



## **MINUTES OF THE RIDGE TO REEF PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON DECEMBER 15, 2021 VIA ZOOM**

The meeting commenced at 9:12 am.

### Attendees

Ms. Valerie Cliff - Resident Representative, UNDP  
Ms. Maria Cruz Gonzalez - Regional Technical Advisor, UNDP  
Mr. Mohammad Nagdee - Cluster Head SSECC,  
Ms. Rudo Udika - Project Coordinator, UNDP  
Ms. Renata Blair - Finance & Administrative Assistant, UNDP  
Mr. Samuel Henry - Programme Officer, UNDP  
Ms. Sacha Lindo - M&E Associate, UNDP  
Mr. Elvis Morain - Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands & Forestry  
Mr. Trevor Thompson - Chief Agriculture Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands & Forestry  
Mr. Evans Gooding and Magdalene Niles - Representative, North East Farmers Organization

Rapporteur: Ms. Janet Sealey

### AGENDA

1. Welcome and Opening Remarks  
Mr. Elvis Morain  
Ms. Valerie Cliff
2. Ridge to Reef Final Report on consultancies, procurements, and project delivery status  
Ms. Rudo Udika
3. Acknowledgements and Adjournment - Chair

#### **1.0 WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS**

- 1.1 Ms. Udika apologized from some of the intended participants who were unable to attend. She introduced the co-chairs of the meeting Ms. Valerie Cliff and Mr. Elvis Morain.
- 1.2 Mr. Morain expressed gratitude for the meeting especially since the closure of the Ridge to Reef project was so delayed. He looked forward to the deliberations especially the learnings which could be implemented in the CRA project.
- 1.3 Ms. Cliff welcomed all participants and briefly highlighted the objective of the UNDP involvement in the two projects. She noted that the Global Environment Facility (GEF) funding provided support to the Grenada Government for the national implementation of the Ridge to Reef (R2R) project. She acknowledged the 90% implementation rate and the moderately satisfactory status of the project which commenced in 2015. She expressed the hope that the lessons learned from the R2R project could be beneficial to future undertakings especially the CRA project. Innovation and information systems were anticipated to enhance climate resilience as the UNDP work with the Government to achieve the stated objectives.



Reference was made to the impact of COVID-19 and the opportunities to do things differently.

## **2.0 RIDGE TO REEF FINAL REPORT**

### **2.1 Activities at Project Closure**

Ms. Udika reported that two Primary Outcomes were anticipated from the project. Biodiversity conservation around protected areas and the pilot project and Beausejour watershed.

#### **2.1.1 Component 1**

There was a shift in governance of the project in October 2020 due to a cabinet reshuffle, with the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry being the new implementing partner. Work was done with the Attorney General's office to draft the new legislation for protected areas. Q2 2020 proposed timeline was shifted, unfortunately the amended legislation was not brought to cabinet. Covid 19 restrictions contributed to some delays.

With reference to the Marine protected areas, there was an extension from Feb 2020 to February 2021. Some activities relating to diving and mooring for the Fisheries Division were provided after permission was granted from the Ministry of National Security and the Chief of Police. In collaboration with the Ministry of Climate Resilience some outreach was undertaken with education and awareness activities in some public schools. The Carriacou Interpretation Centre was not accomplished, there were some challenges and significant delays with the tendering process, site surveys, access to land and Covid-19 state of emergency.

#### **2.1.2 Component 2**

Several activities took place in the pilot area. With the support of the focal point, the design of the rainwater harvesting and contracting of the engineer who did the construction was done. In keeping with the budget, the rainwater harvesting was implemented.

Capacity building was done with the North East Farmers. With exposure to training they demonstrated an integrated approach and transitioned from the use of harmful pesticides to composting and cross pollination.

### **2.2 Exit Strategy and Sustainability Plan**

2.2.1 Reviews and updates were undertaken in the development of marine protected legislation which was shared with the various Government agencies. Since financial management of protected areas could be challenging, Co-management was a strategy proposed for capacity and resource management to be shared. It was hoped that the draft legislation would be brought before cabinet.

2.2.2 The Terminal Evaluation was conducted remotely by the International Consultant in June 2021.

2.2.3 The Evaluation Project Rating was based on four thematic areas:-

- Monitoring and Evaluation was moderately satisfactory



- IA and EA execution were adjudged as moderately unsatisfactory
- Assessment of outcomes was moderately satisfactory
- Sustainability was limited

The overall rating was Moderately Satisfactory.

#### 2.2.4 Project Indicator Final Results

There were seventeen indicators, and all were either partially met or fully met. The outstanding dedication, energy and collaboration displayed between 2019 and 2021 were commendable and contributed to the significant improvement in the latter stage of the project.

#### 2.2.5 Conclusion, Lessons, Recommendations

- Project strategy: There was a divide on the suitability of the project, while some stakeholders saw it as a model for the region, some deemed it overambitious. One recommendation is to have a review of the strategy between project design and implementation to ensure the adaptability of the results framework.
- Impact: It was envisioned that the project would have been a showcase for the Grenada declaration target, but it could not meet the 25% protected areas for the coastal and terrestrial areas. A considerable amount of work was required, and it hedged around the approval of the legislative amendment.
- Output 1: Establishment and effective management of new and existing protected areas were moderately unsatisfactory. The success of these management tools was dependent on the legislation.
- Output 2: Climate resilient SLM practices applied in the Beausejour watershed to reduce threats adjacent to and upstream of protected areas were moderately satisfactory. The community and farmers' organization activities were beneficial.
- Project Implementation and adaptive management were moderately unsatisfactory. Low implementation rate resulted from limited project management capacity and inefficient procurement practices.
- Sustainability: Lack of a sustainable development fund to provide financial resources resulted in this being moderately limited.

#### 2.2.6 Lesson Learned

- Design: The project must be relevant, have regular policy briefings, data gathering based on country context and make sure cost cutting areas are embedded into the project activities.
- Procurement and technical monitoring: Introduce standard operating procedures for each implementing partner to assist in ensuring timely responses.
- Implementation capacity: Adopt an apprenticeship approach to strengthen the ability of national implementation modality and ensure greater engagement.
- UNDP Support: Provide access to technical expertise to help Government improve project management performance. Initially, the agency did not clearly identify the support for specific needs of the project and there was no project coordinator. The due diligence of MOUs to support the Government procurement process was noted.
- Stakeholder Engagement: A recommendation was made that education and awareness activities should continue after the closure of the project. Monitoring, building capacity, continuing synergies and relationships and encouraging co-financing and joint funding.
- Results: Support with replication and scaling up, more science policy approaches.



- Financial: The key to financial sustainability was to showcase innovation, this project could be a demonstration model.
- Institutional capacity building: – More emphasis should be placed on institutional strengthening considering colleagues’ retirement and movement of key staff.

### 2.2.7 Recommendations

- Use the results of the final steering committee meeting to advocate for the legislative reform for the proposed amendment.
- Further explore and approve the co-management plans.
- Design Phase 2 of the project
- Operationalize the National Forestry and Wildlife Law by building on the enabling environment with a second phase project.

### 2.3 Discussion

- 2.3.1 Ms. Cruz Gonzalez questioned the delay in the closure of the project. It was noted that the shifting of key personnel in Government ministries because of the Cabinet reshuffle contributed to the delay. For the duration of the project there were three different ministries responsible for its management. Also, the final report to cover the expenditure was not submitted.
- 2.3.2 Mr. Morain concurred that overseeing the project when he transitioned was a major learning curve for the team especially when key technical persons were transferred. Mr. Thompson noted that the report which was submitted focused on the marine aspect and there was nothing on the terrestrial side, it was referred to the legal team for resolution. Also, the consultants complained that they did not receive the required feedback.
- 2.3.3 Mr. Nagdee stated that the consultancy cost exceeded the \$45,000 allocated to complete the project and stressed the importance of having the matter reported on as soon as possible.
- 2.3.4 Mr. Morain advised that a cheque for the balance allocated to the project was prepared for the consultants and they were informed that the project would be closed but the Government was unable to pay the additional \$67,000. Mr. Thompson advised that the Consultants were willing to negotiate the final settlement but there need to be further discussion on the matter.
- 2.3.5 Ms. Cliff expressed concern about the time it was taking to close the project but was empathetic to Mr. Morain for the situation he inherited. She highlighted the strict reporting requirements of GEF.
- 2.3.6 Mr. Morain articulated that since it was a joint project all partners should be accountable so the outstanding debt could be paid.
- 2.3.7 After much discussion Ms. Cliff agreed to make an extra effort to investigate if funds existed that could be repurposed to possibly assist the Implementing Partner in covering the difference in the cost to compensate the consultant so that the project could be closed.
- 2.3.8 It was agreed that modalities need to be clearly outlined, the UNDP must be aware of all contracting activities and if costs are more than the allocation, a request must be submitted before the project closes.



- 2.3.9 Mr. Thompson identified weaknesses in the Terms of Reference that was issued for the Grenada Coral Reef Foundation consultancy and further recommended that a Technical Review Committee be established for the Climate Resilient Agriculture Project currently under implementation to assist in managing deliverables.
- 2.3.10 Ms. Udika reported that there was a technical review committee on the project in November 2018 and meetings were held with the consultants advising them of the required revisions, however that was pre-COVID 19.
- 2.3.11 Mr. Morain enquired about how the assets relating to the project should be treated, vehicles, computers etc. It was suggested that an inventory list be done in preparation for the handover.
- 2.3.12 Mr. Nagdee advised that all assets of the project must be handed over to the Implementing Partner.
- 2.3.13 Ms. Cruz Gonzalez explained that the stakeholder engagement plan for the CRA project would require some revamping. Key personnel, roles and responsibilities, procurement activities and overall quality assurance were critical.
- 2.3.14 The Draft National Forestry and Wildlife Act was discussed at the PSC along with the importance of ensuring that the legislation be passed as soon as possible. It was noted that delays in approving were due to COVID

## 2.4 **Actions**

- 2.4.1 A copy of the cheque to the Consultants and supporting documents must be submitted to the UNDP. The audit and spot check must be completed. FACE Form reporting for R2R which was outstanding should be submitted as soon as possible.
- 2.4.2 An internal discussion led by Ms. Cliff should be convened to determine if there will be an additional amount to the consultants and how it will be handled.
- 2.4.3 The inventory and handover of assets to the project were to be formalized.
- 2.4.4 The establishment of a Technical Review Committee for the upcoming project to be determined.

## 2.5 **Next Meeting**

- 2.5.1 The meeting agreed that another meeting to review the CRA workplan would be convened during the first week in January 2022.
- 2.5.2 It was recommended that for the meeting, key resource persons should be present, proper documentation and preliminary findings should be shared from the first draft of the MTR.
- 2.5.3 Mr. Nagdee reminded the meeting that a workshop was planned for the end of January and if the MTR draft was not available for the beginning of January then it could be placed on the workshop agenda.

## 3.0 **CONCLUSION**

- 3.1 Mr. Gooding expressed thanks for the opportunity to be involved in the project.
- 3.2 The PSC was informed that the R2R project was now officially closed



- 3.3 Both Co-Chairs conveyed appreciation to all persons for their support and wished the meeting a pleasant Christmas season.



Name	Title and Organisation	Signature
Ms. Valerie Cliff	Resident Representative, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	DocuSigned by:  C5F3A0256F0C41E...
Mr. Elvis Morain	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry	