

Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Saint Lucia



Terminal Evaluation
August 2013

Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Saint Lucia

GEF Project ID: PIMS 3450

Evaluation Time Frame: August 1st to September 20th
2013

Country: Saint Lucia

GEF Operational Program: OP15 SP1

Implementing Partners: Ministry of Physical
Development Environment and Housing

Evaluator: Dr. Reynold Murray

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Ms. Geraldine Lendor, local consultant in Saint Lucia for undertaking logistical arrangements, conducting some interviews and coordinating the national review of the report; Mr. Hildreth Lewis, Deputy Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Physical Development, Environment and Housing for giving the Ministry's perspective on the project. To all who participated in the evaluation process, thanks for your invaluable contribution.

Contents

- Executive Summary..... 3
- Acronyms 6
- 1. Introduction 7
 - 1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation..... 7
 - 1.2 Scope and Methodology 7
 - 1.3 Structure of the Evaluation Report 8
- 2. Project Description and Development Context 8
 - 2.1 Project Start and Duration 8
 - 2.2 Development Objectives..... 8
 - 2.3 Baseline Indicators 9
 - 2.4 Stakeholders 9
 - 2.5 Expected Results 10
- 3. Findings 10
 - 3.1 Project Formulation 10
 - 3.2 Project Implementation 13
 - 3.3 Project Results 15
- 4. Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons..... 20
- Annexes..... 22
 - ANNEX A Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference..... 22
 - ANNEX B List of Persons Interviewed..... 26
 - ANNEX C List of Documents Reviewed..... 26
 - ANNEX D Terminal Evaluation Questionnaire 27
 - ANNEX E Evaluation Question Matrix 29
 - ANNEX F Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form..... 31

Executive Summary

Project Summary Table

Project Title	Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Saint Lucia			
GEF Project ID:	PIMS 3450		<i>At endorsement</i>	<i>At completion</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00046154	GEF Financing	485,000	152,489.70
Country:	Saint Lucia	EA/IA/Own		
Region:	LAC	Government	196,500	
Focal Area:	Land Degradation	Other	839,700	
FA Objective, (OP/SP):	OP15 SP1	Total co-financing	1,036,200	
Executing Agency	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	1,536,200	
Other Partners Involved	Ministry of Physical Development Environment and Housing	ProDoc Signature (Date Project began):		
(Operational) Closing Date	Proposed:		Actual:	30 th June 2012

This Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project is part of a global portfolio project on sustainable land management designed to assist Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and least developed countries address land management issues in a context that meets the goals of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). Saint Lucia's environmental integrity, sustainable livelihood and agricultural production systems are seriously impacted by land degradation. The government is cognizant of the challenges of land degradation and the need to manage the island's limited land resource to the benefit of all Saint Lucians. To this end, the government ratified the UNCCD and sought to be part of the global SLM project.

The goal of the project was to ensure sustainable management of the land resources of Saint Lucia in order to enhance ecosystem health, integrity and social well-being of the people of Saint Lucia while the specific objective was to strengthen capacity for sustainable land management at the individual and institutional level and to mainstream SLM concepts into national development strategy and policy.

The project started well but had significant delays along the way, confirming the need for the capacity building. Following recommendations from the mid-term evaluation, the project was relocated and additional staff support provided. These adjustments enabled the project to achieve approximately 68% percent of its target giving it an overall rating of Moderately Satisfactory (MS).

Of all the contributors to land degradation in Saint Lucia, agricultural production, specifically intense banana farming on steep slopes has been identified as the main causative agent. This project trained in excess of sixty (60) farmers and trainers of trainers in sustainable land management focusing on slope stabilization and drainage. At the time of project development, the country had no comprehensive land use policy hence no statutory land zoning prescription

that defined spatial allocation in the context of optimal land use. This project provided technical support to the GIS Unit of the Planning Department as a first step towards mainstreaming land use planning and ensuring sustainability of project outcomes.

Table1. Evaluation rating

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

Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons

Willingness to implement a project is not sufficient to guarantee its success. From the inception report, it is clear that there was willingness on the part of the MPDE&H to implement the project in the given time frame, but the institutional arrangements were not adequate. Secondly, some degree of harmonization between the financial procedures of the implementing agency and the executing agency was necessary for speedy transfer of resources. A third lesson is that the risk management logs should be updated frequently to clearly articulated alternatives to any challenge identified in the AWP.

This evaluation found that, although the project was well designed and had some practical tangible outputs, it did not have the full impact anticipated due to protracted delays during implementation and the absence of a champion at the policy level. Stakeholder participation and expectations were not well managed therefore project impacts were less publicized and noticeable. The project operated primarily at the technical level and did not provide sufficient support to influence policy and institutional change towards mainstreaming SLM. The project developed some policy documents but these are under review and not yet enforced.

Recommendations provided by the Terminal Evaluation include:

- The need to provide background information on the design and development of projects to senior officials charged with implementation.
- Co-financing arrangements need to be more clearly articulated to ensure adequate financing during project implementation.
- Time lines associated with co-financing from other projects should be closely examined to avoid conflicts.

- Monitoring and Evaluation tracking tools should be developed in parallel with project activities.
- Implementing Agencies and their Implementing Partners should have more dialogue before project inception.
- Stakeholder involvement in project should start at the project concept stage.

Acronyms

ADR	Assessment for Development Results
AWP	Annual Work Plan
CDR	Combined Delivery Report
CEHI	Caribbean Environmental Health Institute
CLME	Caribbean Larger Marine Ecosystem
DIM	Direct Implementation Modality
EA	Executing Agency
FACE	Funding Authorization and Certificate for Expenditure
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
GM	Global Mechanism
HACT	Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer
IA	Implementing Agency
IP	Implementing Partner
IWCAM	Integrated Watershed and Coastal Area Management
LRIS	Land Resource Information System
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MACC	Mainstreaming Adaptation to Climate Change
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries
MPDE&H	Ministry of Physical Development Environment and Housing
MSP	Medium Size Project
MTDSP	Medium Term Development Strategy Paper
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NCSA	National Capacity Self-Assessment
NEMS	National Environmental Management Strategy
NIM	National Implementation Modality
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPDP	National Physical Development Plan
OAS	Organization of American States
OECS	Organization of East Caribbean States
OP	Operational Program
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PPCR	Pilot Project on Climate Resilience
PSC	Project Steering Committee
QOR	Quarterly Operational Report
SBAA	Standard Basic Assistant Agreement
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SPACC	Special Project on Adaptation to Climate Change
TE	Terminal Evaluation
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

This Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project is a medium size project (MSP) funded by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) and implemented by the United Nations Development Programmer (UNDP). The GEF and UNDP guidance regarding evaluations are largely consistent and mutually reinforcing using common standards. Two aspects of GEF guidance extends beyond current UNDP evaluation guidance: a) all GEF financed projects must receive Terminal Evaluation and b) terminal evaluations of GEF projects include at a minimums, rating on project's relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. This evaluation is therefore in response to the requirements of both the donor and the Implementing Agency (IA).

The UNDP Evaluation Policy requires that Project evaluations assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a project in achieving its intended results. They also assess the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to medium-term and longer-term outcomes, they manage for results and serve to reinforce the accountability for project managers; they provide a basis for the evaluation of outcomes and programmes, as well as for strategic and programmatic evaluations and Assessment of Development Results (ADRs), and for distilling lessons from experience for learning and sharing knowledge. In UNDP, project evaluations are mandatory when required by a partnership protocol, such as with the Global Environment Facility. Project evaluation assesses the performance of a project in achieving its intended results. It yields useful information on project implementation arrangements and the achievement of outputs. It is at this level that direct cause and attribution can be addressed given the close causal linkage between the intervention and its effect or output. Project evaluation provides a basis for the evaluation of outcomes and programmes.

The Government of Saint Lucia maintains a prudent and effective financial monitoring mechanism which is a credit to a developing country in a period of global fiscal challenges. The government therefore welcomes the evaluation as a check of its own system and a reporting tool to donors.

This terminal evaluation is design to address the concerns of the donors, implementing agency and the beneficiary country; to generate data that will inform future project development and measure the contribution of the project to local, national and global environmental benefits.

1.2 Scope and Methodology

The steering committee associated with this project was disbanded following the termination of the project, as a result only 5 of the original 12 were available to be interviewed by the evaluation team. The project manager and her assistant provided invaluable inputs to the evaluation. The UNDP country Office (CO) team was very helpful in providing background information and documentation for the evaluation. Information on the actual implementation of the project was provided mainly by the project manager and members of the steering committee since the CO team that was instrumental in the implementation of the project was no longer in

place. This evaluation was national and sub-regional in scope and covered all aspects of the project development and execution.

The evaluator used the UNDP methodological guide provided in the evaluation guide. In this regard, a desk review was conducted followed by a discussion with the UNDP CO. On the island, one-on-one discussions were held with the available personnel.

All information collected were recorded and crossed checked for accuracy. Because the meetings were held at different times with different persons, it provided the opportunity for the evaluator to question all respondents using the knowledge obtained from the previous person interviewed. The draft report was reviewed by the evaluation team and the persons interviewed. The comments and concerns were addressed and the draft document sent to UNDP for comments before finalization.

1.3 Structure of the Evaluation Report

The structure of the evaluation report is based on the guidance provided in the TORs and Annex F of the Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-Supported GEF-Financed Projects. Chapter 1 of the report describes the evaluation purpose, methodology and structure, Chapter 2 introduces the project its development context, its objectives, its expected results and the stakeholders. Chapter 3 discusses the evaluation findings under the following sub- headings: Project Design, Project Implementation, Project Finance and Project Results. Chapter 4 captures the evaluator recommendations and the lessons learnt. The report concludes with the list of Annexes.

2. Project Description and Development Context

2.1 Project Start and Duration

The Global Portfolio project was approved in *September 2004 and UNDP received Delegation of Authority for this Medium Size Project (MSP) on October 9th 2007*. The government of Saint Lucia signed off on this MSP on the 20th of April 2008. The project was designed to be executed over three years with an end date in 2011. However, the project was operationally closed on 30th June 2012 as per the instructions of the donors to UNDP.

2.2 Development Objectives

Saint Lucia's National Land Policy and the National Environmental Management Strategy (NEMS) were key factors that shaped the development of this SLM project. It was the expectation that the outputs of the SLM would dovetail into national policies thereby supporting the mainstreaming of land management into the national development agenda. With this expectation, the project development process received considerable support from government and the private sector. The NGO community also showed keen interest in this phase of the project. Several stakeholder consultations were held during the project development phase allowing stakeholders to have inputs into the project.

The Caribbean Environmental Health Institute (CEHI) completed the work done by the local consultant in developing the project. The evaluator found a state of satisfaction among all involved in project development. They all agreed that the project design was good, the outputs relevant and the indicators realistic.

2.3 Baseline Indicators

Baseline Indicators for all five outcomes listed in the project were established during project development and reviewed at the inception workshop. The matrix below captures the final outcomes and indicators.

Table 2. Outcome and Indicators

Expected Outcomes	Key Indicators
1. SLM mainstreamed into national development policies	SLM considerations included in national development plans and programs
2. Individual and institutional capacities for knowledge management enhanced	Technical staff and key stakeholders (farmers, NGO) trained in SLM issues.
3. Awareness increased on SLM issues and capacities for knowledge management enhanced	Technical staff of government and NGO use LRIS in decision making
4. Investment planning and resource mobilization for implementation of SLM is elaborated	Investment plan in key economic sectors incorporate priority action for SLM as defined in NAP.
5. National action plan completed	Adaptive management used in project implementation and lessons captured and shared.

2.4 Stakeholders

Of the eighteen (18) stakeholder groups listed in the project document, fourteen (14) are representatives of government. These include, from the Ministry of Planning Development Environment and Housing, the Physical Planning Unit, the GIS unit, Surveys and Land Development Unit, the Sustainable Development and Environment Unit and the Housing Department ; from the Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries, the Extension Service, the Forestry Division. The other Government agencies are the Ministry of Tourism, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Communication Transport and Works and the Ministry of Social Transformation. Two of the other four groups represented farmers, one represented the private sector and the other a civil society organization. All of the government agencies served on the PSC. This made the PSC rather unwieldy and often, a quorum could not be assembled in order to convene a meeting.

2.5 Expected Results

The long-term goal of this project was to ensure effective management of land resources to enhance ecosystem health and functionality while contributing directly to environmental, economic and social well-being of the people of Saint Lucia. In order to achieve this, the project was expected to build the capacity of the technical staff among stakeholder groups, train farmers and other land users in sustainable land management principles, and mainstream SLM principles into national development policies. The stated outcomes of the project were:

1. Mainstreaming of SLM into national development policies
2. Enhanced individual and institutional capacities for knowledge management
3. Increase awareness and enhanced capacities for knowledge management on SLM issues
4. Elaborate investment planning and resource mobilization for implementation of SLM
5. Complete the development of a national action plan for SLM.

These five (5) outcomes and the twenty one (21) outputs were assessed in order to determining the degree of success of the project.

3. Findings

3.1 Project Formulation

At the Global level, the Portfolio Project on Land Management was designed as a response to the challenges of land degradation as presented by the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). At the National level, the SLM project in Saint Lucia was designed to address land degradation challenges associated with banana farming on steep slopes and peasant root crop farming on marginal lands prone to slippage and flooding. It was expected that the project would build the land management capacity of relevant stakeholders, mainstream land management issues into the development agenda while creating innovative financial mechanisms to support SLM. To accomplish this, the project design provided intervention points for all stakeholders and the outcome indicators clearly show the expectations. However, it was observed that there was not total congruence between the expectations of the project and those of the stakeholders at the national and local levels. Minutes from the stakeholder consultation that followed the project inception reported recorded stakeholders concerns that the project activities seem centered around government institutional capacity rather than stakeholder's capacity to manage the land.

The project appears to be stakeholder oriented, the stakeholders felt that they were adequately involved in the design of the project however the level of involvement required at the policy level was inadequate, therefore, although the project document reads well and is logical and realistic in its expectation, policy interventions were inadequate to make the kind of change required at the institutional level.

3.1.1 Logical Framework: The baseline markers of the logical framework pointed to the low level of capacity within agencies with land management mandates to effectively manage land resources, the absence of guidelines to incorporate SLM issues into macro-economic policies, limited capacity to implement SLM issues, and low level of awareness and investment on the

part of agencies. Against this background the success indicators called for investment planning in key economic sectors to support SLM, spatial information systems for decision making, an incentive regime for SLM incorporation into sector planning, a strategy developed to mobilize donor resources, development of a Land Resource Information System (LRIS) and training of technical staff in various ministries to support the LRIS. Understanding that SLM issues were not adequately considered in national accounting and that the Medium Term Development Strategy Paper (MTDSP) which articulated the primary development objective of the Government of Saint Lucia stated that the objectives were i) stimulating economic growth and development and ii) reducing poverty in order to build resilience and competitiveness; the reality of the outcomes seemed questionable. The project targets were sequential and time bound. Structurally, the logical framework was well developed but given the project context and background, the project targets and outcomes were challenging.

3.1.2 Assumptions and Risk as stated in the project document the attainment of the project outcomes was contingent upon the ability of the project management to ensure

- policy commitment and support,
- stakeholder buy-in and
- continued financial and technical support.

While these assumptions and risks were tilted towards policy makers, project implementation is mainly at the technical level; therefore adaptive management was an absolute necessity in the success of the project.

These risks were real. The project management team and UNDP sought to avert these risks to the extent possible. Where mitigation efforts were successful, positive project outcomes are visible, where they failed, project outcomes are not so visible. For example, management response to the midterm evaluation recommended the relocation of the project unit so that the support of the more experienced Sustainable Development Unit could add to management effectiveness. The project did not physically move but the additional support was provided resulting in a 50% increase in delivery rate during the final year of the project.

Earlier land management projects in Saint Lucia were undertaken by the Department of Forestry and community groups like the Tournesse and Talvern water catchment groups. Lessons from these efforts though valuable were not reflected in the implementation of this project. The training concepts were used but there is no indication that those trained had the opportunity to put their training into practice.

Early consultations were held with pig farmers along the river banks in Deny but the effort seemed to have encountered challenges that needed more time and resources than the project was able to allocate at the time.

3.1.3 Planned Stakeholder Participation: The stakeholder list in the project document was skewed in the direction of public sector organizations. Following the inception workshop, the project management and the Project Steering Committee (PSC) sought to rectify this by convening a stakeholder consultation with the support of UNDP and FAO. One output from this meeting was a matrix of planned and ongoing activities relevant to the SLM. An overlay was

developed that placed SLM activities and stakeholders atop this matrix. The idea was to match SLM activities to community activities and stakeholder groups to avoid duplication and maximize impact. The evaluator found only two follow-up activities to this excellent initiative. At the end of the project it was only the farmers that stood out as true NGO beneficiaries although several other NGO groups participated in workshops to review outputs from the consultant.

3.1.4 Replication Approach: The stakeholder consultation that followed the inception workshop identified a number of activities to be scaled up and replicated. However, none of these activities were completed in time to mesh with their counterpart activity occurring in the community, hence the exponential benefit anticipated did not occur and the replication idea never materialized. Most of the activities that took place under this project happened in a condensed time frame towards the end of the project so that there was no time for replication during the project life. However, the capacity building activity that supported the development of the Land Resource Information System (LRIS) is expected to be replicated as government continues the institutionalization of the LRIS.

3.1.5 UNDP Comparative Advantage: As a development agency, UNDP maintained its presence on the ground in Saint Lucia through its national focal point in the Ministry of Finance. Its presence became more visible and pronounced in 2009 by the recruit of a Liaison Officer paid by UNDP. This appointment was done during the life of the SLM project. Additionally, UNDP has a Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA) with the Government of Saint Lucia and executes its full range of programmes in Saint Lucia. The Programme Managers make periodic visits to the island and have direct links with the various Ministries of Government bringing the full range of UNDP's vast international network and expertise to bear on project development, financing and implementation.

3.1.6 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector: The list of projects and interventions to which this SLM project was expected to be linked includes the Integrated Watershed and Coastal Area management Plan (IWCAM); Sustainable Management of Shared Marine Resources of the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem (CLME), a UNDP-UNESCO project; Preventing Land Degradation in Small Island Ecosystem in the Caribbean through Sustainable Land Management, an OAS lead initiative and the Mainstreaming of Adaptation to Climate Change (MACC). It is worth noting that all these initiatives are GEF funded.

Although some linkage occurred between the SLM and each of the projects listed here, the links were not sufficiently strong to achieve maximum benefits such as ensuring the sustainability of the outcomes.

3.1.7 Management Arrangements: This project was housed in the Ministry of Physical Development, Environment and Housing (MPDE&H) under the direct supervision of the Permanent Secretary. A project staff was hired and a Project Management Unit established, supported by a Project Steering Committee (PSC) which provided technical guidance and oversight. UNDP was a member of the PSC, allowing it to provide constant technical and financial guidance.

This project design utilized the UNDP National Execution Modality (NEX) with its built in checks and balances, namely the quarterly financial and technical reports (QOR), the annual work plans (AWP), Project Implementation Report (PIR), spot checks and audits. Overall, management arrangements were adequate for this project.

3.2 Project Implementation

As a nationally executed project (NEX), the government was directly responsible for staff recruitment, day-to-day operations and local financial management. The Permanent Secretary as administrative head of the Ministry was the chief accounting officer at the national level. While UNDP provided technical support, the final decisions regarding the implementation of the project rested with the Project Management Unit (PMU)

3.2.1 Adaptive Management: Apart from the late start date of the project, the first year of project implementation followed all aspects of the logical framework. Additionally, the project management team displayed classical adaptive management in adjusting the work-plan to include elements of the NGO work program. Unfortunately, beyond this point there was no further evidence of adaptive management. There was significant increase in the implementation rate during the last year of the project reflecting a condensed work plan and a desire to deliver on the project by closing date.

3.2.2 Partnership Arrangements: During project development, a number of partnership arrangements were identified, these include local level partnership with the Talvern Water Catchment group and the EU funded Special Framework of Assistance (SFA); regional partnership with the Partnership for Sustainable Land Management (PSLM), the Caribbean Environmental Health Institute (CEHI) and the SLM projects in the Eastern Caribbean; international partnerships with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the Global Mechanism (GM).

All of these partnerships materialized during the implementation of this project and provided varying levels of technical and financial support. The evaluator found evidence of coordination with the SLM projects in Dominica, Grenada and Saint Lucia through network meetings and direct contacts. The Project Manager participated in the regional workshops lead by the UNDP's Regional Coordinating Unit (RCU) based in Panama and the FAO Land Degradation Assessment in Dry lands project (LADA) provided some technical inputs. The involvement of the Global Mechanism was the least recognizable.

3.2.3 M&E Feedback: During the period of project implementation, the FAO of the United Nations and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) convened a series of regional workshops on Land Degradation Assessment Methodology. The objective of these workshops was to establish monitoring indicators of Land Degradation. The outputs along with M&E tools provided by the Global Support Program based in Pretoria allowed the Project Management Team to track the progress of the project. Additionally, the Project Implementation Review (PIR) process allowed UNDP and the national project team to apply monitoring and evaluation feedback to the modification of project activities.

Site visits by UNDP's Programme Manager for Energy and Environment provided opportunities for tripartite reviews of the project as well as insights into UNDP's modus operandi.

3.2.4 Project Finance: At the time this project was signed off by the government of Saint Lucia, it had a total budget of US\$1,536,200. Of this amount, US\$500,000 was provided by the GEF, US\$196,500 by the Government and US \$839,700 pledged by other donors.

An independent audit of the project conducted by the firm of Ernst & Young dated 5th April 2013 and covering the period up to December 31st 2012 reported no inconsistencies in money management or outputs delivered by consultants. It should be noted that this assessment covered only the GEF funding disbursed by UNDP. Apart from Government's support to the office of the Project Manager, there was no evidence that co-finance was provided.

3.2.5 Monitoring and Evaluation process at the entry and implementation stages of the project provided adequate financial oversight by UNDP using the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT) methodology. This system provided checks and balances nationally at the level of the project manager and the UNDP focal point in the Ministry of Finance and at the UNDP level through the Programme Manager, the Accounts Department and finally through an independent auditor.

The PIR and annual work-plan (AWP) provide additional check points to match output against project budget. Again, these checks occur at the local level, the UNDP CO level and then at the UNDP regional level through the RCU.

The Government of Saint Lucia requested that UNDP make direct payment to consultants and service providers in order to avoid unnecessary delay in payment and future service delivery. Although UNDP made the payments, they were often late and this did not help the process. The UNDP payment process did however facilitate the audit process since all payments were made from UNDP. Given the ease of accounting, the adherence to checks and balances and the confidence expressed by the auditors, the evaluator rated the financial M&E as satisfactory (S).

3.2.6 Implementation/Execution: The very slow implementation rate of this project did not allow it to benefit from the many partnership arrangements and linkages anticipated at the inception. For example, the mirror image project 'Preventing Land Degradation in Small Island Ecosystem in the Caribbean through Sustainable Land Management' was well advanced and came to an end before this project could connect and the SLM never took on board the lessons learnt.

Although delayed, the project did not capitalize on the added time or the lessons generated by counterpart initiatives. At the end, only about 68% of the expected output could be identified. In the case of Outcome 3, Capacity for Knowledge Management in Support of SLM, only 15% of the output could be identified. In the case of Outcome 5, Adaptive management, UNDP provided training for the Project Manager and the government designated focal point in UNDP's financial procedures including the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT), the Funding Authorization Certificate of Expenditure (FACE) forms and the PIR reporting to encourage flexibility in project implementation.

The project implementation rate doubled during the last year of the project life but this was insufficient to push the implementation rate to a satisfactory level. Given this delivery rate, the achievements of the project during the period 2008 to 2012, the level of coordination among IPs, and the management of operational issues, the evaluator rated this project component as moderately satisfactory (MS)

3.3 Project Results

The M&E outputs from this project namely the PIR, AWP, Audit report and the MTE all speak of a project that experienced delays and had several bottle necks but a project that was able to deliver approximately 68% of its target. The results are in the form of legal and technical documents, trained personnel and institutional capacity inputs. The main failures of the project were its inability to capitalize on the stakeholder momentum created at inception and the protracted delays that disrupted the synergies with other initiatives and prevented the completion of all of its activities. The following matrix summarizes the project result by matching delivery against the expected outputs.

Table 2. Output Assessment

Outcome 1: SLM mainstreamed into National Development Policies Plans and Programs			
Output	Indicator	Degree of Success	Comments
1.1 SLM issues integrated into macro-economic policies and regulatory frameworks of St. Lucia	SLM considerations included in medium-term development strategy.	Strategy formulated and discussed. Awaiting legal approval.	The completion of this activity was hindered by the late start.
1.2 SLM integrated into draft national land policies and the corresponding strategic action plan.	Draft national land policy and update NEP restructured around SLM	Done as planned SLM issues included in national land policy.	National Land Policy for Saint Luca reviewed and available online
1.3 National legislative and regulatory instruments revised and incorporate principles of SLM.	NEP includes principles of SLM	Legislative review done but not yet approved. 60% complete	The activity has been completed but mainstreaming requires time.
1.4 Cabinet-approved NAP document published.	Approved NAP document available to public	Achieved	Some of this was done outside the SLM
Outcome 2: Capacity Building for Land Management			
Output	Indicator	Degree of Success	Comments
2.1 Technical staff from MPHE&H, MAFF, NGO and CBO trained and actively engaged in providing technical support and policy guidance on SLM to stakeholders	Percentage of technical staff from MPDEH&H, MAFF, NGO and CBO trained in policy guidelines on SLM	Over 60 persons trained. Activity completed	Six trainers were trained so that there is scope for sustainability of this activity

2.2 Trained farmers and community stakeholders practicing SLM	Percent increase in numbers of farmers and other resource users that have modified livelihood incorporating SLM principles	Training successfully completed	Training manuals available
2.3 Public Education strategy and awareness material on SLM developed.	Heightened awareness of land degradation issues and SLM approaches by stakeholder groups and general public	Completed as planned	PEO material mass produced (including videos PSA, etc)
2.4 Strengthened support agencies, specifically the MPHE&H and the MAFF have resource capacity to render required support to SLM.	Percentage increase in budget allocations in MPDEH&H and MAFF to support SLM	Only 50% of work completed.	No additional budget allocation done.
2.5 Effective interagency coordination for SLM achieved	SLM issues reflected in agencies work plan.	Only baseline assessment done	Agencies have their individual plans with SLM issues but no coordination
Outcome 3: Capacity for Knowledge Management in Support of SLM Developed			
Output	Indicator	Degree of Success	Comments
3.1 Computerized Land Resources Information System (LRIS) within MPHE&H developed	No of request for access to computerized LRIS	Only baseline investigations done.	The baseline Investigation useless by itself.
3.2 Information databases on land use, land tenure, land degradation, land zoning for St. Lucia (within LRIS) developed.	LRIS in SLM planning updated regularly through M&E	Not done	The LRIS was not developed therefore other activities dependent on the LRIS were not done
3.3 Monitoring and evaluation system for state of environments assessments developed.	Technical staff of MPDEH&H and MAFF develop spatial information products for decision making based on request for SLM planning.	Not done	The LRIS was not developed therefore other activities dependent on the LRIS were not done
3.4 Technical Staff trained in analytical applications for decision making to support SLM planning	Percentage of technical staff of MPHE&H and MAFF trained in analytical applications for decision making	Not done	The LRIS was not developed therefore other activities dependent on the LRIS were not done
3.5 Trained technical staff of MPHE&H and MAFF trained on operation, maintenance and information-access for the LRIS	Percentage of technical staff of MPHE&H and MAFF trained in guidelines for maintaining LRIS	Not done	The LRIS was not developed therefore other activities dependent on the LRIS were not done
Outcome 4: Investment Planning and Resource Mobilisation for implementation of SLM Interventions Elaborated			

4.1 Investment plan in Key economic sectors incorporate priority action for SLM as defined in NAP	Investment plan in key economic sectors incorporate priority action for SLM as defined in NAP	Completed as planned	Pierre, W. for the Ministry of Physical Development, Housing and Urban Renewal, 2012. Strategy to Facilitate Donor Resource Mobilization, Consultancy: Investment Planning and Resource Mobilization for SLM, Sustainable Land Management Project
4.2 Major sector investment regime that include the agriculture incentive regime amended to include incentives for SLM	Incentive for SLM incorporated into main sector incentive regime.	Done as planned	Stakeholders have the intention to build on the output of this aspect to approach donors for funding
4.3 Payment for Environmental Services regime Developed	Strategic development to facilitate donor resource mobilization.	80% completed. Donor financing not mobilize	There is willingness to pay on the part of stakeholders
Outcome 5: Adaptive Management and Learning			
5.1 Project implementation cost effective and according to budget	Project management unit established and effective.	Done	Rapid staff turnover
5.2 M&E plan provide inputs for robust adaptive management	Project management developed through guidelines provided by M&E	60% completed	M&E not effective
5.3 Lessons learnt captured	Documented lessons from project implementation.	Done	Most information in MTE

The objective of this project was to build capacity at all levels to mainstream SLM into national development. All persons interviewed agreed that some capacity was built across the board, that SLM issues now have a much higher profile than at the time of inception. Nevertheless, there is consensus that the mainstreaming effort did not fully reach its goal. The evaluator rated the overall results of the project as Moderately Satisfactory (MS).

3.3.1 Relevance: Saint Lucia is one of the OECS countries now benefiting from an Australian funded OECS Land Policy project. The project goal is to achieve “*enhanced sustainability of development in the OECS - economic development, poverty reduction, social stability and the protection of environmentally sensitive areas - through the formulation, adoption and implementation of comprehensive land policies.*” This project is directly related to and builds upon the ongoing work of the national digital Land Resource Information System (LRIS). The project also supports the national effort to translate and present the cadaster management and maintenance to a GIS base system that also support the LRIS.

Of no lesser significance is the link between the SLM and an initiative entitled Strengthening of Rural Land Administration through the development of National Land Banks. When the links

between the SLM and ongoing and emerging national projects were examined, the relevance of the SLM project becomes very clear.

Outcome 3.1 and 3.2 of the GEF strategic framework on Land Degradation speaks to enhancing cross-sector enabling environment for integrated land management and the adopting of integrated landscape management practices by local communities. These outcomes of the strategic framework apply describes the outcomes of the SLM.

Understanding the links between the SLM outcomes and the national development trend of Saint Lucia as it pertains to land management and land governance enables one to see the relevance of the SLM project. Having examined these elements, the evaluator concluded that the relevance of the project was highly Satisfactory (HS).

3.3.2 Effectiveness and Efficiency: The goal of this project was to strengthen and/or develop capacities for sustainable land management in relevant government ministries, the private sector and civil society organizations and to mainstream SLM into national development planning. From the matrix of results it can be seen that some capacity was developed at the institutional, individual and community level. However, more time is required to see the mainstreaming in action. The fact that SLM issues are now incorporated into land management policies implies some degree of mainstreaming. The fact that Outcome 3 was only marginally addressed detracted from the project's effectiveness giving it a rating of moderately Satisfactory (MS).

GEF funds allotted to this project were disbursed by UNDP. Funds provided by the Government were expected to be managed by the Ministry of Finance of the Government of Saint Lucia. The co-finance pledged by other partners was expected to be provided to the Government who was expected to manage those funds.

The audit commissioned by UNDP in April of 2013 examined only GEF funds. There were no records of how the government contribution was spent. The audit department of the Government of Saint Lucia which conducts audits on Government's expenditure had no disaggregated amount specific to the SLM projects but confirmed government's expenditure in terms of office space, supplies, utilities and the project manager's salary for the seven year period. Based on the outputs of the project, the audit report on the use of the GEF funds, the physical evidence in terms of office space and support structures and UNDP's site visit reports, it is fair to say that a substantial amount of government's contribution was spent but the figure cannot be specified. The auditors reported that in all material respects, the expense of US\$290,328.12 incurred by the project for the seven years ending 31st December 2012 was in accordance with agreed upon accounting policies and were i) in conformity with the approved project budget; ii) for the approved purpose of the project; iii) in compliance with the relevant UNDP regulations and rules, policies and procedures; and iv) supported by approved vouchers and other supporting documents. Further, that an internal control system governing expenditure, recruitment and general operations was in place and worked well. This indicates that there was no request for additional funds and that all expenditures were within the project estimates even though the project ended five year later than it should have. Examination of the annual workplans show some costs below project estimates and all approved costs within budget. Project Efficiency is therefore considered Satisfactory (S).

3.3.4 Country Ownership: The Global Portfolio Project on sustainable land management was a generic project reflecting the wide goal of landmanagement and taking into consideration global challenges. The global project document provided some guidance in the development of county specific projects, therefore, while the general concept was global the specific elements of the project were distinctively Saint Lucia's. The targets were set in accordance with the national development agenda and the expected outcomes were intended to fit the National Physical Plan and the evolving LRIS.

The stakeholder consultation heard Saint Lucians express their interest and commitment to the project as pig farmers and peasants called for capacity building support. Even though the design was not truly Saint Lucian, they readily identified with the challenges and saw the project as offering a way out of their land management quagmire. The Physical Planning Unit readily took ownership of the project since all of its outcomes were in some way relevant to the LRIS and the evolving land policy, however, delivery by the Ministry did not match the zeal expressed.

3.3.5 Mainstreaming: SLM issues cut across UNDP's programme areas of Energy, Environment and Climate Change, Disaster Risk Reduction, Poverty Alleviation, and Governance so that even though the UNDAF speaks largely to Climate Change and Biodiversity and very little to land management, SLM issues are implicit. A central element of the SLM project is governance as it relates to land title and tenure. Farmers are more willing to use SLM principles when the land is owned than if it is only occupied on short term lease. In this regard the SLM project drew on the skill sets from Poverty Reduction, Governance and Gender programme areas in order to anchor the project nationally.

Although the project bears no clear gender marker, the evaluator found clear evidence of gender sensitivity and gender specific activities. A special workshop which targeted women was convened and was very successful. Additionally the Project Manager and project assistant were females.

3.3.6 Sustainability: It is likely that the mainstreaming elements of this project will remain for some time and even get stronger. These elements are the ones tied to institutionalized initiatives that have annual budget allocations. Where there is no committed budget as in the case of capacity building, sustainability of the outcome is less likely. Most of the project stakeholders were public sector workers who are frequently rotated within the public service taking their know-how with them. There is therefore need for dedicated finance to continue to train new staff as those already trained rotated away.

There is no environmental risk to challenge the sustainability of the project outcomes but there are socio-economic risks that are already negatively affecting sustainability. These include market for farmers, lack of land title and shortage of skilled labour and appropriate technology. Given this element of uncertainty, the overall sustainability of the project was rated moderately likely (ML).

3.3.7 Impact: Two Outcomes from this project hold great potential for long term impact; these are Outcomes 1 and 2. Outcome 1 advanced and strengthened the ongoing work of the Physical Planning Department in the development of a national LRIS and introduced SLM principles into

development planning. Outcome 2 supported capacity building at the individual and institutional level by training farmers and technical staff in Government Ministries. These trained individuals now performing with more confidence which should result in improved performance and greater productivity. The farmers are directly involved in ecosystem management, reducing stress on farm lands and aquatic systems making them more resilient and productive. The degree of these impacts cannot be quantified at this point since there were no tools designed by the project for this purpose. This project has not developed or used tracking tools.

There is also increased awareness among the staff in the MPDE&H and MAFF. It appears that this awareness is having a ripple effect among other Ministries but the extent is hard to determine at this stage.

4. Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons

The activities of the Capacity building and mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in There were significant delays during project implementation due to administrative challenges. The national process for recruitment of consultants or other project personnel is a protracted one and often started too late. The delays resulted in only token attempt at addressing Outcome 3, Capacity for Knowledge Management in Support of SLM. All other Outcomes had better than average implementation.

Overall, the project has impacted Saint Lucia's development agenda in a positive way. In an exit interview the Deputy Permanent Secretary admitted that he now has a greater appreciation for the project, its design, goals and final achievements.

While there was consensus on the merits of the project, persons interviewed expressed disappointment over the rate of implementation and the extent of civil society involvement.

The project objectives remain important nationally and some outputs have already been absorbed into national development. Stakeholders see immediate and long term benefits from the project and this has resulted in a commitment from senior public officers to infuse elements of this project, even incomplete elements, into evolving projects. The evolving OECS Land Policy Project and the Integrating Water, Land and Ecosystems Management in the Caribbean Small Island Developing States have already tapped into the outputs and project objectives of the SLM.

The following recommendations are presented for future project development and to embellish the outputs of this project.

- Although the project was very relevant to Saint Lucia, many senior officers who were charged with its implementation locally did not have an appreciation for the project. It is therefore recommended that at the stage of project design and development a wider cross section of stakeholders be involved. Implementation needs to be considered at the design stage so that the appropriate ministry personnel become intimate with the project from inception.
- The PSC should be more streamlined and their mandate clear and known by all members of the PSC.

- The concept of mainstreaming needs to be agreed upon by all Implementing Partners (IPs) in order to bring greater relevance to the project activities and objectives. Counterparts at the country level think of mainstreaming in terms of integrating activities into national, cross sectorial plans and programmes while the UNDP personnel think of integration with the various programme areas of UNDP.
- Project presentation at the inception should contain a component that brings stakeholders and participants from concept to inception. Inception workshops typically present the finished product and the vehicle to move it forward but not enough on the genesis to accommodate newcomers to the process.
- Co-financing arrangements need to be more clearly worked through and presented. Because of delays, the funding source intended by some partners evaporated before this project required the funds. Additionally, the co-finance modality may be in conflict with the project's operational modality.
- Government co-finance also needs to be revisited. Should the Government funds be put into an account accessible by the Project manager or should the request be made as in the general state financing arrangement? These all have challenges that need to be re-examined.
- Because different donors have different funding cycles, project activities should not have multiple donor funding sources unless the funds can be deposited into a designated account.
- Administrative structures should take into account projective specific needs, timeframes, payment schedules and special recruitment.
- Time lines and other project expectations need to be managed so that challenges from one project do not spill over into another.
- Payment modality needs to be standardized and clear to all so that delayed payments do not hinder work progress, as was the case in this project.
- Where there are regional or global projects as in the case of the SLM, functional networks should be established and project teams participate. There were many lessons learnt from more advanced projects that could have benefited Saint Lucia but did not find their way into the Saint Lucian experience.
- This project had a MTE but this evaluator found that some recommendations of the MTE were not taken on board so that the project did not benefit from the caution and guidance provided.
- A project champion at the policy level would have been an asset to this project.

Annexes

ANNEX A 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) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of several projects managed by UNDP Barbados and the OECS in Barbados, Dominica, St Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, and St Vincent and the Grenadines.

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

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Capacity building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Saint Lucia			
GEF Project ID:	PIMS 3450		<i>at endorsement</i>	<i>at completion</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00046154	GEF financing:	485,000	152,489.70
Country:	Saint Lucia	IA/EA own:		
Region:	LAC	Government:	196,500	
Focal Area:	Land Degradation	Other:	839,700	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	OP15 SP1	Total co-financing:	1,036,200	
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	1,536,200	
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Physical Development Environment and Housing	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed:	Actual: 30 June 2012

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 evaluations are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from these projects, 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. 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 **each country**, including project sites. Interviews to be held with organizations and individuals will be discussed during the inception meeting with the UNDP CO.

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, GEF focal area tracking tools, 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 projects' Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A), which provide 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 following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex D.

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluations will assess the key financial aspects of the projects, 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.

MAINSTREAMING

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

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the projects are achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the projects have 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 reports must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing these evaluations resides with the UNDP CO for Barbados and the OECS. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The countries' Project Teams will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 20 days per country according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	3 days	12 July 2013
Evaluation Mission	7 days	2 August 2013
Draft Evaluation Report	8 days	23 August 2013
Final Report	2 days	30 August 2013

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team 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.

TEAM COMPOSITION

A single consultant will be contracted to undertake the evaluation process in each country. A consultant may conduct evaluations in more than one country, but no more than two. 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

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

ANNEX B List of Persons Interviewed

Ms. Esther Stephens (Project Manager)
Mr. Michael Andrew (Steering Committee Member)
Ms. Anita James (Steering Committee Member)
Mr. Hildreth Lewis (Deputy Permanent Secretary)
Ms. Sharma Louise (Project Manager's Assistant)

ANNEX C List of Documents Reviewed

Approved project document
Mid-term evaluation
Auditor's report
Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
Quarterly Operational Reports (QORs)
Annual Work Plan (AWP)

ANNEX D Terminal Evaluation Questionnaire

Dear Respondents,

My name is Reynold Murray. I have been selected by UNDP to undertake the Terminal Evaluation of the project “Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Saint Lucia”. Given your involvement in the project, you have been selected as a candidate to provide inputs into the evaluation report. In this regard, please provide clear and concise answers to the following questions. Feel free to use additional paper or the back of the question sheet if necessary. Where options are provided for your answers please circle the answer of your choice

Questions.

1. Have you been involved or in any way contributed to the design and or development of this project? **Yes** **NO**. If yes, please state in what way you were involved.

.....
.....

2. Were you involved in the implementation of the project? **Yes** **No**. If yes please state your role or responsibility.

.....
.....

3. What did you like most about the project?

.....
.....

4. What was the greatest weakness of the project?

.....
.....

5. Please rate the following on a scale of 1-5 where 1 is poor and 5 is excellent. Provide a statement to support your answer.

-Project management ----
- The role of UNDP ----
-National government involvement ---
- Use of project budget ---
- Quality of the project outputs ----

6. How has this project helped SVG? Give specific examples of communities or people groups that benefited from the project. -----

7. Do you think the activities or outputs of the project will help any other project? How? ---

8. Do you think the activities or outputs of the project would be continued now that the project has ended? Which activity or output will be continued and how? -----

-
9. Were the funds allocated to the project sufficient? Yes No. Were the funds spent in a cost effective manner/ did SVG get value for money?

.....

10. What capacity was built by this project?

11. What elements of the project have been incorporated into national legislative, economic or planning frameworks?

.....
.....
.....

12. Please provide a synopsis of your impression of the SLM project or any component of the project.

.....
.....
.....
.....

13. Please provide any information you consider relevant to the evaluation that was not captured in questions 1 to 12.

.....
.....

Thank you very much.

ANNEX E Evaluation Question Matrix

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, national and regional levels.			
Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/ operational program strategies and country priorities?			
How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the participating country?			
What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation?			
Did the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?			
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?			
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)?			
Has the project been effective in achieving its targets of expected outcomes? Answer for each outcome.			
In case in the original or modified expected outcomes are merely outputs/inputs, were any real outcomes of the project?			
If yes, were these commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects?			
Was the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?			
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?			
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?			
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?			
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project			
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 F Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant: Reynold Murray

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 *Kingstown, St. Vincent* on *30th August, 2013*

Signature: 