

TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) set out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project “Demonstrating the Development and Implementation of a Sustainable Island Resource Management Mechanism in a Small Island Developing State” (PIMS #1899).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Demonstrating the Development and Implementation of a Sustainable Island Resource Management Mechanism i			
GEF Project ID:	PMIS 1614		<i>at endorsement (US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (US\$)</i>
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 1899 00053747	GEF financing:	2,995,930	
Country:	Antigua and Barbuda	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean	Government:	3,434,100	
Focal Area:	Integrated Ecosystem Management	Other:	1,269,200	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	OP12; EM-1	Total co-financing:	4,703,300	
Executing Agency:	Environmental Division of The Government of Antigua and Barbuda	Total Project Cost:	7,699,230	
Other Partners involved:	e.g. Antigua Public Utilities Authority, Ministry of Tourism, National Parks Authority, National Office of Disaster Services, Environmental Awareness Group	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		24 August 2007
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2011	Actual:

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: ensure the sustainability and maintenance of island ecosystem integrity, health, and function through integrated planning and management of island resources, with the objective of evolving and implementing a Sustainable Island Resource Management (SIRM) approach in Antigua and Barbuda to stabilise and maintain ecosystem functions, thereby providing a basis for continued sustainable economic development. The project’s four Outcomes are:

1. Easy and reliable access to information for Environmental Management by all stakeholders
2. Sustainable Resource Management Mechanism developed and in place

3. Policy and institutional reforms provides a framework for the implementation of the SIRM policy
4. Requirements for the implementation of the SIRM plan in place as well as the capture of lessons and best practices

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF-Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method¹ for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF-financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (see Annex C). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Antigua and Barbuda, including the following project sites:

- Codrington Lagoon, Barbuda
- Body Ponds Watershed
- Southwest coast (Ridge to Reef)
- Northwest coast Tourism Zone

Interviews will be held with the following organisations and individuals at a minimum: Ministry of Agriculture, Antigua Public Utilities Authority (Water Division), Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Prime Minister's Office, Barbuda Council, National Parks Authority, Ministry of Tourism, National Office of Disaster Services, Environmental Awareness Group, Gilberts Agricultural and Rural Development Centre (GARDC).

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the

¹ For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

Evaluation Ratings			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	<i>rating</i>	2. IA& EA Execution	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	<i>rating</i>	4. Sustainability	<i>rating</i>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability	

PROJECT FINANCE / CO-FINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realised. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-kind support 								
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other 								
Totals								

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluator will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.²

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO for **Barbados and the OECS**. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure initial arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be up to 25 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	10 January
Evaluation Mission	12 days	31 January
Draft Evaluation Report	8 days	14 February
Final Report	2 days	20 February

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

² A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation will be conducted by **1 international evaluator**. The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The consultant must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum MSc qualification or equivalent in ecological conservation, environmental management, geography, agriculture, sustainable development, or related discipline
- Minimum 8 years of relevant professional experience
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
- Knowledge of and experience with UNDP and GEF project cycles and implementation processes
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies
- Previous experience evaluating UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects in the Caribbean
- Strong technical report writing, data acquisition and analysis skills
- Excellent interpersonal and communication skills
- Excellent command of written and oral English
- Good understanding of the region's norms, practices and cultural sensitivities – evidence of work experience in the region, especially engaging with stakeholders at multiple levels (grassroots, communities, national, sub-regional)
- Previous experience in the targeted country would be an asset.

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	Following submission and approval of the inception report
40%	Following submission and approval of the first draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to submit applications to procurement.bb@undp.org by **2 December 2013 at 4:00pm Eastern Caribbean Time (GMT-4)**. Applications should consist of a single email containing the following, in English:

- Cover letter of no more than 3 pages, including a description of main achievements and how the candidate meets/exceeds the profile requirements

- Completed letter as per Annex H
- A current and complete CV or UNDP P11 form (preferred), with e-mail and phone contact
- A proposed methodology for conducting the evaluation of no more than 3 pages
- Contact details of 3 referees
- A price proposal quoted in United States dollars, as per Annex I

The review process will consist of a cumulative analysis, with technical and financial proposals weighted at 60:40.

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

ORIGINAL LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

PROJECT STRATEGY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS				
GOAL	TO ENSURE THE SUSTAINABILITY AND MAINTENANCE OF ISLAND ECOSYSTEM INTEGRITY AND FUNCTION THROUGH INTEGRATED PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT OF ISLAND RESOURCES				
<u>OBJECTIVE OF THE PROJECT</u>	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	BASELINE	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
<p>TO EVOLVE AND IMPLEMENT A SUSTAINABLE ISLAND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT APPROACH WITHIN ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA</p>	<p>By Year 3 of the project, a SIRM Plan adopted by Antigua and Barbuda</p>	<p>No SIRM mechanism and little by way of coordinated cross-sectoral administration and management of island resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proactive SIRM Mechanism in place and fully operational at policy, institutional and ground level by end of project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Government records and Cabinet minutes. ▪ Reports from the National Coordination Mechanism. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Private sector understands requirement for, and benefits of, SIRM ▪ Identified funding mechanisms are feasible and there is a government commitment to allocate manpower and capacity.
<p>TO STABILIZE AND MAINTAIN ECOSYSTEM FUNCTIONS, THEREBY PROVIDING A BASIS FOR CONTINUED SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC</p>	<p>By Year 3 associated legislative and policy reforms are in place</p>	<p>Physical Planning Act and Draft Environmental Protection and Management Bill</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Government records ▪ Legislative records ▪ New approved legislation in line with SIRM. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Political willingness to adopt an SIRM approach and to undertake necessary reforms.

DEVELOPMENT	By Year 4 government budgetary allocations for SIRM are in place	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate funding for sustainability of SIRM approaches is ensured 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budgetary allocations in relevant line ministries and government agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Government agencies willing to assign adequate funding to continued implementation of SIRM approaches and practices
	Effective program to monitor project progress using impact indicators established by the project.	No effective or coordinated monitoring of resources and ecosystem functions or response system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved and updated monitoring and information processing programmes, focused on SIRM, in place by end Y2 Effective communication and feedback between monitoring process and decision-makers demonstrating reactive management approaches by end Y2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data and reports available from responsible agencies showing regular monitoring of resources and processing of information. Government records, Cabinet minutes, demonstrate policy and decision-making based on monitoring information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communities, NGOs and /or private sector can be voluntarily drafted or contracted for some of field-work Agencies willing to share and make available existing information
	Acceptance of trade-offs between maintenance of ecosystem functions and integrity and existing land use trends, reflected in increased application of EIAs and SEAs	Business-as-usual scenario	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long term economic benefits of a SIRM strategy and approach validates necessary trade-offs and sectoral stakeholders groups accept them by end Y2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of NCM meetings Records of EIAs and SEAs MTE and FEV 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private sector, line ministries, and communities understand requirement for, and benefits of, SIRM
	Incentives for inappropriate practices have been identified and removed	Incentives, or lack of positive incentives, promote unsustainable practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulations on livestock management adopted and enforced Imports of agrochemicals reduced Increased application of integrated pest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports and registers of relevant government agencies MTE and TE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Line ministries with sectoral responsibilities willing to remove negative incentives and to put in place positive incentives

			<p>management approaches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 80% of hotels in North West region have adequate waste management systems in place by end Y3 		
	<p>Areas where the 4 demonstration projects are carried out, totalling 11,274 ha, are under SIRM</p>	<p>No application of integrated management approaches</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration projects provide validation of new models and guidelines for SIRM, and compilation of lessons learned and best practices contribute to up-scaling and mainstreaming SIRM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Internal project reports ▪ MTE and TE 	
<p>OUTCOME 1</p> <p>Easy and reliable access to information for environmental management by all stakeholders</p>	<p>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR</p>	<p>BASELINE</p>	<p>TARGET</p>	<p>SOURCE OF VERIFICATION</p>	<p>RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS</p>
	<p>By Year 3, the EIMAS is operational</p>	<p>No mechanism in place to allow agencies to organise existing data on SIRM and share information with other agencies.</p> <p>Agencies do not currently have requisite equipment</p> <p>Ad hoc information handling and presentation with no feedback from policy level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIMAS database and information processing mechanism in place, and operating as a tool to integrate existing datasets and structure new data input by end Y1 • Agencies required to provide inputs and prepare outputs to EIMAS are fully equipped and trained by end Y1. • Briefing mechanism for policy-makers and senior managers in place by end Y1 • Integrated EIMAS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Necessary equipment installed within defined government agencies, with proof of purchase • Evidence of training materials and records of attendance of training course. • Evidence of information entered into EIMAS and available in a form that is useable by other agencies and interested stakeholders. • Records of requests for information from stakeholders / policy makers / senior managers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing datasets are made available to the Project and sufficient capacity to compile and integrate datasets. ▪ No sensitivity / copyright issues restricting access to existing datasets for inclusion into EIMAS

			<p>system, linked into monitoring programmes, with regularly updated data and GIS datasets, actively used and accessed by policy-makers by MTE and fully operational by Y3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed by MTE and TE through reporting procedures between EIMAS and relevant users. 	
	<p>By Year 2, island resources surveyed and mapped and data and baseline maps input into EIMAS</p>	<p>Limited and out-of-date baseline data and maps.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surveys implemented by end Y1 (using feedback from 4 Demos) Set of maps to guide land-use planning, development, designation of PAs, etc. available by month 18. Maps prepared to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribution and status of biological and physical resources (i.e. terrestrial & marine habitat maps from ground-truthed remote sensing data, invasive and introduced species, soil types, topography, hydrology, watershed function, surface and ground water resources, coastal erosion and shoreline stability); and, Land and marine resource use patterns, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Survey data and maps available to EA (Min of Environment) for Project Review. GIS maps and info analysis available for SIRM as confirmed through Project and Evaluations and reporting Project provides evidence to Evaluators plus positive feedback to evaluation process by policy-makers Confirmed by MTE and TE through reporting procedures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing datasets provide an adequate baseline. Sufficient capacity available to initiate surveys and mapping Policy makers are prepared to ask for guidance and willing to use information analyses even if not favourable. Training provided and resources assigned (including human) continue to be available for EIMAS to operate.

			<p>infrastructure (i.e. roads etc.) and socio-economic data using stakeholder consultation and participatory GIS and resource mapping techniques (e.g. to locate dive sites and fishing grounds).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring indicators identified for long term monitoring programme (for Output 1.5) by Y1 		
	By Year 3, an island ecosystem model developed, tested and in use by appropriate stakeholders	No existing island ecosystem functional integrity model	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model being used by Project and stakeholders to develop the SIRM Plan by month 18 • Set of thematic maps to guide land-use planning, development, designation of PAs, etc. available by month 12. • Analysis of thematic maps and model of island ecosystem available by end of month 18. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of NCM meetings on SIRM Plan • Maps available to EA (Min of Environment) for Project Review • Model in place that captures all of the pertinent information (as listed in the Outcome) by MTE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient capacity available to analyse data, create thematic maps and generate island ecosystem model.
	Disaster management and contingency planning system built into EIMAS by Year 3 and used by all relevant agencies by year 4.	Current approaches to resource management do not effectively capture the potential effects of environmental variability or extreme events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIMAS tools enable stakeholders to plan for environmental variability and extreme events • Bases established for system to monitor Environmental Variability and forecast 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disaster management and contingency plans (DM-CP) reflect value of SIRM • Records of provision of information for DM-CP through EIMAS • Confirmed through Independent Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptance of the need to include extreme event prediction and management as well as on-going environmental variability into SIRM process.

			Extreme Events (accessible through EIMAS linked into long term monitoring programme Output 1.5) by month 18.	(MTE & TE).	
	Sustainable mechanism to update the environmental information through monitoring and reporting established by end of project	No effective monitoring programmes for resources and ecosystem functions. Lack of any cross-sectoral organisation in monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training and capacity building for monitoring, analysis and information presentation completed within Y2 • Full national monitoring programmes, with standardised monitoring methods, and agreed sampling strategy, established and delivering data to EIMAS by Y3 • Updated report on status of national resources and ecosystem function (State of the Islands Environment Report) and updated SIRM components by end of Y3. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented evidence of monitoring programme. • Survey data and reports and entered into EIMAS • Updated Status of Environment Report by end Y3. • Confirmed by Independent Evaluators. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agencies prepared to coordinate monitoring approaches and work together to develop integrated long term monitoring programme and share data. • Training provided and resources assigned (including human) continue to be available for effective monitoring • Policy level commitment and associated sustainable funding made available.
	By the end of the project, key sectors within the island's business and social communities show increased awareness relative to the need and	No effective awareness campaigns for SIRM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop awareness raising materials during Y1 • Targeted awareness campaigns implemented ongoing throughout duration of Project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of widespread media campaign to raise awareness of need and desirability of SIRM (leaflets, Government website, newspaper articles, media reports) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media willing to assist in publicising the need and benefits of SIRM • No cause for 'negative press' generated through the duration of Project.

	desirability of SIRM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Awareness campaign monitored and refined to ensure all stakeholder groups are effectively addressed – clearly demonstrated by time of MTE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive feedback from community representatives (private and public sector, educational, etc) through stakeholder meetings and evaluations. Media reports indicate increasing awareness of the need for SIRM 	
OUTCOME 2	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	BASELINE	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
A sustainable island resource management plan developed and in place	By Year 3, SIRM Zoning Plan and associated regulations and guidelines, developed and adopted, with full participation of stakeholders	No comprehensive zoning maps or plan that address SIRM needs or integrated approach to resource management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key government agencies make SIRM approach effective by adoption of requisite regulations and guidelines, supported by budgetary allocations for implementation and enforcement Zoning Plan, along with guidelines and regulations, adopted and accepted by a broad range of stakeholders within 30 months of Project inception. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of PCC / NCM to confirm adoption. Budgetary allocations of relevant government agencies Project has access to documented evidence of implementing/enforcing agency confirming compliance Reports of stakeholder consultations and records of attendance. Confirmed by Independent Evaluator by MTE. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholders are able to accept trade-offs and understand long-term benefits of Zoning Plan NCM willing to adopt the Zoning Plan in the face of any objections from individual agencies or the private sector
	By Year 2 SIRM Cost-Benefit Analysis indicating economic and resource sustainability advantages of SIRM, developed and presented to stakeholders	No current Cost Benefit Analysis for resource management.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBA, including total economic valuation of environmental and socio-economic resources and consequences of their degradation / loss (e.g., lost recreation values, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBA report available to Project and for review by PCC, NCM, and IA. Feedback from agencies / policy makers on increased capacity to use CBA as a decision making tool for ecosystem based 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBA will find clear economic benefits to an SIRM approach thus off-setting and validating possible trade-offs

			<p>water quality/public health, reduced agricultural productivity, and reduced fish populations), presented to policy-makers and leader in both private and public sector within first month 18</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity building for cost-benefit analysis by month 18. 	<p>management.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from Policy-makers to Evaluators. 	
By end of Year 2, sustainable alternative livelihood options identified and shared with stakeholders	Alternative sustainable livelihood options not well known or rarely considered viable and the need for self-sufficiency not recognized as essential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable alternative livelihood options identified within 9 months of inception. • Advisory Brief with strategies and alternative livelihood options promoted and used as an input into, and for inclusion in, the 5 year plan for SIRM and National Economic Development Plan. Within 24 months of inception. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief prepared within 2 years of inception and made available for review by PCC, NCM, IA • Confirmed through evaluation process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Viable and sufficient alternatives to existing livelihoods and resource use practices identified • Government recognizes need to include these in development planning and promote self-sufficiency. • Resource users, private sector and communities accept proposed alternatives or modifications to resource use practices 	
Demonstration project areas are zoned as per categories and criteria of national Zoning Plan	No Zoning Plan available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration project areas, which include not only defined sensitive and hot spot areas but also of high development potential, are zoned with the agreement of all relevant stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoning maps • Minutes of stakeholder meeting • Minutes of PCC meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant stakeholders will agree to proposed zoning plans 	

	By Year 3, a strategic Plan for SIRM, developed with full stakeholder participation, adopted by Government	No current integrated resource management plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft SIRM Strategic Plan completed by month 21 • Revision of SIRM plan by end of Y2 • Plan accepted by a wide range of stakeholders and adopted by Government within first 30 months of Project • Plan available and being used by government agencies, developers, and other stakeholders for guidance and compliance after month 30 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media reports of to raise awareness of stakeholder consultation process and report on progress. • Report of stakeholders' workshops, records of attendance. • Draft Plan available by MTE. • Confirmed by Independent Evaluator. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders, in particular resource users and private sector, accept trade-offs and long-term objectives • Government recognises need and prepared to adopt a realistic Plan
OUTCOME 3	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	BASELINE	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS
Policy and institutional reforms provide a framework for Implementation of the SIRM Plan	By Year 1 relevant policies, legislation and regulatory reforms have been reviewed, gaps identified and recommendations developed	Existing reviews outdated and not focused on an integrated and cross-sectoral SIRM approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full set of reviews and recommendations relating to realignment of policy and legislation in support of an SIRM approach completed and accepted by relevant government agencies by end Y2 • Policy frameworks are harmonized and strengthened to support SIRM Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews available to Project • Discussed in PCC and NCM as per minutes. • Availability of reviews confirmed through Evaluation process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government prepared to accept that review process is intended to realign overall policy and legislation toward an SIRM approach. • Effective cooperation from relevant agencies and departments

	By Year 1 relevant institutions have significantly and effectively raised their levels of training and capacity to comply with SIRM requirements	Training in SIRM approaches not in place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant institutions, especially in the public sector, support training programs to enhance capacity of staff to address SIRM requirements • Definition of cross-sectoral training and capacity building programme for agencies, NGOS and CBO and specific resource communities by end Y1 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews and training needs and capacity assessments available to Project • Discussed in PCC and NCM as per minutes. • Number of certified staff • Budgetary allocations of government agencies • Confirmed by Independent Evaluator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government prepared to accept that review process is intended to realign overall institutional strategy and financing toward an SIRM approach. • Effective cooperation from relevant agencies and departments • No 'u'-turns associated with elections and possible new government
	Land tenure arrangements encourage short-term leases, usually for small plots	Land tenure reforms lead to longer leases for farms – to a median average of 10 years - and increased size thus providing incentives for better land use practices and investments by end Y3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal project monitoring • MTE and FEV 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing tenure arrangements and land availability make land tenure reform possible 	Land tenure arrangements fully account for and protect the value of land and associated ecosystem functions and services
	Realistic financial mechanisms and fiscal incentives to support policy and institutional reforms identified by Year 2	No current sustainability or financing mechanisms to support an SIRM approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial mechanisms and instruments to sustainably support SIRM identified within 21 months. • Sustainable financing strategy to support SIRM presented to stakeholders and at NCM level within 21 months 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of PCC meetings • Official records from Government. • Records of meetings between Project and government • Confirmed by Independent Evaluator 	Sufficient financial incentives and actual revenues can be generated and allocated to support SIRM
OUTCOME 4 Requirements for	KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR	BASELINE	TARGET	SOURCE OF VERIFICATION	RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

<p>implementation of the SIRM Plan in place, as well as mechanisms for capture of lessons and best practices</p> <p>N.B. see appendix one for individual logframe analyses for each demonstration</p>	<p>By Year 1 PMU fully operational and NCM established as a long-term advisory and policy group with defined project and post-project roles</p>	<p>No existing SIRM project. IWCAM Project needs to be closely coordinated and involved</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Manager, Project Coordinator and Administrative Assistant positions advertised, recruitment process carried out as per UNDP requirements and appropriately qualified staff appointed. • Project Objectives met in timely fashion. • Project M&E undertaken to plan and completed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project reports. APR/PIRs. Project Evaluation Process (MTE and TE). • M&E plan meets targets according to PB and TE 	<p>NCM willing and able to assume role as inter-ministerial/sectoral committee for the project.</p>
	<p>By Year 2 training programmes bring about a demonstrable increase in utilization of sustainable natural resource use practices</p>	<p>Limited training and capacity building at present, and not focused on SIRM</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training and capacity building given to relevant sectors to realign them toward an integrated and cross-sectoral approach to SIRM. • Project develops a T&CB Plan, to address cross-sectoral SIRM needs identified in Output 3.3 within first year • Training and capacity building program targets relevant sectors during Y2 and Y3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project reports • Project reports provide evidence for Training and Capacity Building programmes. • Evaluations and user surveys confirm effectiveness • Confirmation by MTE and TE 	<p>Relevant agencies and stakeholders are prepared to allocate appropriate staff for training and capacity building</p>
	<p>By year 4 at least four Site Specific Demonstrations projects implemented.</p>	<p>No demonstrations of the SIRM approach at selected hotspot sites around Antigua and Barbuda</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Coordinators for each Demo appointed. • Selected Pilot Demonstrations (see Appendix 1) implemented by Year 2 months 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project reporting on demonstrations. • MTE and TE. • Specific technical and process reports on demonstration • achievements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration Implementation process reveals appropriate lessons and practices that are replicable.

	By end of the project lessons and practices, including from the demonstrations, compiled and incorporated into national models, guidelines and governance reforms. (Output 4. 5)	Absence of effective lessons and best practices for sustainable island resource management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demos provide clearly defined lessons and practices collated as a set of model guidelines by year 3 for replication at other sites • Phased plan to replicate the lessons learnt within SIRM at other sites prepared by the end of the Project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mid-term and end-of-activities reports from demos with clear lessons and practices available to GEF and UN for transfer to other pertinent SIDS. • Evaluators review lessons and practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demos work to plan and are completed and produce lessons that are applicable at the national level • Governments willing to adopt models and guidelines.
	Monitoring system designed and operational with baseline information for project indicators, including intermediate benchmarks and means of measurement	No Project therefore no Project M&E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for providing baseline (initial project condition determined by indicators); to be completed during the first year of implementation • All impact and performance indicators are measured prior to the final evaluation. • Final evaluation, PB, Project team evaluate results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring reports. • PIR/APR Reports. • MTE and TE Reports • PB to confirm 	

REVISED LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2013
To evolve and implement a Sustainable Island Resource Management (SIRM) approach in Antigua and Barbuda to stabilize and maintain ecosystem	A SIRM Plan developed for Antigua and Barbuda	No SIRM plan and little by way of coordinated cross-sectoral administration and	SIRMM Plan presented to Cabinet for approval by project end	95% of SIRMM Activities are complete. The SIRM Plan will accompany the revised Environmental Protection and Management Bill (EPMB) to Cabinet. The submission to Cabinet is being led by the project manager, and is planned for September

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2013
functions, thereby providing a basis for continued sustainable economic development.		management of island resources		<p>2013 Outcome 1: 99% complete. EMIAS has been incorporated into the legislation, which will support the creation of a Department mandated to conduct SIRM in the island. Outcome 2: 97% complete. The final activities are the production of Local Area Plans (LAPs) which will demonstrate how the Sustainable Island Resource Zoning Plan (SIRMZP) can improve livelihoods. The LAPs will be used to assess the appropriateness of existing and future development project proposals, evaluate future development strategies and enhance the overall benefits and livelihood of all relevant stakeholders. Outcome 3: 90% complete. The EPMB has been redrafted to incorporate the SIRM as a basis. Consultations on the final draft of the EPMB and the SIRM brief are scheduled for end of July 2013. The EPMB is the legislative instrument which captures the missing policy elements required for sustainable environmental management in Antigua and Barbuda. Through the project a number of elements have been added to the instrument. Th will establish the institutional arrangements for SIRM in Antigua & Barbuda. The Fisheries Regulations have been passed and came into effect on 1 February 2013. A draft of the Physical Planning Act Regulations is under revision and should be finalized in October. Outcome 4: 95 % complete. Progress on all Demonstrations has been slow due to weather delays and slow mobilization of co-financing. Support from government agencies has been reduced due to severe budget cuts, which have affected staffing levels in government agencies and their ability to provide the support committed. However, the Project Management Committee has taken up recommendations from the Project Management Unit, which will accelerate work during summer 2013.</p>
	By Year 3 associated legislative and policy reforms are in place	Physical Planning Act and Draft Environmental Protection and Management Bill exist	Regulations of the Physical Planning Act 2003 approved by the Minister by project end. Environmental Management Bill presented to Parliament by Project end.	The drafts of the Environmental Management and Protection Bill (EMPB) and the draft of the Regulations for the Physical Planning Act 2003 are going through stakeholder review and consultative processes. The EMPB is scheduled for Cabinet submission in September and the PPA 2003 regulations will be submitted to the Development Control Authority for onward submission to cabinet later this year.

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2013
	By Year 4 government budgetary allocations for SIRM are in place	None	(Approximate 25% of funds required for SIRM implementation allocated to the relevant departments by the Ministry of Finance by Project). Relevant government agencies to incorporate the SIRM considerations (plan) into their budgetary plans by project end.	Despite severe budget cuts in the Government, the agencies responsible for Environmental Management have managed to carry out the basic elements of their Work Program for 2012-2013, meeting the SIRMM co-financing requirement. This is reflected in the Antigua and Barbuda budgetary estimates for 2012-2013. Budget cuts have been a recurrent issue and the SIRM Financing Strategy attempts to address this.
	Effective program to monitor project progress using impact indicators established by the project.	No effective or coordinated monitoring of resources and ecosystem functions or response system	Improved and updated monitoring and information processing programmes, focused on SIRM, in place by Project end. Effective communication and feedback between monitoring process takes place. Monitoring Reports are delivered to decision makers as they are produced.	The Data Manager in the Environment Division has made several suggestions to improve data management of Environmental Projects, specifically through the development of a web based monitoring system for all projects. Due to planned relocation of the Environment Division and the SIRMM project office, these recommendations cannot yet be implemented. However, once the EMPB is passed, the Division will become a Department located in a new building and these systems can be established. The requirements for monitoring and reporting have been covered in the EMPB, which calls for the establishment of an Environmental Management and Advisory System (EIMAS) Unit to be responsible for monitoring projects' progress. With respect to the feedback mechanism to enable the making and implementation of policy decisions, a Projects Management Committee comprising of Permanent secretaries and officials from the Ministry of Finance and the Prime Minister's Office has been functioning since January 2013. This committee receives reports on project activities and is able to make decisions to move the project forward when there are unexpected difficulties.
	Acceptance of trade-offs between maintenance of ecosystem functions and integrity and existing land use trends, reflected in increased application of EIAs and SEAs	No approved National Physical Development Plan (NPDP)	Approved National Physical Development Plan in place	The SIRMZP has been approved by Cabinet and Parliament. The development of Local Area Plans will demonstrate the value of the SIRMZP. The Development Control Authority(DCA) Board, despite training and capacity building continues to lack the capacity to implement the SIRMZP fully. While the scope of the issue is beyond the mandate of this project, the project is working with the DCA to encourage the establishment of the Planning Arm of the DCA which is enshrined in the PPA 2003. Additionally the EMPB has addressed critical gaps in the EIA process which will ensure that the application of EIAs and EISs is enforced in every

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2013
				situation where there are required.
	(Incentives for inappropriate agricultural practices have been identified and removed) Positive incentives for appropriate Agricultural practices are identified and promoted	Incentives, or lack of positive incentives, promote unsustainable practices.	(Imports of agrochemicals reduced by 20% Integrated pest management approaches practice by 50% of farmers. 80% of hotels in North West region have adequate waste management systems in place by end Y3) The Department of Agriculture promotes integrated pest management through its teaching education and extension services reflected in Annual work programmes. The National Pesticides Board Regulates the importation of harmful agro chemicals through legislation.	The new EMPB includes the requirements for wastewater management which need to be enforced. The Project has developed a web based tool which will accompany the legislation and help the hotels manage waste water issues. The Department of Agriculture continues to promote good agricultural practices and has recently launched a "buy local" initiative which assists farms in marketing the goods they've produced.
	4 demonstration projects are carried out.	No application of integrated management approaches	Demonstration projects are a model of SIRMM implementation. Demonstration projects capture lessons learnt and best practices to be replicated into national policy.	Progress on Demonstrations have been slow due to weather delays and slow mobilization of co-financing. Support from government agencies has been reduced due to severe budget cuts, which have affected staffing levels in government agencies and their ability to provide the support committed. However, the Project Management Committee has taken up recommendations from the Project Management Unit, which will accelerate work during the summer.
Easy and reliable access to information for Environmental Management by all stakeholders	By Year 3, the EIMAS is operational	No mechanism in place to allow agencies to organise existing data on SIRM and share information with other agencies. Agencies do not currently have requisite equipment Ad hoc information handling and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EIMAS database and information processing mechanism in place, and operating as a tool to integrate existing datasets and structure new data input by endY2 Agencies required to provide inputs and prepare outputs to EIMAS are fully equipped and trained by end Y3 	The EMPB calls for the establishment of an EIMAS unit, which will house the EIMAS database. Additionally, all future projects will be required to submit GIS data to the EIMAS to facilitate sustainability. The Surveys Division continues to work with the Attorney General's Office on the establishment of national GIS protocols. The project carried out additional training on GIS earlier this year, 25 persons from 7 agencies were trained.

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2013
		presentation with no feedback from policy level.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Briefing mechanism for policy-makers and senior managers in place by end Y3 • EIMAS integrated into monitoring programmes, with regularly updated data and GIS datasets, actively used and accessed by technicians from the relevant agencies and fully operational by year 3 	
	By Year 2, island resources surveyed and mapped and data and baseline maps input into EIMAS	Limited and out-of-date baseline data and maps.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys and update remote sensing phase 1 completed by end Y2 (continuous updates using feedback from 4 Demos) • Set of maps to guide land-use planning, development, designation of PAs, etc. by end of Y available by end of Y3. Maps prepared to include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution and status of biological and physical resources (i.e. terrestrial & marine habitat maps from ground-truthed remote sensing data, soil types, topography, hydrology, watershed function); and, • Land and marine resource use patterns, infrastructure (i.e. roads etc.) and socio-economic data using stakeholder consultation and participatory GIS and resource mapping techniques (e.g. to locate dive sites and fishing grounds). • Monitoring indicators identified for long term monitoring programme (for Output 1.5) by Y1 	The EIMAS database has been built based on existing and new maps. A detailed review has found errors, which are being systematically addressed by the Data Manager. Geo databases will be developed for all GIS materials that are meant for inclusion into the EIMAS. The Data Manager is in place and responsible for updates, monitoring and reporting.

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2013
	By Year 3, an island ecosystem model developed, tested and in use by appropriate stakeholders	No existing EIMAS model in place	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model being used by Project and stakeholders to develop the SIRM Plan by Y3 • Set of thematic maps to guide land-use planning, development, designation of PAs, etc. available by Y3. • Analysis of thematic maps and model of island ecosystem available by end of month 18. 	The EIMAS is complete and in use. It is the basis of the SIRMZP, and is being used to develop Local Area Plans as well as for data analysis required for other projects.
	Disaster management and contingency planning system built into EIMAS by Year 3 and used by all relevant agencies by year 4.	Current approaches to resource management do not effectively capture the potential effects of environmental variability or extreme events. The report does not address disaster management and contingency planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EIMAS tools enable MET office to plan for environmental variability and extreme events • Bases established for system to monitor Environmental Variability and forecast Extreme Events (accessible through EIMAS linked into long term monitoring programme Output 1.5) by month 18 	The National Office of Disaster Services continues to utilise the EIMAS for management and planning.
	Sustainable mechanism to update the environmental information through monitoring and reporting established by end of project	No effective monitoring programmes for resources and ecosystem functions. No capacity building programme for monitoring and analysis has been done Lack of any cross-sectoral organisation in monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuous Training and capacity building for (all) staff within the 6 pilot agencies for monitoring, analysis and information presentation • National monitoring programmes of certain ecosystems with standardised GIS monitoring methods, and agreed sampling strateg, established and delivering data to EIMAS by Y3 • Updated report on status of national resources and ecosystem function (State of the Islands 	Final planned training on the EIMAS was completed in March 2013. Additional training and workshops on issues such as Biodiversity, Water Resources Climate Change and Adaptation, Waste Water Management, Land Management, Development and Monitoring of Biodiversity Indicators, Environmental Legislation have been carried out for stakeholders, both government and private sector. Others, focusing on SIRM Financial Sustainability mechanisms are planned for the rest of 2013. Training in data collection and input have been carried out, however most Government Agencies lack the staff numbers required to carry out sustained data collection. Instead data collection is done at the time of site visits and in projects. Several chapters of the Environmental Atlas are completed; final editing and printing will take place in the second half of 2013.

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2013
			Environment Report) and updated SIRM components by Project end.	
	By the end of the project, key sectors within the island's business and social communities show increased awareness relative to the need and desirability of SIRM	No effective awareness campaigns for SIRM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct KAP Survey of the Project by Year end • Awareness campaign monitored and refined to ensure all stakeholder groups are effectively addressed – clearly demonstrated by time of MTE 	<p>Extensive awareness raising activities are continuous and materials have been circulated to the national media, including several interviews and newspaper articles. The project web site is www.gefantigua.org. A documentary was completed and DVD's are available. The production was triggered by a review of the communication strategy and the recommendations from the Midterm Review of the project. SIRM has been incorporated into and is the basis for the Environment Division Communication strategy which focuses on \"touch, see and feel\" experiences.</p> <p>These are to be rolled out in the Botanical Gardens. Central to the Communication Plan is the use of the Botanical Gardens as an inspirational space for learning and recreation. The Botanical Gardens is located in the outskirts of the city of St. John's, making it easily accessed by various members of the public. The office of Environment Department will be relocated to the Botanical Gardens, which will assist with ease of the anticipated necessary renovations.</p> <p>The communication strategy anticipates a permanent exhibit of the various Conventions and projects including national outputs. This exhibit will be within the Botanical Gardens, which will be enhanced to facilitate improved access and displays of green technology, exhibition stalls of projects and environmental issues. Moreover, this design will facilitate an afterschool program, and enable members of the private sector, including tourists, to explore and possibly host educational workshops.</p>
Sustainable Resource Management Mechanism developed and in place	By Year 3, SIRM Zoning Plan and associated regulations and guidelines, developed and adopted, with full participation of	No comprehensive zoning maps or plan that address SIRM needs or integrated approach to resource management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key government agencies make SIRM approach effective by adoption of requisite regulations and guidelines, supported by budgetary allocations for implementation and enforcement • Zoning Plan, along with guidelines and regulations, adopted and 	The SIRMZP is 100% complete. Local Area Plans are being developed to demonstrate the cost benefit of implementation of the SIRMZP.

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2013
	stakeholders		accepted by a broad range of stakeholders by end Y4.	
	By Year 2 Cost-Benefit Analysis of SIRM plan completed and presented to stakeholders.	No current Cost Benefit Analysis of selected aspects of the NPDP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost benefit assessment based on case studies with the proposed options, completed by 6months after the preparation of the plan 	Local Area Plans are being developed and will assess the cost benefit and the livelihood advantages related to implementation of the SIRMZP within the broader framework of prescribed mitigation methods that can be used to assess the appropriateness of new and present project proposals. The Local Area plans will be used as a tool to evaluate future development strategies and enhance the overall benefits and livelihood of all relevant stakeholders.
	By end of Year 2, sustainable alternative livelihood options identified in the NPDP (SIRMZP) and shared with stakeholders	Alternative sustainable livelihood options not well known or rarely considered viable and the need for self-sufficiency not recognized as essential.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable alternative livelihood options identified within 6 months of the NPDP (SIRMZP). • Sustainable alternative livelihood options presented to the Ministry of Finance for consideration in the preparation of the National Economic Development Plan 	Local Area Plans are being developed and will assess the cost benefit and the livelihood advantages related to implementation of the SIRMZP within the broader framework of prescribed mitigation methods that can be used to assess the appropriateness of new and present project proposals. The Local Area plans will be used as a tool to evaluate future development strategies and enhance the overall benefits and livelihood of all relevant stakeholders.
	Where appropriate, local area plans from demonstration project zoning plans are fed into the preparation of the National zoning plan	No Zoning Plan available	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration project areas, which include not only defined sensitive and hot spot areas but also of high development potential, are zoned within the plan 	Sensitive environmental areas are highlighted and zoned in the SIRMZP. Additional Local Area Plans are under development and demonstrate the usefulness of the SIRMZP.
	By Year 3, a strategic Plan for SIRM, developed by October 2011 and presented to Cabinet by end of Y4	No current integrated resource management plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft SIRM Strategic Plan completed by month 21 • Revision of SIRM plan by end of Y2 • Plan accepted by a wide range of stakeholders and adopted by Government within first 30 months of Project 	See completed SIRMZP available at http://gefantigua.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/05/111018_Final-SIRMZP1.pdf .

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2013
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan available and being used by government agencies, developers, and other stakeholders for guidance and compliance after month 30 	
<p>Policy and institutional reforms provides a framework for the implementation of the SIRM policy</p>	<p>By Year 1 relevant policies, legislation and regulatory reforms have been reviewed, gaps identified and recommendations developed</p>	<p>Existing reviews outdated and not focused on an integrated and cross-sectoral SIRM approach</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report identifying gaps and recommendations for institutional reforms for implementation of SIRM policy available 	<p>The EPMB has been completely redrafted based on the comments of stakeholders. The revisions are designed to more fully incorporate the SIRM as the basis of the instrument. The consultations on the final draft of the EPMB and the SIRM brief have been scheduled for end of July 2013. The EPMB is the legislative instrument, which captures the missing policy elements required for sustainable environmental management in Antigua and Barbuda. Through the project, a number of elements have been added to the instrument or redrafted completely. The EIA sections have been strengthened to include sections dealing with identifying activities and undertakings subject to an environmental impact assessment and environment management and monitoring. Water quality management has also been added; this section includes provisions for the formulation of a national Water Quality Management Policy. The Bill provides for the establishment of an EIMAS Unit, which will be responsible for periodic Natural Resource Inventories and a Natural Resource Management Plan. Watersheds and wetlands management have been redrafted. These sections address the declaration of critical watersheds, management of watersheds and wetlands. The issues of Biodiversity and wildlife management have been redrafted. The EMPB addresses the issue of forest management and incorporates the recommendations for institutional reform resulting from the Body Ponds Project.</p>
	<p>By Year 1 relevant institutions have significantly and effectively raised their levels of training and capacity to comply with SIRM requirements</p>	<p>Training in SIRM approaches not in place</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of staff trained from relevant institutions in (X) Number of courses • Definition of cross-sectoral training and capacity building programme for agencies, NGOS and CBO and specific resource communities by end Y1 	<p>The project continues to provide training in a variety of relevant areas. During the period July 2012 to June 2013, the project organized and supported workshops and training for 50 persons from 10 agencies in water resources and waste water management, GIS, Climate Adaptation issues and biodiversity indicator development and monitoring.</p>

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2013
	Reformed land tenure policy.	Land tenure policy encourages short-term leases, usually for small plots	Field lessons influence land tenure reforms by year 4	The Ministry of Agriculture continues to work on land tenure and land management issues. It has Championed the SIRMZP which include measures to reserve all class 2 agricultural crown lands for agricultural production. The Extension Division continues to actively implement its land tenure policy.
	Realistic financial mechanisms and fiscal incentives to support policy and institutional reforms identified by Year 2	No current sustainability or financing mechanisms to support an SIRM approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate financial mechanisms and instruments identified in the Environmental Management Bill to sustainably support SIRM identified within 21 months. • Financial needs identified to support the SIRM plan are embedded into the National Economic Plan 	At the core of the revised EMPB is the establishment of the Antigua and Barbuda Sustainable Island Resource Framework Fund (SIRF). The SIRF will be embedded legislation and not exist on its own, as is the traditional approach for the formation of funds. The regional OECs environmental legislation model recommends the establishment of a fund to provide adequate and sustainable financing for Environmental Management. The SIRF will be established to own assets from which it will generate an income. In the first instance these assets will be wind turbines, solar panels, sewage treatment systems and a system to recycle waste oil. The fund will have several funding windows. The main funding windows are general environmental management, protected areas, and NGOs and CBOs. These windows will be established by the act and any new windows can be established by regulations.
Requirements for the implementation of the SIRM plan in place as well as the capture of lessons and best practices	By Year 1 PMU fully operational and National Coordinating Mechanism established as a long-term advisory and policy group with defined project and post-project roles	No existing SIRM project. IWCAM Project functioning in isolation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A project management team of three (3) Project Manager, Project Coordinator and Administrative Assistant recruited. • Project Objectives met in timely fashion. • Project M&E undertaken to plan and completed 	The Permanent Secretary of the Ministry responsible for the Environment Division appointed a Project Manager to provide overall direction to the project and Project Coordinator responsible for day-to-day implementation. As part of the revised project management arrangements stemming from the midterm review, the Project Management Committee (PMC) was established to focus mainly on procurement, institutional arrangements and financial management. The PMC also monitors implementation of the project activities according to the approved Work Programs and approves any essential deviations where necessary. The PMC is composed of representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture, the UNDP national representative, Permanent Secretary of the Environment Division and a representative from the Ministry of Finance. The technical staff of the project as well as key personnel from related and synergistic projects form the Project Management Unit (PMU). The PMU acts as an advisory body to the project providing high-level guidance, policy input and support, facilitating communication, cooperation

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2013
				and coordination among stakeholder agencies and other project partners. The PMC and the PMU meet at least once per month.
	By Year 2, training programmes carried out to support utilization of sustainable natural resource use practices	Limited training and capacity building at present, and not focused on SIRM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 training programmes carried out by Y 4 on 5 specific issues. • Project develops a T&CB Plan, to address cross-sectoral SIRM needs identified in Output 3.3 within first year • Training and capacity building program targets relevant sectors during Project life 	Training programs on GIS, Land Management, EIA, pest management have been implemented with all key stakeholders, including Heads of 3 key agencies, Environment, DCA and CBH; Barbuda National Parks, National Office of Disaster Services, the Department of Analytical Services, the Attorney Generals Office, The Forestry Unit, the Survey Department, the Environment Division, the Lands Division, the Fisheries Division. The SIRMM project sponsored training at the Subregional Workshop for the Caribbean on Capacity-building for Implementation of the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas for the Barbuda National Park council, as well as the participation of staff from the Ministry of Agriculture at workshops on Financial Mechanisms of Sustainable Marine Protected Areas Management and waste water management and sewage treatment. The project also supported training for Local Farmers.
	By year 4 at least four Site Specific Demonstrations projects implemented. 1. Rehabilitation of the Body Ponds watershed. 2. A Ridge to Reef Ecosystem assessment and improvement. 3. Codrington Lagoon development. This is a protected area without a management structure.	No demonstrations of the SIRM approach at selected hotspot sites around Antigua and Barbuda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Coordinators for each Demo appointed. • 4 Demonstrations projects completed by year 4 	Demonstration project 3 is complete and Demonstrations 1, 2 and 4 are in their final stages. Demonstration 1 - The site suffered a catastrophic fire in June 2012 which destroyed the majority of the plants. However, the SIRMM replanted the area and terracing is being finalized. This was determined a best practice during the replication exercise on another farm in the area. Demonstration 2 is spear heading completion of the MOU with the Community Group to take over management of the Wallings centre, and the installation and deployment of bouys in the Cades Bay area is being arranged. With respect to the southwest coast of Antigua, the ecological reports and maps for marine and terrestrial resources have been completed. The project's livelihoods diversification activities included collaboration with other institutions for training workshops on opportunities such as glass beads (August, 2011) during which ten artisans were trained in the art of creating beads and jewelry from recycled glass bottles. Demonstration 3 - Codrington Lagoon's management plan and Parks Board are in place. Demonstration 4 - the main activities are complete including a review of waste water management issues in the North West tourism zone; costing and

Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2013
				<p>implementation plan for the proposed natural waste water treatment system; review of factors affecting the quality of water entering the pond, and assessment of legislative considerations with respect to water and waste water re-use; review of codes of practice that affect the quality of waste water; comparative analysis of various types of natural treatment systems; costing and implementation plan for the “floating islands” concept for natural waste water treatment. The SIRMM is also collaborating with the NWSMA and local schools and hotels in the demo site to construct the floating islands. Environmental Management Systems (EMS) for select hotels on the North West coast are being developed; and an online database completed by the Antigua State College (ASC). Monitoring of water quality and maintenance of the site continues.</p>
	<p>By end of the project lessons and practices, including from the demonstrations, compiled and incorporated into national models, guidelines and governance reforms.</p>	<p>Absence of effective lessons and best practices for sustainable island resource management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Project end, lessons learnt and best practices, including demonstrations, are compiled and submitted to national agencies for guidance policy and agenda setting 	<p>Biannual knowledge reports and quarterly reports capture lessons learnt and best practices. Furthermore, there is replication of best practices and lessons learnt in the demonstration sites.</p>
	<p>Monitoring system designed and operational with baseline information for project indicators, including intermediate benchmarks and means of measurement</p>	<p>No Project therefore no Project M&E</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan for providing baseline (initial project condition determined by indicators); to be completed during the first year of implementation • All impact and performance indicators are measured prior to the final evaluation. • Final evaluation, PB, Project team evaluate results 	<p>Project Impact Indicators will be measured and reported on in the Terminal report of the Final evaluation scheduled for the second semester of 2013.</p>

ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

Approved project document

Mid-term evaluation

Auditor's reports for 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012

Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)

Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs)

Minutes of meetings of the Project Coordinating Committee, Project Management Unit and Project Management Committee

Any document generated as an output of the projects

ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Further details will be discussed during inception meeting with the UNDP CO.

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/ operational program strategies and country priorities? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the participating country? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives? 	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the project outcomes commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project been effective in achieving its targets of expected outcomes? Answer for each outcome. 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In case in the original or modified expected outcomes are merely outputs/inputs, were any real outcomes of the project? 	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, were these commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects? 		•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes? 		•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? 		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			

• Was the project cost effective?	•	•	•
• Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?	•	•	•
• Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?	•	•	•
• Were the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them used as management tools during implementation?	•	•	•
• Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?	•	•	•
• Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?	•	•	•
• How was results-based management used during project implementation?	•	•	•
• To what extent were partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organisations encouraged and supported?	•	•	•
• What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? Which methods were successful or not and why?	•	•	•
• How could the project have been more efficiently carry out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc)?	•	•	•
• What changes could have been made to the project in order to improve its efficiency?	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
• What risks are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes?	•	•	•
• How are these risks likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes?	•	•	•
• How will other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project affect sustainability?	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
• Has the project played a catalytic role (e.g. provided opportunities for replication, scaling/up or influencing relevant public policies)?	•	•	•

ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form³

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

³www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE⁴

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
 - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Region and countries included in the project
 - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁵)
1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁶)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
 - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
 - Project Finance:

⁴The Report length should not exceed 60 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁵ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁶ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
- Relevance(*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (*)
- Impact

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by	
UNDP Country Office	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP GEF RTA	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____