



UNDP EEG and GEF

Annual Performance Report (APR)

Simplified Project Implementation Review (PIR)

For Individual SLM MSPs under LDC-SIDS Global Targeted
Portfolio Project

Reporting Period = 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2010

UNDP EEG and GEF
Annual Performance Report (APR)
Simplified Project Implementation Review (PIR) /Progress Monitoring Template
For Individual SLM MSPs under LDC-SIDS Global Targeted Portfolio Project
Reporting Period = 1 July 2009 to 30 June 2010

1. Basic Project Data

Official Project Title: “ Mainstreaming and Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Belize ”
--

Project Summary (as in PIMS and Project Document)

Whilst effort and investments have been made to improve biodiversity management in Belize in the recent past, sufficient measures have not been taken to directly confront issues contributing to land degradation and to promote integrated natural resource management. In Belize, as in most SIDs, these issues center around the frameworks and processes used for development planning, the regulatory and institutional arrangements, human resource capacity and public awareness levels. This project will contribute to achieving sustainable land management through the strengthening of national capacities for the sustainable management of land resources as well as mainstreaming of land use planning and sustainable land management into relevant national legislative and institutional frameworks.

This project, developed through a consultative process and in line with the findings of Belize’s completed NCSA initiative and the recommendations of National Awareness Seminar of the UNCCD, elaborates actions allowing for improved land management as proposed by the NAP. Working in tandem with other planned initiatives, this project will strengthen coordination between the various natural resource management ministries/agencies/ stakeholders through improved information management and the development of information sharing policies allowing for a more integrated approach to land resource management. Through the implementation of small pilot initiatives in the areas of agriculture, land mining and integrated landscape management, best practices for reduction of land degradation and the rehabilitation of degraded lands will be demonstrated and documented for promulgation and promotion by the various managing entities. These best practices once demonstrated will form the basis of development policies within the Government’s SLM framework.

The total budget of the project is US\$ 1,152,728 of which US\$ 500,000 would be the GEF increment.

Country	PIMS Number	3409
BELIZE	Atlas Project Number	43949

Project Timeframe:



Date of Delegation of Authority Letter	1 February 2008	Planned Project Duration	3 Years
Project Document Signature Date	14 th February 2008	Original Planned Operational Closure Date	March 15, 2011

Date of First Disbursement	17 th September 2008			Revised Planned ¹ Operational Closure Date	N/A	
Is this the Terminal APR/PIR?	YES		NO	X	Date Operationally Closed (if applicable)	N/A

Project documentation and information:

List documents/ reports/ prepared about the project.	N/A
List the Website address (URL) of project	N/A

Project contacts:

Title	Name	E-mail	Date	Signature
Project Manger	Judene Tingling	jbtingling@hotmail.com	July 4, 2010	
UNDP CO Programme Officer	Diane Wade-Moore	diane.wade@undp.org	July 6, 2010	
Regional Technical Advisor	Paula Caballero	paula.caballero@undp.org		

¹ Please explain any entry here in Section 3

2. Progress towards Addressing Project Priorities and in Delivering Expected Products

****** Please complete Annex 1: Project Implementation Status Questionnaire.**

Rating of Project Progress:

Level/Position	2010 Rating	Comments (Please comment on the rating for 2010 and also on any observable trends from the project commencement)
National Project Manager/Coordinator	Satisfactory (S)	<p><i>The PM has been engaged in several capacity building exercises including training in applied project management. This training gave new breath to the project by enabling the PM to be strategic in her undertakings. As such, the PM was able to bolster the capacity of the project to achieve its objectives by extensive and purposive networking which has led to additional project funds, greater project sensitization and public awareness of SLM initiatives. Further to this, the PM has expended much effort in progress reports which eases the implementation of project activities.</i></p> <p>Additional: Workshop attended by PM: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Number of monitoring visits to the project site by PM: <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 or more</p>
UNDP Country Office/ Programme Officer	Marginally Satisfactory (MS) Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally-revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.	<p><i>Consistent delays in the delivery of several large project workpackages due in part to influences outside the control of the PM and the PMU have reflected negatively in project expenditure and delivery timelines. A failure to attain consensus as to expected deliverables of the landscape management pilot as well as pressures to resite the scarred landscape pilot have delayed execution. Project's delivery towards Outcome 1: Long term planning for SLM; have been constrained by the project's inability to secure appropriate teams for execution of planned activities.</i></p> <p><i>In all the above mentioned workpackages, remediative actions have been taken by the project stakeholders, however it is felt that this initial disruption have already resulted in irreversable delays.</i></p> <p><i>All other project associated workpackages have been satisfactorily delivered by the project team with exceptional results/ progress being observed in those areas dealing with national capacity building, intergrated financing systems for SLM, GAP pilot, information sharing and complementing strenghtening of supporting regulatory frameworks.</i></p> <p><i>The project has done exceptional work in identifying areas of synergies between project deliverables and other initiative being executed in country. This has increased the impact of these initiatives. An example of this is cooperation with the AED project, and attracting FAO/GM funding to fortify delivery of project Outcome3(Medium term Investment Plan / sustainable financing for SLM).</i></p> <p>Additional: Number of field visits by the CO staff: <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 5 or more</p>

UNDP Regional Centre/ Technical Advisor		
		<p><i>Additional:</i> <i>Inception workshop attended by RTA:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <i>Number of visits to the project by RTA:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more</p>

Please rate the project progress as per the following nomenclature:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as "good practice".
Satisfactory (S)	Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally-revised plan except for only a few which are subject to remedial action.
Marginally Satisfactory (MS)	Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally-revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.
Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU)	Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally-revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally-revised plan.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally-revised plan.

Action Plan to Address Marginally Unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory or Highly Unsatisfactory Rating:

Where a rating of MU, U or HU is noted above describe the actions to be taken to address this:

Action to be Taken	By Whom?	By When?
N/A		

3. Adjustments to Project Timeframe

If the duration of the project or the project work schedule has been adjusted since project approval please explain the changes and the reasons for these changes.

Change	Reason for Change	Scope of delay (in months)
N/A		

4. Financial Information: cumulative since project started to 30 June 2010

Name of Contributor	Type of Contributions In-kind/cash-UNDP managed only	Amount Carried Over from PDF-A into Project US\$	Amount Committed in Project Document US\$	Amount Committed After Project Approval US\$	Estimated Total Disbursement to 30 June 2010 US\$	Expected Total Disbursement by end of project US\$

GEF		0.06	\$480,500	0	250,362.77	\$480,500
		0.06	\$480,500	0	250,362.77	\$480,500
Co-financing /Nature (Gov, Multilateral, etc.)						
UNDP	Cash/Inkind		\$54,200	\$49,000 (UNDP AED Project)	\$42,000	\$103,200
Government	Inkind		\$305,428	\$159,108 (Expenditure in line with actions outlined within cofinancing letter)	\$159,108 (Expenditure in line with actions outlined within cofinancing letter)	\$305,428
FAO/GM	Cash			\$52,000	\$12,000	\$52,000

5. Challenges and Difficulties in Project Start-Up and Implementation and Lessons-Learnt

Please describe any technical and managerial challenges or constraints you encountered during the project start up and implementation for the reporting period, as well as mitigation measures, which you applied. Also, indicated any lessons-learnt and assistance you would need from your respective CO, Regional Centre and Regional Centre of Excellency to overcome these difficulties.

Challenges	Constraints	Mitigation Measures	Lessons Leant	Required Assistance
Administrative				
Operational- Restructuring of the project management unit at critical time of project implementation	Limited transfer of knowledge of project activities. Increase of workload for project manager which contributed to delays in some project activities .Identifying experienced professional to fill post in an expedient manner.	Project Manager invested a great deal of time reviewing project files. PM worked fervently to develop a network of experienced project managers. Project Manager assumed all duties in lieu of an assistant. With the contracting of a new assistant the SLM PMU worked ardently to complete pending matters.	Creating a network with experienced project managers proved successful as I was able to adopt their best practices and lessons learned. On a point of information, it is vital that an official handover occur prior to any departure from the post.	
Technical				
Communication gaps	Participatory approach used to obtain feedback for the approval of proposal for a major consultancy. Length of time take to receive relevant	Project will formulate small task force to provide clear objectives and tasks for this group. Project will develop a work package for the completion of activities.	While the participatory approach is effective, it may not work for every situation especially since officials have multiple tasks to attend to and may	

	feedback was a limiting factor and consultants pursued other interests.		not have sufficient time to address SLM project issues. Formulating a deadline to complete an activity provides specific time for the completion of certain activities and individuals are held accountable to those agreed upon times.	
Other				
External Interference/ Influence into Project Processes	Creates lags in project execution resulting in disruption in delivery timelines	Work to make processes more internal to national entities as well as additional time invested in consensus building by the project		

6. Good Practice in this reporting period

Key Achievements in this reporting period:

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identifying project Manager to assume full responsibility of project activities. 2. Completion of training manuals from agricultural pilot. These are Good Agricultural Practices, Integrated Farming Systems, Soil Conservation and Slope Management. 3. Building institutional capacity within Government Departments (Forest, Lands, Meteorology, Police, Department of the Environment, Department of Geology and Petroleum) Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries in various disciplines such as Geographic Information Systems, Soil Conservation and Slope Management for effective Natural Resource Management. 4. In collaboration with the Agricultural Enterprise Development Project, through the implementation of the Agricultural pilot capacity building training of approximately 200 local stakeholders were trained in various disciplines thus increasing income generation power. The thematic areas include Post Harvesting Methods, Crop Cluster, Good Agricultural Practices, Integrated Farming Systems and Soil Conservation and Slope Management. 5. Development of Information Sharing Protocols on information access, sharing and data standards to inform the national development process. 6. Initiating process towards the re-formulation of National Coordination Body of the UNCCD. 7. Co-financing from GM and FAO for Medium Term Investment Plan (development of an Integrated Financing Strategy for Sustainable Land Management). Recognition of efforts by the project. 8. Initiation of the consultancy to develop Integrated Financing Strategy for Sustainable Land Management in Belize.
--

Best Problem Solving Practices Demonstrated:

Problem	Solution
Inadequate support from stakeholders in project activities contributing to slow progress.	The project has observed that the offices of key stakeholders such as government officials who are

	<p>ultimately the decision makers are dynamic. In an effort to get commitment, support and acceptance of project objectives, regular presentations of project activities and accomplishments have taken place. The PMU has made presentations on several occasions to ensure that stakeholders are kept updated on pending activities and achievements.</p> <p>The project believes that frequent stakeholder participation will facilitate its objective in mainstreaming SLM in country.</p>
--	--

General Comments:

Is there anything noteworthy/special/critical that was learned this year that is important to share with other projects so they can avoid this mistake/make use of this opportunity?

<p>In engaging in capacity building efforts within government departments, the selection of participants is of great importance. To achieve greater impact in strengthening and building capacities, the selection of recipients must be a strategic process involving considerations of both the individual interest and the organization needs. It was also noted that time constraints need to be taken into consideration in developing a course. Based on the thematic focus, major events, departmental obligations and national priorities, greater interest may be placed on intense courses that offer a full range of knowledge in a short period of time.</p> <p>Additionally, as it relates to strengthening capacities of local stakeholders, it is very important that consultants (facilitators) especially internationals, provide training materials in a timely manner so that it can be reviewed and feedback provided so as to ensure that material is suitable for its intended audience.</p> <p>It has also been noted that when agreements are made across multiple agencies there should be a guiding document that clearly outlines responsibilities of each agency.</p>

Annex I: Project Implementation Status Questionnaire

PIMS Number, Project Title and Country		PIMS: 3409 Title: Mainstreaming and Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Belize		
		Country: BELIZE		
Implementation Status		Monitoring & Evaluation		
<input type="checkbox"/> Before Inception <input type="checkbox"/> At Inception <input type="checkbox"/> 1 st Year <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2 nd Year		<input type="checkbox"/> 3 rd Year <input type="checkbox"/> 4 th Year <input type="checkbox"/> Completion <input type="checkbox"/> Mid-Term Review Completed When: Project in recruitment stage. <input type="checkbox"/> Final Evaluation Completed When:		
SLM Capacity Development	NAP Elaboration	SLM Mainstreaming		SLM Impacts
<p>1. Project Developed?</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Policy Capacity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Institutional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Local Policy Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Local Institutional Capacity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individuals Capacity (farmers, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> NGO Capacity Others:	<p>4. NAP Elaboration Done?</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NAP Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> NAP Adopted When: A draft has been developed; however, the NAP is under revision and recommendations are being made for realignment with UNCCD 10-year strategy.	<p>7. Attended DIFS Workshop?</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <p>8. IFS Elaboration Done?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> IFS Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> IFS Adopted When: This consultancy is underway and a draft will be developed within the next 6 weeks.	<p>11. Stakeholder Interest Increased?</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <p>12. Financial Flow to SLM Increased?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 1~5% <input type="checkbox"/> 6~ 15% <input type="checkbox"/> 16~ 30% <input type="checkbox"/> Over 30% Mostly from: <input type="checkbox"/> Internal Sources <input type="checkbox"/> External Sources <input type="checkbox"/> Innovative Sources	<p>16. Project Contributed to Policy Reform on SLM?</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Which policy: Which policy: National Land Use Policy, National Information Sharing Protocols
<p>2. Capacity on SLM at Project Start?</p> National Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Weak <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Average <input type="checkbox"/> Strong Local Capacity <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weak <input type="checkbox"/> Average <input type="checkbox"/> Strong	<p>5. Government Support on NAP elaboration?</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> More than Sufficient	<p>9. SLM Mainstreamed?</p> Line-Ministries/Sectors <input type="checkbox"/> Finance <input type="checkbox"/> Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture/Forestry <input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Economic Development <input type="checkbox"/> Transport/Infrastructure <input type="checkbox"/> Social Development <input type="checkbox"/> Public Health <input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Others: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Private Sector <input type="checkbox"/> International Donor	<p>13. Climate change mitigation or/and adaptation options considered in SLM</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, circle one or both (<i>Mitigation/adaptation</i>)	<p>17. SLM field-Tested?</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If no, planned when:
<p>3. Capacity on SLM after intervention?</p> National Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Weak <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Average <input type="checkbox"/> Strong Local Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Weak <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Average <input type="checkbox"/> Strong	<p>6. Linkages with other Global Environmental Conventions Strategies/Plans Made?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> NBSAP <input type="checkbox"/> NAPA <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nat'l Comm. to UNFCCC	<p>10. Government Support on SLM mainstreaming?</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not Sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> More than Sufficient	<p>14. Indigenous SLM Knowledge Mainstreamed?</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (A part of Good Agriculture Practice initiative) <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, into which sector(s):	<p>18. SLM Land Coverage Increased?</p> Before Project _____ha. / _____% of total land area After Project Intervention _____ha. / _____% of total land area Indicator not yet applicable
			<p>15. Gender Mainstreamed?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>19. Land Productivity Increased?</p> Average Yield Increase due to Project Intervention <input type="checkbox"/> 0%

LDC-SIDS GLOBAL SLM TARGETED PORTFOLIO PROJECT - PIR QUESTIONNAIRE 2010

		<p>If yes, into which sector(s):</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> 1~5% <input type="checkbox"/> 6~ 15% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 16~ 30% <input type="checkbox"/> Over 30% </p> <p> Productivity increased approximately 25% for those farmers involved in combined SLM project and AED project intervention. </p>
--	--	--------------------------------------	--