba, St. Lucia and Trinidad & Tobago</p> <p>3. Caribbean WaterWays Newsletters published quarterly (4 issues); posters, video shorts and monthly bulletins produced</p> <p>4. Communications Strategy prepared and reviewed by countries</p>
Outcome 5: Effective project management at the national and regional level. National Intersectoral Committees capturing and promoting IWCAM best practices. Project evaluations	<p>1. Project Steering Committee and Regional Technical Advisory Group meetings and 5 Regional Workshops successfully convened/reported on</p> <p>2. 4 participating countries launch exhibits at CEF-4</p> <p>3. 4 Consultancies successfully completed/Final Reports in hand</p>

Project Outcomes	Key Outputs as of June 2008
reflecting successful and sustainable project objectives. An active and effective sustainable regional information management system in place.	4. Demo Quarterly Reports

Annex 11 Risk Factor Table

INTERNAL RISK Project management									
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
									NOTES
Management structure	Stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood	Individuals understand their own role but are unsure of responsibilities of others	Unclear responsibilities or overlapping functions which lead to management problems	X					There is a well staffed and appropriately qualified PCU with clear roles defined.
Governance structure	Steering Committee and/or other project bodies meet periodically and provide effective direction/inputs	Body(ies) meets periodically but guidance/input provided to project is inadequate	Members lack commitment (seldom meet) and therefore the Committee/body does not fulfil its function	X					The project has a well defined PSC with annual meetings supported by a Regional Technical Advisory Group
Internal communications	Fluid and cordial	Communication process deficient although relationships between team members are good	Lack of adequate communication between team members leading to deterioration of relationships and resentment / factions	X					There appears to be adequate internal communication within the PCU and between the PCU, the demonstration projects and the IAs.
Work flow	Project progressing according to work plan	Some changes in project work plan but without major effect on overall implementation	Major delays or changes in work plan or method of implementation	X					There have been delays with the demonstration projects but these are mostly on-track. One demonstration project is still to be progressed but recommendations on this have been given by the MTE
Co-financing	Co-financing is secured and payments are received on time	Is secured but payments are slow and bureaucratic	A substantial part of pledged co-financing may not materialize		X				There is still limited information on co-financing from the countries. At the MTE this is seen as a 'medium' risk, but if information is not available by the next PSC this should be seen as a 'substantial' risk.
Budget	Activities are progressing within planned budget	Minor budget reallocation needed	Reallocation between budget lines exceeding 30% of original budget		X				Minor budget reallocations are planned for PSC approval in the next PSC (September 2009). If these changes are approved then this risk will be seen as 'low'.
Financial management	Funds are correctly managed and transparently accounted for	Financial reporting slow or deficient	Serious financial reporting problems or indication of mismanagement of funds	X					There are no apparent concerns with regards to financial management.

INTERNAL RISK Project management									
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined
									NOTES
Reporting	Substantive reports are presented in a timely manner and are complete and accurate with a good analysis of project progress and implementation issues	Reports are complete and accurate but often delayed or lack critical analysis of progress and implementation issues	Serious concerns about quality and timeliness of project reporting	X					Technical and administrative reports appear to be delivered on time by the Regional project. The national demonstration projects deliver periodic reports according to plans.
Stakeholder involvement	Stakeholder analysis done and positive feedback from critical stakeholders and partners	Consultation and participation process seems strong but misses some groups or relevant partners	Symptoms of conflict with critical stakeholders or evidence of apathy and lack of interest from partners or other stakeholders	X					The project has a wide stakeholder involvement and will conduct an awareness survey towards the end of the project to determine the project's impact in raising awareness on IWCAM issues. A baseline on this awareness was not conducted. There was a high stakeholder awareness on IWCAM activities provided to the MTE.
External communications	Evidence that stakeholders, practitioners and/or the general public understand project and are regularly updated on progress	Communications efforts are taking place but not yet evidence that message is successfully transmitted	Project existence is not known beyond implementation partners or misunderstandings concerning objectives and activities evident					X	The project undertakes a wide range of dissemination (web, newsletters, press releases, etc.). An awareness assessment is due towards the end of the project on IWCAM related issues.
Short term/long term balance	Project is meeting short term needs and results within a long term perspective, particularly sustainability and replicability	Project is interested in the short term with little understanding of or interest in the long term	Longer term issues are deliberately ignored or neglected	X					Work on capturing the short term lessons from the demonstration projects and utilising this within the 'Clearing House Mechanism' is planned. The Regional Project will further encourage replication and sustainability debates and action within the demonstration project countries and more widely.
Science and technological issues	Project based on sound science and well established technologies	Project testing approaches, methods or technologies but based on sound analysis of options and risks	Many scientific and/or technological uncertainties	X					Key long term environmental monitoring strengthened by project activities on laboratories.
Political influences	Project decisions and choices are not particularly politically driven	Signs that some project decisions are politically motivated	Project is subject to a variety of political influences that may jeopardize project objectives		X				Whilst the project is not openly influenced by political decisions a key success criteria of the project is the move towards the LBS Protocol ratification. This is a political process and the

INTERNAL RISK Project management												
Risk Factor	Indicator of Low Risk	Indicator of Medium Risk	Indicator of High Risk	Low	Medium	Substantial	High	Not Applicable	To be determined	NOTES		
										project needs to work to assist further the ratification of the protocol in support of UNEP CAR-RCU		
Other, please specify. Add rows as necessary												