





Minutes of the Terminal Project Board Meeting (Steering Committee) Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Habitat Degradation In Protected Areas and their Areas of Influence in St Kitts and Nevis

November 25, 2020 Virtual Project Board meeting via Zoom

9.05am – 11:00am

AGENDA

| Time | Agenda | Expected Outcome | Facilitated by |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| 9:00 – 9:10A.M | Welcome Roll Call Apologies | | Co-Chairs June Hughes and Mohammad Nagdee |
| 9:10 – 9:20A.M. | Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 24 th March 2020 | To recap matters that were discussed and recorded from previous meetings | Co-Chairs |
| 9:20 – 9:25A.M. | Matters Arising from the Minutes | To discuss and clarify issues recorded in the previous meetings' Minutes. | Co-Chairs |
| 9:25 – 9:40A.M. | Final Report on consultancies and procurements | To provide update on project delivery status since approval of project extension towards closure. Development of St. Kitts Marine Species Rehabilitation Center Financial Position to date Terminal Evaluation – Management Response Plan | Project Coordinator |
| 9:40 – 11:40AM | Project Closure | To discuss project phase down and hand over activities. • Project Indicators • Quality Assurance • Exit Strategy • Lessons Learned | UNDP |







| | | | nesmen |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-----------|
| | | | |
| 11:40 – 11:45AM | Any Other Business | | Co-Chairs |
| 11:45 – 12:00noon | Acknowledgements | Official Project Closure | Co-Chairs |
| | | | |
| | Adjournment | | |
| L | 1 | 1 | 1 |

PARTICIPANTS

| | Name | Organization |
|----|---------------------------|--|
| | Present | |
| 1 | Sharon Rattan | Ministry of Environment and Cooperatives |
| 2 | Mr. Mohammad Nagdee | UNDP |
| 3 | Ms. Tricia King | St. Kitts Department of Marine Resources |
| 4 | Ms. Lavern Queeley | Department of Economic Affairs and Public Sector Investment Programme |
| 5 | Ms. Kimberly Stewart | St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network |
| 6 | Ms. Thema Ward | Department of Physical Planning and Environment |
| 7 | Mr. Randy Morton | Nevis DMR |
| 8 | Ms. Ilis Watts | GEF Small Grants |
| 9 | Captain Kennette Garnette | St. Christopher and Nevis Defence Force - Coast Guard |
| 10 | Mr. Lemuel Pemberton | Nevis DMR |
| 11 | Mr. Richard Lupinacci | Nevis Historical and Conservation Society |
| | <u>Observers</u> | |
| 1 | Mrs. Claudia Drew | Project Coordinating Unit |







| | Name | Organization | |
|----|------------------------|---|--|
| 2 | Ms. Phynora Ible | Project Coordinating Unit | |
| 3 | Ms. Fiona Francis | Department of Economic Affairs and Public Sector Investment Planning | |
| 4 | Mrs. Karen Douglas | Department of Economic Affairs and Public Sector Investment Planning | |
| 5 | Mr. Jason LaCorbiniere | UNDP | |
| 6 | Ms. Astrid Proverb | UNDP | |
| 7 | Ms. Maxine Welsh | UNDP | |
| 8 | Ms. Cheryl Jeffers | Department of Environment | |
| | Apologies | | |
| 1. | Ms. Ryllis Percival | St. Christopher National Trust | |

MEETING OVERVIEW

The meeting was called to order at 9.05am

Agenda Item 1 – Welcome and Opening Remarks

| | Welcome remarks were shared by Mr. Mohammad Nagdee. He acknowledged the presence of the Permanent Secretary of Environment and Cooperative, Ms. Sharon Rattan. Ms. Sharon Rattan expressed deepest appreciation to UNDP for their and the provided of the presence of the presence of the permanent secretary of Environment and Cooperative, Ms. Sharon Rattan. |
|------------|---|
| DISCUSSION | assistance on the project which the Federation of St. Kitts and Nevis has benefited handsomely. She added that the Ministry hopes to work with UNDP in the future. |
| | 3. Each member introduced themselves. |
| | 4. The meeting Minutes dated 24 th March 2020 was accepted by Mr. Jason |
| | LaCorbiniere and seconded by Dr. Kimberly Stewart with no amendment. |







Agenda Item 2 – Final Report on Consultancies and Procurements

| DISCUS | SION |
|----------|--|
| inal Rep | port on consultancies and procurements |
| 5. | Ms. Claudia Drew stated the following: The last advance received was EC\$719,994.55 Expenditure January to March 2020 was US\$295,013.85 Expenditure and Incurred Expenses April to November 2020 was US\$581,028.81 Project Expenses over 5 years as follows: Year <u>Prodoc budget Actual/Projected</u> Year 1 1,201,097.00 340,777.22 Year 2 1,098,766.00 706,533.89 |
| | Year 3 709,767.00 696,813.06 |
| | Year 4 362,000.00 748,906.32 |
| | Year 5 - 876,042.66 |
| | Total 3,371,630.00 3,369,073.15 |
| | be sent in short order. The Terminal Evaluation was completed and circulated. The three main items in the Management Response Plan were addressed, and correspondence were sent from UNDP to the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis. The Spot Check which was a requirement for GEF Projects was still ongoing. The St. Kitts Marine Species Rehabilitation Center located at Keys will be completed by 5th December 2020. There were some setbacks with regards to the completion of the floor since the environment had to be sterile it requires specialized flooring. The contractor had a difficulty sourcing the right company to complete the flooring, however it will be completed by next week. |
| 6. | Ms. Claudia Drew expressed thanks to the Department of Public Works for supervising the work. She added that Mr. Livingston Pemberton was excellent at keeping the contractor on track and focused. |
| 7. 8. | Ms. Claudia Drew stated that the Project will come to end on Monday 30 th November 2020. Ms. Claudia Drew said that the Project will not be able to complete certain aspects thus the |
| | Department of Economic Affairs and PSIP was asked to complete the Financial Closure activities. |







- 10. Ms. Claudia Drew responded that the project made a huge impact and that project output over the 5 years was shared with the Project Steering Committee, particularly the capacity development. She expressed that she came to the project with very little official managerial skills and the project has helped her improve on those skills. She explained that the project might have been further along with someone who had more experience in Protected Areas and management, but it was all part of local capacity development within the federation. She stated that the Project Steering Committee did a good job at analysing issues but many times the Project was left wanting concrete decisions and next steps. She added that the Terminal Evaluator reported that the Project relied on the Project Steering Committee for technical guidance instead of implementing a technical committee. The CTA was hired very late in the process, in going forward the technical person should get on board sooner.
- 11. Ms. Claudia Drew thanked Ms. Phynora Ible for her ingenuity and initiative to research and create processes based on best practices at the initial stage of the project when there was little guidance on each organization policies through UNDP's portals but in the end the tools made available were impactful.
- 12. Ms. Claudia Drew said that the local government acceptance and embrace of project came very late in the process when the project was far ahead, she implored the government in the future to embrace the projects as a function of the various department and ministries to achieve better results.
- 13. Ms. Claudia Drew recapped that the Project went through several ministries which created many bottlenecks, and that the constant shift affected the output. She added that the approval processes were onerous and unnecessary on the project. However, the Project Coordinating Unit adapted to the situation.
- 14. Ms. Maritza Queeley asked if the Keys Center was completed.
- 15. Ms. Claudia Drew responded that the flooring was still to be completed. She explained that some painting will take place after the flooring was installed, then site will be cleaned up.
- 16. Ms. Maritza Queeley mentioned that with regards to the Project Steering Committee technical support, one of the issues for the Department of Marine Resources was that some cases under the marine component, many of the consultancy implementation matters were brought to the Project Steering Committee after decisions were made. She said that the committee was voting on matters that were already done.
- 17. Mrs. Tricia King explained that there was a publication regarding coral reef which was wrong and branded under the Government of St. Kitts' name, which was a perfect example of wrong information circulated.
- 18. Ms. Maritza Queeley stated that a lot of monies could have been saved regarding the consultancies' work if the Project Steering Committee was consulted before approval was given.
- 19. Mrs. Tricia King asked if the building at Keys was completed.
- 20. Ms. Claudia Drew responded that the building will be completed by next week after the flooring and final painting is completed. She explained that the Pump Room roofing was not originally a part of the plan but the contractor will place a roof next week. Also, she explained that due to the COVID-19 restrictions there were some delays in the shipment of the tanks and filtration system, but measures will be in place to clear the tanks and have them installed.







- 21. Ms. Sharon Rattan asked for clarity on the issues raised by Ms. Maritza Queeley with regards to decisions made without the input of the Department for Marine Resources even with a representative on the Project Steering Committee.
- 22. Ms. Lavern Queeley pointed out that the project was designed from a national portfolio exercise that was done and that everything articulated in the document came from stakeholders on the ground as it was the first national project under the GEF Star mechanism. She commented that they had a lot to learn and had learned a lot but many of the advice provided to the Project Coordinating Unit was not heeded. The Department of Economic Affairs and PSIP in particular, has skills in regard to project management, public financial management and gave the benefit of their advice. The GEF Operational Focal Point had an automatic seat on every project steering committee and kept track of what was happening. The Department was assigned by the Financial Secretary to do the financial management. There came a point where the members of the committee became extremely frustrated for the same reason mentioned by Department of Marine Resources, as documents were being compiled, comments were made. Based on past experience it was expected that the Project Coordinator would support the committee and facilitate incorporating their comments even after a deadline that was set had passed. The Project Coordinator was doing a job on behalf of the stakeholders thus if the government stakeholders stated that there is a problem then it should had been fixed. These types of recommendations were made for several of the assignments and meeting were held outlining steps to be taken, what was expected and timelines, thus if nothing happened, the consultants should have been removed from the particular assignment. Nothing was done and that created a difficult situation. On their second national project those will be looked at. St. Kitts and Nevis invited UNDP to be the executing agency as required by the GEF. Their concerns were expressed verbally and in writing to UNDP as they had serious concerns that UNDP was not lending the required support that was necessary even when the stakeholders said there was a problem. She outlined that these should be part of the lessons learned going forward.
- 23. Mr. Mohammed Nagdee expressed appreciation for Ms. Lavern Queeley's extremely critical feedback at that juncture. He assured her that he will try to locate the letter that was sent. The critical feedback from the project will have to be addressed. It would be useful to mention solutions as it was critical that the important government stakeholders did not feel disadvantaged as a result of implementation of a project under UNDP regardless as to what the relationship looked like. Moving forward UNDP will address it in such a manner to attain a better fit for the government of St. Kitts and Nevis.
- 24. Ms. Maritza Queeley supported Ms. Lavern Queeley's comments and outlined that socioeconomic document by Mr. Black could not be used and also the Envision Mapping documents. She did not know if there was a process to hire Mr. Black but Department of Marine Resources (DMR) participated in the selection of the Envision Mapping. Department of Marine Resources responded late to Envision Mapping initial document, but they had already received the go ahead to proceed. At the same time their work continued, and they could not go back and fix the initial document, however DMR could not move forward with them. They also could not use the financial mechanism document. The DMR was now concerned because their funding under the project was reallocated to the building of the Keys Center, hence the questions regarding the update on the Center so that nothing was left outstanding.







- 25. Ms. Claudia Drew stated that she was glad that Ms. Maritza Queeley outlined that the DMR responded to the assessment late. She added that if DMR was asking about the status of the Center then it showed the lack of participation and how they operated with the project.
- 26. Mr. Mohammed Nagdee interjected that the concerns had been acknowledged and the appropriate measures will be in place going forward. He hoped to meet with the government counterparts so that what transpired will not be repeated. He appreciated individuals or organizations feeling left out in the decision-making process and also appreciated the acknowledgement of the issue because as part of monitoring evaluation quality assurance processes it was important that the issues were identified. If a statutory corporation or a government ministry felt aggrieve in any way whatsoever UNDP would take it into consideration and address it moving forward so that they did not find themselves in a similar situation.
- 27. Ms. Ilis Watts asked Ms. Claudia Drew what in her opinion can be tools to improve linkages between future projects and government entities.
- 28. Ms. Tricia Greaux requested a separate follow up conversation with Mr. Mohammed Magdee.
- 29. Mr. Jason LaCorbiniere commented that he would have been aware of some of the issues over the past year. UNDP had already started to take on board concerns and now had a dedicated Monitoring and Evaluation functions to ensure that recommendations were integrated in the planning processes in a strategic and targeted way. Prior there were no SOPs of how to improve implementation and UNDP recognised the importance of moving from talking about issues to strategically addressing them, and a part of that was to ensure that discussions like that were not only reflected in meeting Minutes but acted upon. UNDP will follow up with a discussion with DMR and Ms. Lavern Queeley's team. It would also be useful to have a follow up discussion about how they could do things better in the future so that it can inform the design of future projects and implementation.
- 30. Ms. Maritza Queeley stated that she knew where the contractor was with the building but she wanted to clarify that there would not be any outstanding funds or budget and it was on record. The DMR knew where the site was and were present at the last online meeting with the contractor (Public Work's engineer).
- 31. Ms. Kimberly Stewart stated that the power was not connected so they were working to seek grant funding and Claudia and Phynora worked very hard to get a wind energy quote and the quote from Skelec. The St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network are currently trying to seek funding.
- 32. Ms. Cheryl Jeffers asked which Department would be responsible for completing any outstanding tasks once the project ends.
- 33. Ms. Sharon Rattan suggested that MOUs be developed so that it will be clear who will oversee the building and that roles were clear.
- 34. Ms. Claudia Drew said that the power was a responsibility of the St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network and when the project construction began the Sea Turtle Monitoring Network was in the process of applying for electricity to their site. The Project Coordinating Unit tried to facilitate but the cost was above the budget. The matter was raised with the Permanent Secretary of Environment and Cooperatives and it was agreed that there would be further discussion with DMR and DOE on how the facility would be operated with the Sea Turtle Monitoring Network. The Project Coordinating Unit drafted and MOU for the construction and operationalization of







the facility but the Dept of Economic Affairs- PSIP and DMR agreed the MOU would only go up to completion of building, so the Departments have to work out the details of a new MOU.

- 35. Dr. Kimberly Stewart stated that they were responsible for getting power for their building but for the Project building they were not expecting at this juncture to be responsible for it. However, they were working on it.
- 36. Ms Claudia Drew stated the Project Coordinating Unit looked at the options of solar and wind energy, but wind was more conducive due to the environment.
- 37. Ms. Sharon Rattan proposed that at the end of projects on a national level more MOUs were needed in terms of where they go. Based on her experience, perhaps UNDP can assist with the major problem of dealing with egos. Persons should look at what the Federation had benefited from the project and how the country can continue to benefit.
- 38. Mr. Mohammed Nagdee expressed gratitude and noted her comments and looked forward to follow- up meetings addressing the feedbacks.
- 39. Ms. Lavern Queeley stated that the MOU was shared with the Department of Economic Affairs with regards to how things will go forward with the construction, and her department emphasized that DMR should be a part of the meetings, as they were not included in the draft. There is an MOU being drafted by DMR in circulation with regards the management of the facility between to DMR and St. Kitts Sea Turtle Monitoring Network. Her concern was that only in recent days the matter of no electricity came to the forefront. The benefit of bringing such issue to the forefront was for other entities to provide an intervention. She requested that someone share with the PSC the breakdown of the estimate.
- 40. Mr. Mohammed Nagdee stated that a follow up meeting will take place and requested that any additional concerns be sent via email.
- 41. Ms. Lavern Queeley expressed that what had been transpiring in previous meetings was that persons were asked to send emails for decisions to be made that were never made. She requested that the information be shared with the stakeholders so that a quick decision could be made as she could not say when she would have time to have another meeting within the next few weeks.
- 42. Mr. Mohammed Nagdee voiced that he understood the very passionate plea put forward and he was very much aware that persons were very busy. He hoped that they could come to an agreement on a time to discuss the matter further.
- 43. Mr. Randy Morton asked about the beetle that was found on Nevis Peak and requested any information on what had transpired.
- 44. Ms. Claudia Drew explained that a beetle of special interest was found by the Environment Awareness Group during the terrestrial ecological inventory and that it was endemic to Federation and that in July 2020 the paper was about to be peer reviewed.
- 45. Mr. Jason LaCorbiniere said that UNDP wanted to avoid those issues going forward and will definitely have a follow up discussion. The discussion and action items will be included as part of the addendum to the minutes so that persons will be able to see the outcomes, the follow ups and actions can be taken. He added that it is important for UNDP to remain accountable to the stakeholders.

CONCLUSIONS







| • Follow up meeting with UNDP, DMR, DOE and Dept Economic Affairs PSIP | | |
|--|-----------------------|----------|
| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
| • Follow up meeting with UNDP, DMR, DOE and Dept Economic Affairs PSIP | Mohammed Nagdee | ASAP |
| | | |

Agenda Item 3 – Project Closure

DISCUSSION

Project Closure

- 46. Ms. Claudia Drew stated that there were 31 project indicators that needed to be satisfied. She summarized the report. (see Appendix III)
- 47. Ms. Claudia Drew commended the Department of Environment for increasing the management effective for Booby Island even though it was not declared.
- 48. Ms. Claudia Drew indicated that the marine areas improved in management effectiveness, however, only Keys did not exceed the target.
- 49. Ms. Claudia Drew explained that the terrestrial ecological inventory was not able to establish a baseline, because there was not a physical count of species based on the available budget

Quality Assurance

- 50. Ms. Claudia Drew reported that the quality assurance was completed in the UNDP reporting system.
- 51. Mr. Jason LaCorbiniere said that the quality assurance would be share with government counterparts.

Exit Strategy

52. Ms. Claudia Drew outlined how the government will continue with Protected Areas once outputs are handed over. (Appendix IV)

Lesson learned

53. Ms Claudia Drew shared a few points from the lesson learned report. (Appendix V)

AOB

- 54. Mr. Jason LaCorbiniere advised that the given the discussions the lessons learned should be updated and a follow up meeting was needed.
- 55. Ms. Cheryl Jeffers asked what should happen next and who will be taking the responsibility.







- 56. Ms. Claudia Drew reported on the following:
- Last year five Rangers were hired by the government to continue work in Protected Area. They were equipped with tools and equipment to continue their work.
- The Centralized Integrated Information Management System (CIIMS) was operational to store and retrieve environment and protected areas information.
- Communication strategy was rolled out.
- Two Centers were constructed.
- One Pubic washroom was constructed.
- National Conservation and Environment Management Bill (NCEM) to be enacted.
- Project Coordinating Unit will hand over all documents to the Department of Environment.
- Final report and return of outstanding funds to the donor.
- Final actions will be taken up by Department of Environment and will dialog with other departments on way forward.

| 57. | Ms. Sharon Rattan stated that going forward it was the intention for the ministry to meet with |
|-----|--|
| | Department of Marine Resources and the Department of Economic Affairs and PSIP to |
| | resolve the issues. She emphasized that there must be a resolution to the issues. |

- 58. Mr. Lemuel Pemberton advised that with regards to the St. Christopher and Nevis Conservation Fund for further details one should contact Ms. Brenda John and Ms. June Hughes. He indicated that there might be some opportunity for funding there.
- 59. Ms. Cheryl Jeffers added that Mr. Marc Williams was also on the board.
- 60. Mr. Jason LaCorbiniere expressed that he worked with project and it was good to see the work Ms. Claudia Drew and Ms. Phynora Ible was able to do and the close collaborations developed even with challenges.
- 61. Mr. Mohammed Nagdee thanked everyone for their participation. He will follow up on the request for another meeting to discuss challenges and solutions. On behalf of UNDP he thanked Permanent Secretary Ms. Sharon Rattan and looked forward to further projects. He thanked Claudia Drew for her presentation.

CONCLUSIONS Terminal Project Steering Committee Meeting Minutes will be circulated for acceptance and archived. Following the meeting a notice will be sent to Project Steering Committee members to note that project is operationally closed.

| ACTION ITEMS | PERSON RESPONSIBLE | DEADLINE |
|---|-----------------------|----------|
| Terminal Project Steering Committee Meeting Minutes will be circulated for acceptance and archived. | Claudia Drew | ASAP |







Adjournment

62. The Meeting was adjourned by Mohammad Rafik M.S. Nagdee at 11:00AM