PROJECT TERMINAL EVALUATION

"Implementing a "Ridge-to-Reef" Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem functions within and around Protected Areas in Grenada"

UNDP PIMS 5087

GEF ID 5069

GEF FOCAL AREA: Biodiversity and Ecosystems

STRATEGIC PROGRAM OF GEF 5:

FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	2.3. Solutions at the local level for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystems and environmental services, for expanded jobs and livelihoods, and 3.5. Transparent and non-discriminatory legal and regulatory frameworks and policies enabled for sustainable management of natural resources, biodiversity, and ecosystems (in line with international conventions and national legislation)

IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES: Ministry of the Environment; Ministry of Agriculture-Fisheries; Ministry of Tourism

REGION: CARIBBEAN COUNTRY: GRENADA

Programme Period: 2014–2019	Total Resources Required: US$18,458,488
ATLAS Award ID: 00082951	Total Allocated Resources (Grant): US$18,458,488
ATLAS Project ID: 00091627	GEF: US$ 3,031,666
GEF Sec Project ID: 5069	Ministry of the Environment: US$ 6,130,525
PIMS#: 5087	Ministry of Agriculture-Fisheries: US$ 4,629,630
	Ministry of Agriculture-Fisheries: US$ 2,250,000
Duration: 60 Months	Ministry of Tourism: US$ 2,166,667
Start Date: 10 February 2015	UNDP: US$ 250,000
End Date: December 2019; Actual End: June 10, 2 2021	
Management Arrangement: NIM	
PAC Meeting Date: 1 October 2014	

Evaluation conducted by Mrs. Stephanie Hodge (international consultant)
From February 24, 2021–July 1, 2021
Report submitted July 1, 2021

- **Acknowledgments**

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) consultant expresses thanks to those who patiently took part in interviews and who generously took time out of their busy schedules to share perspectives and information crucial to conducting this review. Gratitude is also expressed to the Project Coordinator and the Project Administrative/Finance Assistant for the insightful inputs and the significant amount of time allotted to meet. Sincere thanks to the UNDP Programme Analyst, UN ME, UNDP RTA, UNDP UNV officer, and all responsible for this project (based in Barbados and Panama), for sharing relevant project experiences and the effort invested in obtaining important background information. The government, the private sector, the donor community, and the NGO community are also recognized for sharing information critical to the conduct of this Terminal Review.

CONTENTS

I. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

APR	Annual Project Report
AR	Afforestation and Reforestation
AUD	Avoided Unplanned Deforestation
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BD	Biodiversity
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CC	Climate Change
CCM	Climate Change Mitigation
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CBO	Community-based Organization
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FFEM	French Fund for the Environment
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Green House Gas
GIS	Geographical Information System
GOG	Government of Grenada
GPS	Global Positioning System
IPCC	Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change
INRM	Integrated National Resource Management
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
LD	Land Degradation
m.a.s.l.	Meters above sea-level
M&E	Monitor and Evaluation
LULUFC	Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture and the Environment
MCO	Multi-Country Office
MCS	Monitor Control and Surveillance
MMER	Monitor Measurement Evaluation and Response
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PA	Protected Area
PC	Project Coordinator
PD	Project Description
PIF	Project Identification Form
FSP	Full Size Project
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PPG	Project Preparation Grant
PPP	Project Preparation Process
Prodoc	Project Document
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RBLAC	UNDP Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean

RCU	Regional Coordination Unit
REDD+	Reduction of Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation of Forests
ROAR	Results Oriented Annual Report
RTA	Regional Technical Advisor
SGU	Saint George's University
SFM	Sustainable Forestry Management
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SOP/P	Standard Operating Procedures and Practices
SRO	Statutory Rules and Orders
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Summary Table

Project Title:	Implementing a "Ridge-to-Reef" Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem functions within and around Protected Areas in Grenada			
GEF Project ID:	5087		at endorsement (Million US$)	at completion (Million US$)
UNDP Project ID:	00091627	GEF financing:	$ 3,031,666	$ 2,743,488
Country:	Grenada	Government:	$ 15,176,822	$ 250,000
Region:	Latin America & the Caribbean			
Focal Area:	Biodiversity and Ecosystems			
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	2.3. Solutions at the local level for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystems, and environmental services for expanded jobs and livelihoods 3.5. Transparent and nondiscriminatory legal and regulatory frameworks and policies enabled for sustainable management of natural resources, biodiversity, and ecosystems (in line with international conventions and national legislation)			
Implementing Partner	Ministry of Climate Resilience, the Environment, Forestry, Fisheries, and Disaster Management	Total Project Cost:	$ 250,000	$ 250,000
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Infrastructure and Works, National Water and Sewerage Authority Division, Ministry of Touism.	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		February 10, 2015
		Inception workshop		March 19, 2015
		MTE		April 13, 2018
		PM came aboard		November 2018
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2019	Actual: June 2021

Project Description (summary)

The overarching goal of the project is to support local beneficiaries, and by extension the global community, through strengthening land, forest, and reef management processes (ecosystem functions) and biodiversity conservation on all terrestrial landscapes and marine seascapes in Grenada, especially within and around marine and terrestrial protected areas. During project implementation this was to be

achieved through a multifocal strategy employing a ridge-to-reef approach which increased protected area management effectiveness and applied targeted land management practices to include the following improvements:

- Development of a policy-based legal, planning, and institutional/regulatory framework in support of a *sustainably managed network of TPAs and MPAs;*
- Development and management of landscapes and seascapes by adopting the approach of integrating *SLM and SFM/REDD+ principles and practices as a matter of public policy (integrated approach for managing forest ecosystems, protection, and sustainable use of the biodiversity, prevention of land/sea degradation, and integration of people's livelihood objectives within the management of forest and marine ecosystems*);
- Piloting SFM/REDD+ and SLM practices in the Annandale/Beauséjour watershed to improve carbon stocks, reduce deforestation, and reduce susceptibility to drought (and forest fires) and consequent land degradation that would impact downstream landscapes and seascapes.

According to the Project Document, the project sought to address, directly or indirectly, the main causes of loss of biodiversity which were outlined as:

1) environmental planning and weakness in policy formulation and implementation resulting in inadequate monitoring and management of ecosystem functions including those under the current Protected Areas system and;
2) the contamination of (surface) water sources by both direct agricultural use and resident rural communities while considering significant constraints like the land tenure system characteristics (high fragmentation and private ownership).

The project was designed to address these areas through a focus on enhancing the ecosystems' management and protected areas. As such, activities were to be guided by the overall project objective which was to ensure that the biodiversity and the ecosystems' function within and around marine and terrestrial PAs in Grenada are better protected from threats through the adoption of an integrated ridge-to-reef approach that increases PA management effectiveness and the application of targeted sustainable land (and coastal sea) management practices while ensuring ecosystems' resilience to climate change.

In particular, the project design directly addressed and was consistent with the outcomes and outputs of GEF Strategic Objective #1, to improve the sustainability of the protected area systems. The project would support the implementation of key aspects of the Grenada System Plan for Parks and Protected Areas and the Grenada Declaration (COP8) to effectively conserve at least 25% of its marine and territorial ecosystems by the year 2020. This project, therefore, was expected to enhance the capabilities of Grenada concerning institutional, regulatory, and policy-based strategic planning. It would provide Grenada with financial support for various materials that would enable the process. Concretely, the project would expand and enhance the existing PA system in the country by expanding the number of TPAs from 8 to 9 (increasing the number of hectares from 1,931 ha to 2931 ha) and growing the number of MPAs from 3 to 7 (increasing the number of hectares from 1,780 ha to 13, 180 ha). Furthermore, the project would support the incorporation of several mini-PAs into the national network as a minimum cost output. The consolidation and expansion of the PA system would be enhanced by the project's support in reducing threats to biodiversity by addressing habitat degradation and over-exploitation of biological resources within PAs.

The project was expected to result in ecological sustainability of terrestrial and marine ecosystems, which would result in enhanced quantity and values of ecosystem goods and services, including shoreline maintenance, storm protection, soil protection, water provision (quality and quantity), flood control,

carbon sequestration, tourism attractions, and increased resilience and self-repair of ecosystems from other stresses such as increased sea temperature. The project would provide direct benefits for endangered species, e.g., the endemic Grenada Dove *(Leptotilawellsi)* and six species of marine turtles (Green, Leatherback, Loggerhead, Hawksbill, Kemps Ridley, and Olive Ridley) found in Grenada's waters. A more detailed analysis of global environmental benefits is provided in the table below.

Evaluation Rating Table: [i]

1. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating	
M&E design at entry	S	The M&E design at entry was completed according to GEF technical requirements. The plan was clearly outlined in the original project document.
M&E Plan Implementation	MS	This MS rating is justified because the project was designed with a generic PA system improvement framework, and it could have been interpreted and scheduled with milestones by project oversight and management. The key issue was the lack of PM understanding of the GEF monitoring and adaptive management requirements and parameters. The inception meeting lacked UNDP guidance on interpreting the project document and training on the GEF monitoring requirements. While activities took place, including the MTR, the course correction was not implemented in the logical framework, i.e., to make the targets realistic or smart.
Overall Quality of M&E	MS	Same as observation above
2. Implementing Agency (IA) Implementation & Executing Agency (EA) Execution	**Rating**	
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	MU	UNDP provided significant support to the government-implemented project on one hand and, on the other hand, was responsible for result and fiduciary oversight. However, there were insufficient resources for UNDP to execute these two roles simultaneously, leading to delays in both areas. The NIM modality presented a challenge for UNDP, which a greater separation of roles would have remedied. A stronger steering committee leading the oversight function, especially as it related to managing project bottlenecks, would have been an effective solution to this challenge. Consistent separation throughout the project would have allowed for higher-level UNDP and government support to be continued on the technical work planning and day-to-day technical monitoring.
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	MU	There were gaps in the IP's performance as project deliverables were not evaluated against key benchmarks, nor the implementation monitored to the specifications outlined in the plan. The role of vetting and providing product quality assurance was conducted by the PC.
Overall quality of Implementation/ Execution	MU	A weak communications and risk management feedback loop between UNDP and PC existed which negatively impacted implementation. This finding was supported by project steering committee members and implementing partner feedback with key takeaways noting the need for guidance on managing the process and generating effective feedback loops on actions. The lack of agility and flexibility in allocating funding for problem solving, as well as effective communication pushed the project from a threshold of caution to risk mitigation to get back on track. UNDP was tasked with assisting the implementation due to the government's significant shortfall in capacity. The government wanted the project team and UNDP to guide and implement their project through to results. There were also several procurement delays, many of which might also have been better dealt with had there been more coordinated and structured communication. It was noted that misunderstanding surrounding UNDP's support might have compounded the issue however, the lack of project milestones with

		the high-level partner for joint monitoring and technically evaluating deliverables contributed adversely to the quality of implementation. Further to this, the lack of recruitment of a CTA was noted as a significant barrier to results. In a technical project, the technical oversight is a key input for guiding execution and providing support to the PC and the RTA on technically complicated projects. The absence of a CTA further impacted the project due to the RTA's limited scope to manage day-to-day and ongoing inputs. Procuring a CTA would have remedied this and would have been beneficial given that the project was flagged for acceleration and required risk mitigation efforts.
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating	
Relevance	HS	It was determined that the project was relevant and remains a major priority for Grenada. The project directly contributed to Grenada's global commitments including the Paris Agreement, Sendai Framework, the three Rio Conventions, the SDGs, and the 2030 Agenda. Reports by officials reinforced the findings that the project was visibly and constructively supporting international and national priorities. The project interventions directly complemented Grenada's efforts on the local level to fulfill its obligations to various Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) concerning biodiversity and ecosystem functions/services by applying program-based delivery systems and co-management initiatives that would accommodate the involvement of local area communities in a direct way. Interventions were designed to address the GEF STAR 5 strategy for SLM and SFM/REDD+ along with focal areas such as BD, LD, and climate change mitigation (CCM). In particular, the project design directly addressed and was consistent with the outcomes and outputs of GEF Strategic Objective 1 to improve the sustainability of protected area systems. The project supported the implementation of key aspects of the Grenada System Plan for Parks and Protected Areas and the Grenada Declaration (COP8) to effectively conserve at least 25% of its marine and territorial ecosystems by the year 2020. Additionally, the project addressed GEF SFM-REDD+ Objective 1, to reduce pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services, by reducing the threat of deforestation from fire, slash and burn agriculture, and encroachment by housing and tourism and by increasing forest cover and carbon stocks through agroforestry and the removal of invasive species. Finally, the project supported the goals *inter alia* of the 2004 CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas.
Effectiveness	MS	While the exact project targets and structural changes envisioned were not realized, the project has contributed to the overarching goals. (See the assessment of the Project Indicator Framework Results in the findings section). For example, the ProDoc stated it would expand and enhance the existing ecosystem management framework in the country by increasing the number of TPAs from 8 to 9 (increasing the number of hectares from 1,931 ha to 2931 ha) and increasing the number of MPAs from 3 to 7 (increasing the number of hectares from 1,780 ha to 13, 180 ha.) The project provided concrete support to the goal of improving ecosystem management through public awareness and demonstration of the cross sectoral working approaches. It also supported the implementation of key aspects of the Grenada System Plan for Parks and Protected Areas and the Grenada Declaration (COP8) to effectively conserve at least 25% of its marine and territorial ecosystems by the year 2020. This project enhanced the capabilities of Grenada for institutional, regulatory, and policy-based Strategic Planning for PAs to a limited degree. A major highlight reported was the successful partnership with other development projects and actors. The project contributed to the coastal zone management policy deliberations and others.

		With respect to policy, the project has generally worked both upstream and downstream. It produced key policy recommendations and drafted amendments, currently awaiting review by the Attorney General's office, and successfully contributed to the legal work required to bolster the Forestry Act and generate synergies to support the land use policy. While substantive legal work was advanced on the terrestrial side, the project was less successful in its efforts to support the marine and fisheries sectors. However, notably for marine PAs, the project, together with the GIZ project, advanced the law on coastal zone management, which included a stipulation for marine protected areas. As a result of this project, the Forestry Department has a recommended park fee structure with drafted legislation for co-management. A legislation review was also executed to focus on combining all the existing forest-related legislation. Although the project is closed, these elements are expected to be fulfilled through the Cabinet by end of the year. CANARI, the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute, an implementing partner, has supported the revision to the Forestry PA act, a major expected output of this project. Concrete public stakeholder engagement/public awareness/education for sustainable development was achieved, including engagement with community and landowners in six beneficiary communities, strong awareness building, and alternative livelihoods. For objective 2, rainwater harvesting, education was provided to all 6 beneficiary communities and was expected to be expanded based on small grant activities, such as training on reducing pesticides. Extension officers were trained and community, wardens, coast guards, and staff as well as the public were also trained in conservation, with positive reports that some individuals are using the qualification to enhance their lives. Reforestation was completed at the baseline (see above) however, there was no project planned monitoring to support it. The project did intensive work under outcome 2 in demonstrating management and cross-sectoral coordination work for sectors in the Beauséjour Watershed and the protected turtle area. It also changed destructive agricultural and local practices in pesticides and fishing. One significant positive impact was that locals voluntarily stopped fishing within turtle nesting sites, at 6 pm. This is a testimony to the value of the project's public advocacy and educational efforts. With respect to infrastructural development, key equipment was provided in forestry operations, a new boat was procured for fisheries to support control and training in the MPAs. The project rebuilt a protected area recreation site; which was damaged during hurricanes Ivan and Emilee 2004–2005 and refurbished the Interpretation Center at Grand Étang, The Project also engaged consultants and implemented an action plan for environmental education and conducting international events of significance to demonstrate biodiversity.
Efficiency	MU	The strategic oversight and coordination roles of UNDP allowed for the efficient use of funding to contract a Project Coordinator to manage the project and create synergies for deliverables. However, gaps were identified in this execution. To mitigate the inefficiencies documented in this process, stronger implementation support may have been required to assist the government as project-supported policy and legal work needed to be technically vetted and then guided through open policy windows. Knowledgeable interviewees, i.e. Implementing partners and stakeholders, reiterated this sentiment by emphasizing that validation by the government as a integral in policy development. *The establishment of benchmarks was needed for completing this collaboratively with UNDP and IP.*

		Many government officials interviewed, identified a lack of private and public landholder involvement along with the need for increased public and business engagement (and for ensuring sustainability) as a barrier to the results. Interviewee consensus was that continuing public and private stakeholder engagement would have better supported the new policies being recommended. Notably, as large land tenure is under private ownership in Grenada, it is imperative that governance over natural resources on those lands be done in partnership with those persons. Improving public education on the value of biodiversity is therefore critical for results. Dialogue concerning the conservation and land use (for business) and the restrictions and impositions on land use is generally a collaborative exercise and considers the fact that Grenada's land is 85% privately owned. For example, key knowledgeable government partners stated that on the acquisition of land by a company, the Minister and the local developer met to discuss construction conditions and water management. The fundamental lesson learnt, is to ensure owners are part of the process as once they see the value, they will cooperate and co-manage. In addition to this, key stakeholders noted that Grenada has an opportunity to focus on higher-end tourism inclusive of a strategy that places a value on conservation and nature. *Management and establishment of a strong science-to-policy link* The science-to-policy link is a systemic issues in protected area monitoring. In this project, the environment division had attempted to measure biodiversity assets and losses through *proxy measures*. The government department depended on key data for monitoring the marine protected areas, i.e., fish stock and the state of reefs. However, in the absence of a strong baseline, it was impossible to say how many hectares of seagrass were lost. **Therefore, a key lesson learnt regarding the work on scientific monitoring, underscored the need for a science-to-policy linkage built in from the beginning as a monitoring baseline set with sustainability built-in as part of the process.** For future projects, an academic institution or university, UWI (possibly SGU, depending on the activities to be undertaken) may provide these services to conduct baseline work if COVID-related travel restrictions permit). Of note, key stakeholders interviewed confirmed that the ministry now recognizes the importance of the scientific–policy–data connection for decision-making relationships. Additionally, for future design policy, these relationships, institutional know-how, and data will be explained and faceted with UNDP/GEF-supported technical expertise. Policy results needed, process indicators and protocols/rewards will be built into the design so that the PC can build relationships and influence.
Overall Project Outcome Rating	MS	The evaluation undertook a review of the project indicators framework and activities, in summary below and a complete analysis of the project indicator framework and expected results on page 60 in the performance section of this report. In general, progress toward the mainstreaming of PA management in Grenada has experienced moderately unsatisfactory progress. Noteworthy progress, however, has been achieved since November concerning TPAs managed by the Forestry Division. While additional MPAs (e.g., Magazine Beach) were declared by the Cabinet in January 2021, support to MPAs was not as successful as with Forestry. The state of emergency enacted due to COVID 19, resulted in significant delays in finalizing the formal incorporation of planning and management instruments into government administration largely due to shifted priorities; many GOG administrative matters/legislative processes which are not directly related to the COVID-19 response were delayed. The project had been undertaking advocacy among key government officials and legal stakeholders to strengthen country ownership to back the approval/endorsement of draft legislation and policy proposals to support the implementation of these management plans. It was

		anticipated that the process would be completed and approved by October 2020, but this did not happen before the Terminal Evaluation. Triangulation of institutional and community stakeholders' feedback revealed that the timescale for the programme, at design, was inadequate to achieve the intended results. Nonetheless, some successes were noted, and it was expected that the legal work would be passed by the Cabinet this year. However, the lack of structure in the advocacy work within the project and the absence of a clear plan for stakeholder consultation hindered buy-in at the national level. In addition, the work planning process needed further integration. While the two outcomes were linked and would make significant contributions, the project management component needed increased focus on supporting cross-cutting areas across the two main outputs toward upstream outcome-level results, i.e., knowledge management, partnership strategy, and monitoring for results. Initial project management deficiencies affected this project's expected outcomes significantly. While much was done to boost awareness and increase the national and community-level appreciation of the economic and social value of protecting the forest and marine ecosystems and the broad range of services they provide, the project was unable to fill the critical gaps in the legal and institutional framework needed to facilitate cross-sectoral integration concerning INRM and the participation of the communities and private sector in conservation efforts. Future work is especially needed to operationalize a national park management system (with a focus on fiscal operations and co-management with communities, starting private-public partnership, payment for an ecosystem approach to the approved National Forestry and Wildlife policy and the soon-to-be approved land use policy). The initial timeframe for adopting the legal and policy instruments targeted for change project was insufficient and this compressed timeline was compounded by the impacts of COVID-19. The lack of structure in the advocacy work within the project and the absence of a clear plan for stakeholder consultation, which hindered buy-in at the national level, contributed to the lack of progress toward targets. In addition, the evaluation found that the work planning process needed further integration, i.e., the two outcomes were linked and would make significant contributions, but the project management needed more focus on supporting cross-cutting areas across the two main outputs (see elaboration of these in the next table) toward upstream outcome level results, i.e., with knowledge management, partnership strategy, and monitoring for results.
4. Sustainability	Rating	
Financial sustainability	ML	Financial sustainability was only moderately well integrated across project outcomes, in particular those related to the MPA and TPA. While some work in this area was advanced, significant gaps in implementation of proposals remained. Due to the major delays in implementation, the project was not able to fully deploy relevant financial sustainability mechanisms, making it difficult to assess the project's medium to long-run sustainability and determine how activities will be monitored after the project. A solution to this would be to showcase the essential financial part of the project as a demonstration.
Sociopolitical sustainability	ML	The project sought to increase equality by supporting training programmes and workshops that provided gender mainstreaming and ensured participation by women and vulnerable groups. For fisherfolk and farming groups, gender mainstreaming took place for capacity building in the areas of Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) and apiculture training programmes. Distribution of rainwater harvesting and irrigation equipment supported gender mainstreaming efforts through included vulnerable groups in rural communities.

Institutional framework and governance sustainability	ML	As it relates to contributing to institutional capacity and governance for the PA system and PA management and the overarching biodiversity mainstreaming, the project made significant contributions to mobilize stakeholders through education and the delivery of key knowledge products intended to support the legal arrangement, i.e., the Forestry and Wildlife Act. For the country to act on this work, the government will need to pass the Forestry and Wildlife Act and deal aggressively with systemic issues relating to environmental work and conservation coordination. Many stakeholders assert that the country needs a human resource succession plan. The Minister of Agriculture identified a key need for technical capacity to support the government's agenda and build capacity for the ministry staff for the sustainability of interventions.
Environmental sustainability	L	Environmental sustainability is highly dependent on the degree to which those responsible for conservation and resource management can strategically coordinate their efforts and ensure that policies and plans are translated into effective monitoring, surveillance, and enforcement. Reviews of available reports, including the PIRs, illustrated that some efforts were made to address the limited capacity to undertake effective coordination across agencies and personnel responsible for biodiversity conservation in both marine and terrestrial areas. Specifically, progress was made in the formal establishment of advisory councils and coordinating committees intended to support improved coherence of conservation policies. Nonetheless, these groups have not convened with the frequency nor the participation that would be required for them to be effective coordination mechanisms. In this sense, while the programme set some of the foundations to improve coordination and, by extension, environmental sustainability, there remain some aspects of the operationalization of these interventions that could prevent them from meeting their objectives.
Overall likelihood of Sustainability	L	This project was aimed at mainstreaming biodiversity through concrete demonstration of the PA system management in a principal at-risk watershed and support to key upstream areas as well as through educational activities and significant stakeholder engagement. However, for the work to be sustained, the key aspect of sustainability is tied to the passing and the operationalization of the Forestry and Wildlife Act. This is in motion and will go through the Cabinet in 2021. Additionally, the country has recently amended the land use law which will promote cross-sectoral collaboration among the different sectors to enforce it. The project provides capacity building to the technology sector on how this intersectoral collaboration will work in practice.

Summary of conclusions, recommendations, and lessons

Design Summary	Results update
Project Strategy	The project's *objective* was to ensure that ecosystems within and around marine and terrestrial PAs in Grenada are better protected from threats through the adoption of an integrated ridge-to-reef approach that increases PA management effectiveness and applies targeted sustainable land (and coastal sea) management practices while ensuring the ecosystems' resilience to climate change. There was a divide on the suitability of the project design as many institutional, as well as community-level stakeholders, deemed the project design as over-ambitious (see MTR) while others deemed it acceptable (and envisioned it as a model design for the region). The project had two expected outcomes. The first was centered around mainstreaming PA system management and developing management plans in PAs and MPAs. The second focused on showcasing the integrated water resource management in the Annandale/Beauséjour Watershed and demonstrating co-management of the adjacent MPA (Beauséjour MPA) and TPA (Annandale). These strategy elements needed clear integration and scheduling for outcome-level results and smooth implementation. Insufficient

Design Summary	Results update
	management involvement and a lack of technical input into the initial design of strategies for implementation impacted the project. Adaptation and course correction were used as strategies to accelerate and correct project management issues as part of the project monitoring process. However, despite this intervention, delivery of all components could not occur on time. The project was successful in increasing public awareness/sensitization on the value of biodiversity with its strong focus on learning activities with technicians, the public, and farmers. The project completed key reviews including that of the Forestry and Wildlife Act, which the government should follow up on to pass by the end of this year and put into operation. The development of a system-wide PA management plan at the national level and the operationalization of co-management, however, are still required. These interventions would demonstrate the financial benefits of a system-wide management approach which shares the benefits with the communities and the private sector. COVID-19 presented further challenges that delayed the implementation of key activities due to government's refocusing resources on prioritizing social resilience. Further to this, the project team faced technical and logistical challenges given the nationally imposed restrictions.
Impact	While the project was highly regarded for its breadth and island-wide presence through a public awareness campaign and farmer education efforts, it failed to affect the institutional reforms necessary for PA system policy and legal arrangements as envisioned by the passage of the Forestry and Wildlife Act. This Act as a key target is now expected by the end of 2021 (see assessed Indicator framework in section). In terms of upstream policy impacts, issues were identified with the system-wide capacity gap to coordinate and take the intervention through the process of reformation to a national structure for PA management, particularly the need for strengthened intersectoral coordination. The project was built to showcase the coordination and cross-sectoral work, i.e., how joint environmental monitoring is key to INRM and downstream-level results. The project contributed to the "protected areas, wildlife, and forestry" bill, which is now redrafted (originally drafted in 2003) and once approved (in 2021, according to the high-level officials interviewed), will bring policy more in line with the targets. While the project target was set at 25% PA for nearshore and land protection, not much has changed in terms of outcome level targets, i.e., expansion of PAs. This is expected to be remedied when the Forestry and Wildlife Act is approved. Some key government stakeholders involved in implementation commented that Grenada should set a higher target for protected land under government control, especially as land is vulnerable and the coastal ecosystem is fragile. The land is central to human well-being and the economy of the island as well. The community-based stakeholders interviewed reported the project had high visibility across the island via different media and activities and fully supported the results from the education and awareness activities. Capacity building through training and education has shown the most significant progress in terms of change, including the engagement of six communities of farmers who were trained in alternative livelihoods and provided with small inputs, i.e., seeds, knowledge, and technology about Biodiversity Conservation, SFM/SLM, and CC.

Output One MU **Establishment and effective management of new and existing Protected Areas**	This output focused on establishing effective biodiversity management, including the institutional framework for management effectiveness in and around Protected Areas. At the start of the project, there was **no formal National Parks Advisory Council; the Forestry Division had been administering eight TPAs under suboptimal conditions and the Fisheries Division administered 3 MPAs**. The target aimed at formally establishing a National Parks Advisory Council for TPAs and a Management Committee for MPAs, administering policy-based PAs. This was not achieved, but the project has made significant contributions. At TE, activities were found to have been initiated to support the institutional framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs and with PAs, but there was only moderate progress. Most significantly, however, the Cabinet appointed members of the National MPA Committee, and the government made a commitment for the re-establishment of the National Parks Advisory Council in September 2019. The project started dialogues with the Tourism Ministry to resolve any conflicting responsibilities/roles with those of the Ministry of Climate Resilience. The project's supportive work was completed but was not scheduled synergistically,

Indicators • Institutional framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs • Regulatory and legal framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs • Expansion of protected areas system • Measurable threat reduction: forest cover • Direct carbon benefits, • Indirect carbon benefits • Mangrove, seagrass bed, and coral reef areas • Management of expanded PA network institutionalized • PA network infrastructure and services • Community involvement in PA management through conservation and sustainable use of natural resources • Benefits/profitability from conservation/ sustainable-use resource-based livelihood opportunities	and additional technical oversight was required for some components. However, despite implementation delays, most enabling work was completed. Going forward, results should be vetted by the government for scale-up. For instance, the project did a review of the national Forestry and Wildlife Act. It also provided concrete management planning at five sites. Of the five, only one management plan requires substantial revisions. All the others have been thoroughly reviewed/revised, when necessary, before approval. The government can now take these before the Cabinet at the discretion of the Ministry. The project embarked on stakeholder engagement, including advocacy with civil society groups, legal/ law association members, and relevant government officials/departments that reflect satisfactory progress toward an improved regulatory and legal framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs. The MPA Unit, Fisheries Department, utilized the PA Systems Business Plan for proposed revision to fee structure. This has had some initial support from GoG officials. However, the on-the-ground COVID-19 realities/economic decline have prompted a postponement of any adjustment to the costs associated with fee management.
Output Two MS Climate-resilient SLM practices are applied in the Beauséjour watershed to reduce threats adjacent to and upstream of PAs.	In collaboration with the Ministry of Infrastructure and Works, National Water and Sewerage Authority Division, there was procurement of equipment and the establishment of an MOU to support ongoing water quality monitoring within the MPAs. The project aimed at improving the planning and management framework for SLM/INRM, which has shown moderate progression. For instance, the LUP was updated through the OECS commission GCCA project and is awaiting the Cabinet's approval but there was no change regarding the national forest policy considering carbon sequestration. The project successfully engaged stakeholders in an intersectoral watershed committee and continued to support the Fisheries Division which continued to monitor the quality of water within the MPAs. Additional capacity building was supported through collaboration with the T.A. Marryshow Community College. The Water Quality Monitoring course trained 15 participants from agencies including the Ministry of Climate Resilience et al., the Ministry of Agriculture, the National Water and Sewage Authority (NAWASA), and Her Majesty's Prisons. Since its establishment, the Intersectoral Committee has engaged with relevant community stakeholders for INRM. Significantly, this committee reviewed the Annandale and Beauséjour watershed management plan along with government counterparts and initiated activities to engage its members in the construction of septic tank units in the pilot area of New Hampshire to reduce nutrient runoff into the Beauséjour/Annandale MPA. Output two focused on farmer education and included a demonstration of co-management in six communities in the Beauséjour Watershed. The project did intensive work on the demonstration of management and cross-sectoral coordination work for sectors in the Beauséjour Watershed and the protected turtle area. This changed destructive agricultural and local practices (pesticides and fishing practices). For the turtle area, it was significant that locals voluntarily stopped fishing at 6 pm. This is a testimony to the value of education and public advocacy done by the project.

Indicators • Planning and management framework for SLM/INRM • Community participation in SFM • Direct carbon benefits through avoided deforestation, forest enrichment, and planting in the Beauséjour watershed • Turbidity levels/ sediment buildup at two MPAs downstream from Beauséjour • Pesticide and fertilizer levels at two MPAs downstream from Beauséjour • Application of gender and community-sensitive SLM and SFM practices in 6 communities (Beauséjour, Happy Hill, Granville Vale, New Hampshire, Annandale, and Vendome) • Impact of soil erosion/stability on household incomes of farmers within the Beauséjour watershed • Education and awareness levels	As an infrastructural development, the project added a storeroom to an office. Rainwater harvesting training has been implemented and physical infrastructure/equipment. A common criticism of the project by interviewees across the main groups (NGOs, government staff, IPs) was that the stakeholder engagement for the entire project could have been more strategic, directed at the different groups, and linked to a broader capacity building CB and HR succession plan for the Ministries involved. This required strong project management skills and foresight against the outcome-level results. The cross-sectoral collaboration, however, was viewed as an excellent showcase of the integrated natural resource management approaches, but more is needed to sustain this collaboration. The project also could have done more strategic communication on these aspects of the process.
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management **MU**	The low implementation rate resulting from limited PM capacity and ineffective procurement practices identified in the MTR improved during the last two years of the project 2019–2021. At that point, key activities had not been implemented, indicating a need for significant adaptive management inclusive of the recommendation of hiring a qualified project coordinator. A requested extension supported more significant achievements of the project's targets, which relied on the collaborative work of the government and stakeholders. While some adaptive interventions were implemented, funding will still have to be returned due to the delays, government Implementing Partner changes related to the Cabinet reshuffling (September/October 2020), and other scheduling impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic experienced throughout 2020-2021. In addition, for human capacity development, it should be noted that a key lesson was to engage in more apprenticeship-type activities. A mixture of interactions was needed between the project and the local people and stakeholders, including the international and national consultants. Good examples were reported as coming from recent projects, i.e., GIZ and the commonwealth climate finance access hub. In both examples, there was a built-in level of integration between the project and the local people for building sustained human development capacity, so the capacity and apprenticeship added to the project's work with the agencies.
Sustainability	The key sustainability issue that came up was related to financial sustainability. In this regard, how could the learning from the project-supported activities be continued and new skills and policies be monitored after the project? The

ML	stakeholders agreed that the key to PA system management is financial effectiveness and that the need was first to showcase the financial innovations in these PAs to demonstrate a solid economic case for a national management model. There were design and conceptualization issues, witnessed by one high-level official who held the view, supported by others, that if a good piece of legislation is not monetized, it will not be used. The financial aspects of a national management system with a variety of management models still needs to be showcased and operationalized. This financial demonstration is needed at both the national level and local level with PAs and communities living in or near TPAs/MPAs. In terms of the project's contribution to institutional human capacity development for coordination, the lesson here was to engage in apprenticeship-type activities. A mixture of interactions was needed among the project, the local people, and the stakeholders to be salient for the broader institutional framework. Good examples have come from recent projects, i.e., GIZ and the commonwealth climate finance access hub. In both, there was a built-in level of integration between the project and the local people for building sustained capacity, At times, the GEF policy and the design needed to be tweaked to get the desired resources and results. The UNDP GEF had a second ongoing project, climate-smart agriculture that was promoting a similar INRM/SLM approach, i.e., coordination, watershed management, and SLM CSM biodiversity. In terms of environmental sustainability and biodiversity, the project experienced difficulty in delinking environment and economy while at the same time building government. Due to limited government capacity, an external coordination role was identified. The external coordination can operate in a without frustrating the internal technical officer who would be free from the added task of coordination. There are opportunities to build on the lesson of this project implementation and to hone the focus on strategic gaps.

Conclusion

Several observations were noted throughout the Terminal Evaluation process, including the following:

1. From a technical perspective, the project technical oversight and quality assurance from the UNDP MCO, Regional Technical Advisors and the Government counterparts lacked a smooth initiation and coordination during implementation. This interruption in communication and coordination between these entities delayed the actions and interrupted the scheduling of activities. More could have been done to ensure clear benchmarks for joint monitoring. Further to this, the involvement of local consultants and stakeholders was lacking throughout the project.
2. Unattractive compensation packages resulted in the absence of a qualified PC for two years. This staffing gap resulted in the project staff responsible for accounting, to end up managing the project during this time. In this instance, UNDP should have placed greater emphasis on recruitment.
3. There must be more national ownership in terms of HR requirements with all staff open positions filled promptly.
4. There is a need for adequate support and resources to ensure national level implementation is well suited to local conditions, national constraints and capacity needs.
5. UNDP, however, was not entirely equipped for the role it was expected to play in oversight. The government was also at fault for creating or allowing bottlenecks. These are critical lessons learned and discussed throughout the report.

The current state of the key deliverables

While developing a land-use plan was not this project's remit, it was an important driver for the structural change envisioned by the project including the project's support work on the Forestry and Wildlife Act. The linked land-use work was under another GCC project, and according to stakeholders interviewed in

government departments, viewed as complementary. The land-use policy is before the legal committee for both policy and legislation. The Forestry and Wildlife Act was approved and was expected to go to parliament this year.

Key achievements (noted by the key stakeholders *interviewed)*

- The project successfully reviewed the national Forestry and Wildlife Act with national consultants, building on the international work completed years before. The project also developed five co-management plans; however, interviewees expressed that they did not receive a rigorous review. The project was behind schedule, seemingly due to poor project management (see appendix) and the technical reviews had been rushed. The management plans required further review as well as technical and public consultations. Two of these plans were showcased as good practices and have operational models that can be further assessed and scaled: Annandale National Park and Morne Gazo National Park. Work was done on the expansion of PA areas, complementing the activities and increasing the PA numbers. For instance, solid work was completed at the expansion of the marine area.
- With respect to marine, the Magazine Beach area was demarked as a national park. The government is taking action.
- The project supported the PA work directly by raising the profile of the need for PAs.
- Under outcome two, the SLM component was categorized as very useful. The project showcased a visible ridge-to-reef perspective, supported the education and demonstration target and rain harvesting. In addition, stakeholders said the education input on conservation and biodiversity value advocacy aspects impacted the more transformative mindset of the country's goals. Regarding the upstream work on legalizing forestry and wildlife protection, stakeholders explained that the government and public now understood the benefits for all: expanding and increasing the visibility of PAs for livelihoods and conservation measures.
- In general, most of the required legal products are in late draft form or approved. However, stakeholders indicated that these products require implementation. A related water policy has been approved, and the country has a draft land use act awaiting approval, while the Forestry and Wildlife Act is currently undergoing the legal process. Key stakeholders said additional support work was not needed in that regard. The country has approved coastal zone management policies and strategies.
- The scalable good practices that have emerged include Annandale National Park and Morne Gazo National Park, with Morne Gazo being properly demarcated. The government is rehabilitating the trails and a facility was built and leased to a private individual. This is a success story that has also showcased the financial viability and support for the private-public partnership PPP arrangement for the management of those areas.
- Notably in the design, the focus was on mainstreaming approaches, not on the concrete national level demonstration with a financial management plan for the national level PA system. Stakeholders explained that operationalizing the institutional and financial aspects from a national level is the next step.
- For the fishery-managed MPA, plans have been developed but additional vetting is required.
- The project completed the demarcation of the national park with buffer zones and showcased PPP in key marine areas. COVID-19 impacted showcasing financial benefits for tourism. The government may want to assess the two practices. Additionally, these practices can be scaled and replicated by the financial aspects as a new phase.

In general, key government stakeholders stated that this project might have been a better benchmark-good practice for the region as the design ideas and concepts behind it were needed in the Caribbean. Grenada was ahead of other countries with enabling legislation on national parks and earmarking MPAs and TPAs and other related policy legislation in the pipeline. The lack of solid project management from the beginning affected the outputs the country was looking for. Much was done to bring awareness and capabilities to the approach and biodiversity value. It will be useful to work on operationalizing the national park management system to focus on fiscal operations and co-management with communities and start a private-public partnership and payment for ecosystem approach related to the approved national forestry and wildlife policy and the soon-to-be approved land use policy.

Currently, several new projects are being examined including a GEF 6 project that will build on operationalizing this work in more watershed areas, with a Climate/Landscape focus.

The project requires follow-up including further project advocacy, inclusive of an exit strategy for the soon to be passed (based on reports by key officials, at maximum, by the end of this year 2021) Forestry and Wildlife Act and operationalizing the Forestry and Wildlife Act as a national PA system including showcasing the financial aspects of the project areas system from a national perspective. The focus might be on scaling the good practices shown by the two successful co-management cases done by this project, Annandale National Park and Morne Gazo National Park.

For the remaining areas where management plans have been developed, the need is for the government to technically review those management plans, which then need to be shared with the public. Stakeholders explained that the plans were properly reviewed but required further public consultation. It is advisable that Forestry take the lead supported by Fisheries, and Environment to propel the review forward. After the review process, the government can implement land-use stipulations in close consultation with the public, the landowners, and officials involved. According to interviewees, the greater land-use policy does not detail work on zoning because the land is privately owned. The policy instead focuses on land management and generating land information based on this. Accordingly, recommendations put forward to use the land according to the specification will be granted or refused based on their compliance with the regulations, i.e., if a developer holding land close to the beach wants to develop it and remove the mangrove, since mangroves cannot be removed, no permission would be granted.

A physical development law, i.e., rules on beaches, already exists and there has been a national parks advisory council since 1991. The policy now addresses how to manage one's land as a resource; the National Parks and Protected Areas Act speaks to the management of those lands.
The gap and need for follow-up that remains is to consider how these PA areas will be financed and fiscally managed at the national level. Establishing the forest advisory council was part of the Forestry and Wildlife Act. It is expected that continued momentum to support the legal work will set up the national management structure for revenue collection to financially manage the national parks and protected areas (pay for wardens and guards, community and public education, small infrastructure, control measures). There is a need for government follow-up to continue to implement the law, to set up the facilities, and operationalize the management of the national parks, including the PES, PPPs, and the collection of the fees. Currently, these areas are managed financially by Forestry and some by Fisheries. The national management coordination and the national system were not the design's intent. The design focused on developing individual management plan for all areas, with the development of an overarching management plan considered as next step.

Lessons learned

DESIGN	
Priorities of Country	In design, the project responded to and was aligned with country priorities regarding biodiversity management.
	The GEF project was intended to be a pilot project, a catalytic input toward transformative work. Nonetheless, a key lesson on design is that the project must be built on enabling conditions, and if those enabling conditions change, there must be quick oversight action/adaptive management. As a corollary, understanding national institutional capacities is crucial at the design stage, and technical stakeholders suggested that insufficient attention was paid to capacities and support needs. In this project, community stakeholders interviewed explained that there were gaps in availability of national support staff which negatively affected their work program. Another pivotal lesson learned regarding design was that the project coordinator's role of providing support to implementation, which involved the coordination of work plans, dialogue and buy-in between stakeholders was crucial to the design process. The project team worked towards the ultimate success of the project policy level results, However, for more systemic results (policy, institutional reforms desired), stakeholders highlighted the need for more strategic-level engagement on the use of vertical funds at the national level. An additional insight garnered is the need to spend more time on design and adequate costing, the UNDP support, i.e., to support smooth implementation in monitoring and procurement strategies for results incorporating the lesson from the failed previous project. A key lesson learned for the capacity-building approach is for the project coordinator to provide regular policy level briefings on project implementation with data gathered from the project integrated as part of a learning process.
Cross-cutting areas including gender mainstreaming and women's empowerment are needed in the Results Plan and Indicator Framework	This project was designed without a strong gender implementation strategy. While the project had several indicators concerned with gender results, i.e., gender-sensitive co-management, the work plan as envisioned by the project document with concrete measurable pilot activities involving women was not executed as planned. The project *did include* the recruitment of a gender specialist toward the end. This input was late but did produce a tangible upstream result that can be taken forward. The co-management experiences that benefit women however would have also provided stories for policy if co-management pilots had been strengthened during implementation.
UNDP and Government Procurement and Technical Monitoring Planning design issue	The procurement process was slow on both UNDP and government sides, causing a delay. Stakeholders indicated that an elaborated procurement and technical monitoring plan in the project design would have been preferable. Sufficient government attention to the project was also highlighted as an area for improvement. In some cases, the relationship for joint technical monitoring by UNDP and Government was established with limited capacity; it was, however, noted that, benchmarks and plans for procurement and vetting the project's outputs were available.
IMPLEMENTATION	

Implementation (capacity-building approach) and delivery	Based on reports from interviewees, the UNDP MCO and government partnership required a more strategic programme approach to GEF. The current practice of having disparate GEF projects in a small island nation has raised questions. The portfolio needed to be better coordinated with a holistic implementation approach to climate change, biodiversity, and the environment. Resilience is a very relevant theme for this dialogue in this region; the impact of a holistic approach within this area may result in reduced transaction costs by having a single GEF unit and cross-cutting areas like communications, evidence-based policy briefings, monitoring, and capacity building amalgamated. Stakeholders interviewed explained there was a dynamic staffing situation at the MCO over the past few years as the office experienced unprecedented turnover in leadership and project management; noteworthy is the turnover rate in 2018. Even though the MCO's DRR lea the majority of the work; leadership was still needed at the highest level as the GEF portfolio oversight required a much more strategic approach. Despite efforts to transfer to a more strategic NIM model, as best practice the MCO could shift from the project-led approach using the GEF portfolio for delivering on comparative value (good governance and institutional strengthening for resilience). A well-designed strategy, which takes into consideration a capacity assessment of what exists and the risks to that enabling context capacity was needed for the effective implementation of the NIM project. Additionally, it was found that as the project provided training, attrition occurred. The human capacity building component required systemic analysis which was beyond the scope of this project. The key finding was that there was a shortfall in terms of capacity building. It was not strategic and systemic, for example with allowances for master's and Ph.D. degrees and time commitments built into the program. There could have been more opportunities to build skills if coordination and/or IWRM INRM were seen to be the challenge. Then, information could have been provided on these issues with links to local trading institutions for sustainability, offered. The question was how to be more strategic in integrating capacity building into projects, for instance, to find donor partners with some stake in the human capacity issues; for this, a strategic approach was essential. In building government capacity, there was a strong role to support the relationship between environment and the economy with external coordination due to limited capacity. Additionally, this provided strength/value added to the technical officers in coordinating for results. There is a role for external coordination supported by UNDP, but this must be done in a manner allowing the activities to be absorbed.
UNDP RTA involvement: critical points for in-person monitoring	UNDP GEF RTA involvement on the ground (or in person via Zoom) to educate the national implementing partners firmly on what can be changed in the log frame during inception and MTR and take forward concrete adaptive management by changing the log frame as it is permitted and should be used as a monitoring tool.
UNDP support to implementation as value-added	The project required agility and flexibility in the implementation approach with good communication on strategic planning (programmatic and financial) for results achievement. With UNDP and PC, the need was for flexibility in the use of funding to solve a problem, e.g., providing Blackberry electronic devices for all to garner effective coordination. Stakeholders reported there was a weak feedback loop between UNDP and PC on communications for risk management, noting the need to instill how to manage a process and create a good loop of feedback on actions. This project went from a threshold of caution to risk mitigation to get back on track. UNDP stepped in as the government had significant capacity issues. The government wanted the project team, including UNDP and the PC, to guide and implement the project to results. Many of the issues around procurement lags were resolvable. Stakeholders indicated there was a misunderstanding of UNDP's support role from project start. The project was also lacking milestones with the high-level partner for joint monitoring and for technically vetting deliverables. The lesson learned relates to the HR planning and staff recruitment issue. UNDP can build on the lesson to recruit a PC with specific skills for NIM projects, i.e., a technical development "policy" generalist with networking and relationship-building, budgeting, excellent coordination, and initiative. The recruitment of the CTA in a technical project is the integral input for guiding execution and providing support to the RTA in oversight of technically complicated projects especially when the RTA is regional and not able to provide day-to-day and ongoing inputs and certainly if the project is flagged for acceleration or risk mitigation. As an example of the importance of building relationships (especially for influencing policy) and the importance of high-quality coordination between UNDP and the IP on HR, one of the key project targets has been to sign MOUs. This was mentioned by key interviewees from the steering committee as having been misinterpreted. The result of this is that the PC must continually meet with people to learn their priorities and build relationships based on project implementation and data gathered from the project. Additionally, the PC role is coordination, however, technical oversight and support were also very much required. There must be a relative technical expert in that conversation. This technical support assists the PC in implementation and making the case for policy.

Monitoring: GEF and building capacity for technical monitoring for results	GEF has clear guidelines for adapting the projects. Interviewees noted the NIM project proponents, including the PC, all needed GEF training and support on adaptive management early in the implementation and at MTR. The monitoring for adaptive management was technically weak in terms of GEF guidelines. While the monitoring occurred throughout, including day-to-day programme support, at the initial inception meeting and MTR, the project did not adequately adapt or make changes to the existing logical framework. While the MTR recommended reducing the number of sites, they were not changed (page 2, paragraph 4). "Mid Term Review (MTR) recommendations: the Project Board is not obligated to agree to every recommendation provided by the independent evaluator in the MTR report, including recommendations to change/alter the project results framework/log frame and/or to extend the duration of the project. The mandatory management response to the MTR must include a statement that the recommendations have been acknowledged and reviewed by the Project Board (date/place), and outline which recommendations are fully accepted, partially accepted, or rejected, and the justification for these decisions." If the proposed changes led to a material reduction in the expected global environmental benefits that would have been considered a major project revision and would not have been allowed. "Material" is defined as more than a 10% reduction in the expected approval at CEO endorsement. In this case, the MTR called to reduce the number of PAs targeted (see attached management response, yellow highlights). The project had the following targets: 7 MPAs managed under optimal conditions, and 9 TPAs + 4 mini TPAs (13 TPAs) effectively managed. Without incurring "material" reduction, the Project Board could have reduce scope from 7 to 6 MPAs. Stakeholders highlighted this was not done as it would have likely meant a material reduction. Without further GEF inputs on what was possible, *the MTR was left up to interpretation by a new PC without the tools to make adaptive measures concrete in the project documentation.* This restriction on adapting a project requires a critical review especially when the project is designed ambitiously. At the national level, stakeholders indicated the country needed a review on the quality of the manager or coordinator from the start. This goes with the lesson to recruit a technical advisor for such projects. Such groupings provide a second level of oversight and take the pressure off the PB members to do the main technical drafting of ToR and work plans in addition to their real role as the higher-level decision-making body.
Stakeholder engagement	Continuing education of the public and private sector including private landowners/users on the benefits of the NRM approach is central to results. Grenada has an issue of large land tenure under private ownership. Due to this, the governance over natural resources on those lands must be with the people. For instance, a company had recently bought some land; the minister and the developer met to discuss conditions on the way they are going to be executed and how water management would be handled. The lesson learned is that once the owner is part of the process and sees the value, cooperation and co-management is possible. Grenada has an opportunity to promote higher-end tourism focusing on nature. A key lesson learned is the need to translate the protecting biodiversity jargon into tourism jargon. Public education is central to all GEF initiatives and results. If dealt with holistically in the country, i.e., linked to education and public stakeholder work on climate, biodiversity, and environmental education, initiatives will be more strategic and efficient, i.e., with a programmatic approach to these issues rather than several GEF projects doing the same work. The budget for cross-cutting areas in a GEF unit, for example, might be amalgamated and cost-effective with one GEF unit per country, managed by an expert for policy messaging and cross-cutting areas including education, monitoring, and knowledge management. The success of this, however, will depend on the leadership quality of the liaison coordinator managing the unit and providing evidence-based policy to the National Director or Minister regularly. Seychelles has a good model to learn from in this regard.
Administration time and procurement	The government and UNDP need to revisit their procurement standards and expectations for results when implementing GEF projects. The UNDP would need a procurement plan built into the design so that it can cost-effectively support technical procurements. To be able to implement on time, the government needs to revisit the process for securing timely approvals. The lesson is to build this into the design of the project and get blanket approvals.
Partnerships	Synergies were built into the co-financing of the work program, i.e., a joint fund programme. The turnover in staff and teams at UNDP MCO impacted the execution of some key deliverables.
Results	
Replication/ catalyzing/ scaling up	Scaling up PA and INRM is a policy and institutional capacity issue. Government commitment to providing the reforms in the legal arrangements is necessary. Additionally, there are clear benchmarks needed in projects to allow ministers to vet technical proposals put forth by consultants on legal documents.
Private land ownership and sector engagement is critical in monitoring for	Grenada has an issue of large land tenure under private ownership. In this sense, the governance over natural resources on those lands must be with the people and the private landowners. The lesson learned is that if the landowner is part of the process, sees the value in biodiversity conservation, and cooperates, co-management will be effective. Before activities begin, there must be planning and there will be restrictions on use and management activities. Grenada has an opportunity to promote higher-end tourism focused on nature. Stakeholders identified one key lesson learned as the importance of communication in plain language to explain what is meant by biodiversity assets and value so that everybody understands the concepts.

results	Engagement of the private sector was a central focus needed for results and sustainability as the process of change needed to be led somewhat by the private sector, considering the market forces and the buy-in required. The private sector could have been more engaged in the lower watershed, i.e., showcasing fishing as a sustainable business.
Institutional capacity building for policy	The lesson learned was that the project's policy expected changes are process-level work. Those involved need to understand the policy window and the rules of the game during the journey. The key lesson learned for results was for the PC to always keep a check on the "rules of the (political) game." The political agenda of the current prime minister, recently returned to government, was a green declaration of 25%, and he was adamant about where he wanted to meet those targets. Then COVID came (2019-2020). The newly-appointed minister of the tourism authority has a good, close relationship with agriculture.
Science into Policy	To conduct evidence-based policy work, there was a need to build implementation strategies and indicators for science and scientific monitoring and science to policy (evidence-based policy) linkages in design. St George University is slated to conduct the baseline work for the new project. Such a strategy ensures long-term monitoring and continuous science to policy links.
SUSTAINABILITY	
Financial	While the project may set up a TPA or new MPA and allow the community to work in that framework, the question is sustainability, so the TPA/MPA must be established and running well. The key question was on financial sustainability and how the activities will be monitored after the project. The key to financial sustainability is to showcase financial innovation and make the economic case on the model. These are design and conceptualization issues. For instance, if a good piece of legislation is not monetized, it will not be used. The financial part of this project needs to be showcased as a demonstration.
Institutional Capacity Building	In terms of the project's contribution to human capacity development, the lesson learned, based on this and other GEF projects reviewed in the region was to engage in apprenticeship-type activities. A mixture of interactions was needed between the project and the local people and stakeholders to be salient for the institutional framework. Good examples have come from recent projects, i.e., GIZ and the commonwealth climate finance access hub. In both, there was a built-in level of integration between the project and the local people for developing sustained capacity, so the capacity and apprenticeship added to the project worked with the agencies. At times, the GEF policy and the design need to be tweaked to get the desired resources and results. The UNDP GEF has a second ongoing project, climate-smart agriculture that is promoting a similar INRM/SLM approach, i.e., coordination, watershed management, and SLM CSM biodiversity.
Socioeconomic	The project has sought to increase equality by supporting training programmes and workshops that provide gender mainstreaming and ensure participation by women and vulnerable groups. For fisherfolk and farming groups, gender mainstreaming took place in the form of capacity building in the areas of Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) and apiculture training programmes. Rainwater Harvesting and irrigation equipment supported gender inclusivity and included vulnerable groups in rural communities.
Environmental	In terms of the biodiversity topic, stakeholders indicated difficulty in delinking environment and economy. Interviewees in government departments reported the need for specific personnel assigned to provide support coordination, as Technical officers expressed frustration in executing coordination activities. An external coordination role can be assigned which operates in a manner that allows the activities to be absorbed. Thus, there are opportunities to build on the lesson of this project implementation and to hone the focus on strategic gaps.

Recommendations Table

Rec #	TE Recommendation	Entity Responsible	Time frame
A	Category 1: Policy and Legal Management Plans	Government/UNDP	2021
A.1	Key recommendation: Using the results of this project, conduct a final steering committee with a policy-focused presentation, following which the government can conduct a further vetting of the legal and policy-level deliverables, i.e., draft the national Forestry and Wildlife Act and pass it as soon as possible.		September 2021
A.2	Government can conduct a final vetting of the co-management plans in consultation with public and communities and approve them.		2021
B	Category 2: Design Phase Two of the Project Considering **the GEF funds allocated to the country**, the recommendation is that best practices, i.e., co-management, be operationalized and scaled up with focus on the assessment of the financial and sustainable livelihoods aspects to make the case for further government and donor investment.	Government	Mid- Late 2021
B.1	Key recommendation: Operationalize the National Forestry and Wildlife Law by building on the enabling environment with a second phase project. The focus of a new project could be on operationalization of the PA system and improved management at the national level. The phase two project can focus on the showcaseing and scaling up of the operationalization of the co-management plans. The second phase can focus on activities that promote the increasing of capacity for conservation and protection and the mindset for real biodiversity value, i.e., education and demonstration of a PA systems approach. This can include an overarching framing of financial benefits, and the implementation of co-management, showcasing payment for ecosystem services and private-public partnerships in rural T/MPAs.	Government	End of 2021

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Purpose of the evaluation

Following UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. The Terms of Reference (ToR) (Annex) set out the expectations for the TE of the *full-sized* project titled, "Implementing a "Ridge-to-Reef" Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem functions within and around Protected Areas in Grenada" *(PIMS #5087)* implemented through the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries, and the Environment. The project started on February 10, 2015 and is in its fifth year of implementation. The TE process follows the guidance outlined in the document, "Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects," and *Guidance for UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects.pdf*. TEs are useful for distilling lessons learned and the audience for this TE is UNDP, Government, and implementing partners.

1.2. Scope & Methodology

Scope
This TE assessed key areas related to the following:

1. Project Design/Formulation
    - project strategy
    - project design
    - project results framework
    - progress towards objectives and outcomes
    - management arrangements
    - work planning
    - stakeholder engagement

2. Project Implementation
    - project implementation and adaptive management
    - financial management and co-financing
    - project-level monitoring and evaluation
    - collaboration with the private sector

3. Project Results
    - GEF additionality
    - replicability
    - The pursuit of gender equality, reporting, communications, knowledge management, and sustainability

The intent was to distill lessons for future projects and cooperation.

Methodology
The Terminal Evaluation was theory- and evidence-based, following the GEF and UNDP guidelines as well as international standards, criteria and guidelines of the OECD-DAC: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and lessons learned (guidelines/standards for evaluating development and humanitarian

projects).[1] It has employed a range of qualitative and quantitative methodologies and was participatory, ensuring the inclusion of all relevant stakeholders' perspectives. The evaluator aimed to make an unbiased, objective, evidence-based assessment of the project's stated achievements/results. The evaluation specialist (ES) was externally recruited to provide technical leadership and objectivity for a useful, balanced, and forward-oriented terminal evaluation. The ES was responsible for the conduct and the overall implementation across four phases: inception and desk study, online and survey data collection, data analysis, and the final report writing process.

The standard GEF evaluation criteria guided the development of the evaluation matrix and questionnaire (see inception report) for assessing the project results and performance. The study was augmented by a set of strategic questions developed as the inception study progressed (for further details, see below). The partnership efficacy and project performance assessment were based on actual implementation.

Strategic Evaluation Question Topics:

Design

- Is the biodiversity mainstreaming focus on a PA system improvement and IW/NRM approach a priority for the country and is it needs-based, i.e., mainstreaming biodiversity through improving PA system management and financial aspects?
- Why, and what policies, institutional arrangements, and legal processes are ongoing that enable readiness for this work?
- Explain the logic including RR framework and project document strategies. For instance, the ES found the topic and scope broad and ambitious, including a complex component dealing with biodiversity mainstreaming and then one concerning operationalization, upstream and downstream work—component two—focused on protecting a critically endangered watershed. The planned work area includes six community-level focus sites.
- Have the project's strategies (and general refinement of the project's theory of change) been adequately interpreted at the inception period and been prescriptive enough?
- Was the design attached to capacity assessment for enabling context and readiness at the IP level? What had worked in the design and what needed tweaking? What changes happen to the logical framework at MTR?
- Were the expected results the right results?
- Was the R2R modality and approach suitable for the context, integration of SLM, REDD, with focus on PA system, etc.?

Implementation

- How well was UNDP's *support to NIM* set up? Was it costed correctly?
- How did the original log framework work out as a good monitoring tool?
- What were the adaptive measures put in place to reach results post-MTR?
- How did COVID-19 affect the implementation and shift priorities, i.e., MPA and PA legislation to health?
- How did the PC forge synergies between the two components and other linked projects for outcome-level results? For instance, the project was designed with built-in co-programming in several key areas: forestry, small grants, REDDs.
- What were the actual synergies to support results?

[1] Terminal Evaluations Guidelines attached.

- The GEF financing was to be catalytic in terms of topping up readiness. Was that the case?
- What were the contingencies put in place for possible dynamic transitions in government, in UNDP, with implementing partners, and with changeover of staff?
- How did UNDP technically provide oversight and support on the RTR approach? For instance, did UNDP bring international standards and experiences in the country to support the value added?

Results

- Were the results the intended results as presented in the logical framework?
- Did the project make a good contribution to the outcome goal?[ii]
- Has the project been able to successfully use the map of the biological diversity and conservation needs for biodiversity mainstreaming purposes?
- Was the baseline adequate for policy and action planning purposes?
- What policy incentives were enacted based on this project's work, given that Grenada has a special PA management situation with 85 percent of its territory under private control?
- How have Land Trust Agreements been engaging the private sector in this project's activities?
- What government incentives, i.e., policies and laws, have changed as a result?
- In terms of the systems improvements and legislative work in component one, which policies and acts needed to be changed?
- What did this project do to expand PAs and MPAs?

A. Evaluation Phases

Desk Review Phase

The first phase (March–April 2021) included an inception period to reconfirm the client's and the consultant's understanding of the ToR and undertake an in-depth desk study of the documentation, resources, and results framework. The first phase culminated in a set of core evaluation questions and tools for gathering data through mixed methods.[2] The first step included obtaining expert and evaluation stakeholder agreement on final methods (during COVID-19) and the draft evaluation matrix (questions to guide implementation). The ES developed a survey tool in line with the GEF evaluation question matrix (annex). The ES considered whether the targets and indicators were smart and the logical framework appropriate for the context. The evaluator conducted an assessment of the capacity development and the TA delivery mode including scrutinizing the project's "capacity development" baseline and targets. The Terminal Evaluation also assessed whether a capacity assessment and baseline had been adequately established. A dropbox folder for project documentation was created and shared. Finally, to achieve ownership and legitimacy of the process, an evaluation inception validation workshop was hosted with the support/reference group (annex) via the Microsoft Teams Video Conferencing Platform.

Data Collection

The second data collection phase (virtual; April 2021) validated information collected from the desk study with key informants (see list in annex) and confirmed whether the project had met, partially met, or not met its expected results and targets. The consultations were mixed, collecting data through a survey, focus group, questionnaires, team meetings, and a review of the reports and case studies. The orientation of questions tested the theory of change.

[2] The phase involves confirming the key evaluation questions (see a draft sample matrix attached) with the evaluation managers.

For this evaluation, the data collection and validation were primarily conducted by desk study and online. The second phase (April 2021), for primary data collection, was restricted to online work due to COVID-19 restrictions. The second phase included staging interviews with the Project Coordinator and her team, UNDP MCO, RTA government offices, country partners, project beneficiaries, implementing partners, and others.[3]
As the project had finalized activities at the time of TE (the project ended in March 2021), there was a challenge to identify and interview key informants. As such, snowballing (identifying key informants from others involved in the interview process) was used. A paper survey was sent with the initial request for interviews (attached) to high-level officials who delegated the interviews to those who participated across sectors and levels. The questionnaire was disseminated to those involved in the implementation and aimed to collect data on the program-level implementation goals and to solicit key insights as a forward-looking process.

The evaluation collected primary and secondary data from Regional and National Project Management and UNDP Support Units, other participating agencies, government agencies, and financing partners. Additional groups interviewed were from the private sector, NGO/CSOs, civil society, and other implementing partners.

Generally, targeting and snowballing were applied to select key informants and interviewees. One-to-one interviews were conducted via Zoom or Teams online calls made with key government stakeholders and UNDP support staff. The evaluator transcribed and coded all notes throughout the process.

Analysis and Synthesis Phase

The analysis phase included coding key themes and issues emerging from the data and validation against the project's stated success indicators and theory of change. This period included a study of the trends, gathering of perceptions based on experiences, reporting back on initial main findings, and incorporating comments. A draft evaluation report was then provided to the project partners to gather feedback. Finally, the evaluation results were presented to governments, donors, and other stakeholders.

Dissemination Phase

The final stage (April–May 2021) included efforts to finalize the report after receiving inputs, which required incorporating the comments received. The evaluation specialist shared the final findings report with the client and discussed the lesson learned.

Limitations

As this evaluation started after the project implementation had finished, it was a challenge to acquire the requested materials, identify key informants, and schedule the interviews on time. The evaluation process was further limited to online interviews due to COVID-19 travel restrictions. The agreed timeline was disrupted by natural events, i.e., the volcanic erruption in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines that impacted the region during the process. Normally, there would be international travel to visit the PC office and to the project sites but travel restrictions made this impossible.[iii] To mitigate these impacts, the information-gathering process was supported by UNDP. The evaluator employed a longer desk study and worked

[3] The TOR is the starting point.

closely with the UNDP M&E team to offset the limitations. As the evaluation progressed, the evaluator maintained the flexibility of who to interview by using snowballing to identify key informants.

Ethics

The evaluation was conducted following the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) "Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations."

1.3. Structure of the evaluation report

The report has key sections separated into six (6) distinct areas:

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. Project description
4. Findings
5. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons
6. Annexes

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1. Project Start and Duration

Key Project Dates	
PIF Approval Date	Nov 15, 2012
CEO Endorsement Date	Sep 12, 2014
Project Document Signature Date (project start date):	Feb 10, 2015
Date of Inception Workshop	Mar 19, 2015
Expected Date of Mid-term Review	Jan 1, 2018
Actual Date of Mid-term Review	Apr 13, 2018
Expected Date of Terminal Evaluation	Apr 30, 2021
Original Planned Closing Date	Feb 10, 2020
Revised Planned Closing Date	Jun 10, 2021

2.2. Development Context (Problems the project sought to address)

With a land area of around 340km², mainland Grenada is the most populated island (±101,000 inhabitants) of the Grenadine archipelago together with the islands of Carriacou and Petite Martinique (10,000 inhabitants). With mountainous landscapes of volcanic origin, the main island (310 km²) is characterized by a wide variety of ecosystems (cloud and rain forests, [semi-]evergreen forests, deciduous forests, cactus shrubs, littoral, and mangrove woodlands), most of which are under severe threat through the combination of anthropic pressure and natural disasters. Forests cover around 20% of the island; their main uses have been the provision of water supply, recreation (hunting), and the collection of medicinal plants and forest fruits. Agricultural land (including abandoned and fallow lands) covers up to 50% of the island.

With successive hurricanes in recent history, there has been a slow disengagement of the population in commercial agriculture with repositioning around horticulture and food crops. Coastal and marine

ecosystems (including corals, mangroves, and seagrasses) are of critical importance for fisheries, and beaches provide nesting grounds for many marine species. Habitat destruction and fragmentation, degradation of land and water resources, climate change impacts, and overexploitation of fisheries remain the main threats to biodiversity. Approximately 10% of mainland Grenada is considered "a protected area" however, only some of this area has been legally declared.

Grenada's Protected Areas are managed by the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries, and Environment. As a strategy to manage ecosystems under threat and conserve biodiversity and to comply with the Grenada Declaration and Caribbean Challenge, which set an objective of conservation of 25% of marine and terrestrial areas, the government is trying to upgrade its Protected Area system. To support Grenada's current protected system, the government relies on a series of policy instruments (e.g., National Heritage Areas, National Parks & Protected Areas, Planning and Development Control, Forest [iv]that were set up over the past 80 years, often with overlapping topics. The latest piece of legislation on Protected Areas, Forestry, and Wildlife of 2003 has not been finalized.

2.3. Immediate and development objectives of the project (threats and barriers)

According to the project document and situational analysis, the specific constraints to implementing INRM included insufficient planning and systems for PA management and limited institutional capacity for landscape NR planning. The inherent need for INRM was highlighted as an approach to be applied for biodiversity mainstreaming based on the following gaps: (a) lack of sufficient "command and control" of lands by government for the greater leadership role in INRM, (b) constraints for adopting consistent public policy options that allow incorporation of private forested lands into an integrated PA network, (c) lack of historical experience with a model for co-management with respect to BD conservation and ecosystem services/functions as eco-assets, (d) absence of effective structures to coordinate the activities of disparate agencies of government that must necessarily be involved in PA management, (e) lack of sufficient coordination between management of forests within PAs and neighboring landscapes that provide contesting ecosystems services, such as water sources, versus agricultural services, and prevent forest fragmentation for ensuring ecological connectivity, (f) lack of institutional capacity for public education enforcement and monitoring, (g) lack of priority and sufficient financing for BD conservation and ecosystems services, and (h) lack of tracking concerning the *status* and *trends* at ecosystems as starting point for responses to both anthropogenic and natural threats on BD and ecosystems functions.

Barriers the Project was expected to help overcome (ProDoc).

1. Lack of a systemic approach and mechanisms for Protected Areas Management and insufficient geographic coverage of TPAs and MPAs

- The mainstreaming of biodiversity into national policies, including the **2010 Protected Areas Systems Plan (PASP),**[4] has received only tacit support from the decision-makers at the national level. Policy direction for protected areas is generally dependent on existing legislation, which addresses only the three existing Forest Reserves, and there are no comprehensive policies for the conservation of biodiversity within marine and terrestrial PAs or for management of visitors and those whose livelihoods, in whole or in part, depend on PAs. Laws and regulations for protected area management are in place, but these overlap and contradict each other in many ways. There is a need to consolidate the legal framework based on the draft "Protected Area, Forestry, and Wildlife Bill" and strengthen enforcement

[4] Turner, M. (2011) Grenada Protected Areas System Plan. OECS Sect

mechanisms (particularly for wildlife conservation). Another priority is to establish legal mechanisms that allow for tax benefits to be granted to persons willing to donate lands to the PA system and/or to establish conservation covenants on their lands. Over 85% of Grenada is under private ownership, including all the islands within the proposed marine protected areas, and expansion of the PA system would require significant contributions from private owners. This is an important factor because the existing PA system does not adequately represent Grenada's ecological diversity. Of 26 environments classified in Grenada, only three terrestrial environments (cloud forest, transitional cloud forest, and evergreen forest) currently meet the target of 25% or more representation as expressed in the Grenada Declaration.

- Another issue is the absence of effective structures to coordinate the activities of disparate agencies involved in PA management, including the Department of Fisheries, the Department of Forestry and National Parks, and the Ministry of Tourism, which typically lack coordination in activities (for example, there is no coordination between the management of forests within PAs and neighboring productive landscape forests and forest fragments to ensure ecological connectivity, prevent fires, etc.), and there is a lack of institutional capacity for activities such as public education, enforcement, and monitoring. Furthermore, while Grenada has recently expressed its intention to initiate community co-management of both terrestrial and marine PAs, there is no experience with this approach among PA managers or local communities.

- Financing for protected areas is another key issue at present. The Government of Grenada spends US$1.8 million/year on PA management, which would not be sufficient to enable an effective expansion of the PA system. It is estimated that a total of 40 PA units would be in place when Grenada reaches its goal of 25% coverage. In addition to insufficient government budget allocations, other factors include the lack of a PA system business plan to increase efficiencies and prioritize the use of financial resources and the existing practice through which visitor fees are not retained by PA units or management agencies but instead go into the government's consolidated fund. Finally, management of protected areas is constrained by a lack of information on the status and trends of Grenada's ecosystems, including information on changes in ecosystem coverage over time, the composition of ecosystems and functions of various ecosystems' services, as well as changes in species abundance and distribution.

2. Insufficient Planning and Technical Capacities for Landscape Level Resource Management

- Existing National Forest Policy does not incorporate climate change-related objectives, e.g., carbon sequestration, and legislation to support the policy, which is still in draft form. Therefore, forest management currently relies on a decades-old legal framework (additionally, existing regulations for forest management do not apply to private lands). The separation of institutional authority and regulatory frameworks between protected areas and the broader landscape, and additionally between terrestrial and marine protected areas, acts as a barrier to an integrated landscape-level ridge-to-reef approach to managing Grenada's territory and resources. There is no central entity with oversight for land development decisions. Coordination between the many agencies responsible for environmental management is weak, and in some cases, there are overlaps in the jurisdiction or no clear competent authority. For example, concerning regulations to control development in mangroves and coastal wetlands, Grenada's National Physical Development Plan has limited policies and regulations and even fewer enforcement mechanisms to support sustainable land management, while the Physical Planning and Development Act does not refer at all to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. In general, land use planning and management processes in Grenada do not take into consideration the maintenance of ecosystem services for the benefit of biodiversity or ecosystem functioning. Many private landowners, including those living in areas bordering PAs, can develop their lands with few restrictions and no need

for compliance with land management plans. Landowners are not required by law to implement proper land management practices (e.g., there are no controls on grazing).

- Insufficient financing of SLM and SFM activities is another constraint; funding limitations mean that field activities of the MAFF are limited to outreach programs focused on crop/livestock production and controlling illegal activities within forest reserves. No programs are in place for activities to conserve ecosystem services, including research and monitoring. Capacities for forest management are also a limiting factor; forestry personnel require more technical training and better equipment. Another challenge is poor access to information on the status of land resources and ecosystem functions, which constrains both national-level planning and the design and execution of appropriate watershed management interventions. Among the agencies that generate and utilize spatial information products (such as the Land Use Division of the Ministry of Agriculture, the Physical Planning Unit, and the Cadastral Surveys Unit), systems of data collection, storage, and dissemination are poorly coordinated and largely incompatible.

- Finally, lack of awareness among farmers of viable SLM approaches inhibits the uptake of practices and technologies aimed at mitigating land degradation. Also, environmental management is largely seen as the domain of government, and as a result, a culture of conservation is not present in the utilization of land resources, directly leading to problems such as degradation of steep slopes through poor farming practices and destruction of mangrove ecosystems for marine development projects.

- Several limitations were identified with prospects for addressing problems concerning conservation and management of BD and ecosystem functions and in the context of CC adaptation. These limitations included the following:

1. a lack of existing provisions for incorporating a Climate Change objective (e.g., carbon sequestration) with legal requirements for CC responses as policy instruments for effective actions;

2. separation of responsibility for TPAs and the adjacent landscapes and the separation of authority thereby providing a challenge for the integrated development of PAs in the context of BD and ecosystems functions;

3. the lack of a central agency for the management of all land development since the physical planning development control functions for administration of land settlement seems to be separate from controls for agriculture promotion and expansion;

4. a lack of sufficient authority, law, and institutional support to the forestry department for the conservation and management of the BD (and wildlife) and ecosystem services at landscapes and in general;

5. a lack of sufficient “command and control” by the government concerning incorporating the multiplicity of medium-sized landholdings into an effective integrated natural resource management (INRM) system in the name of effective BD and ecosystems management and conservation;

6. the limited institutional financing for maintaining optimal manpower capacity to enforce and control for SLM and SFM;

7. the lack of capacity to make timely responses to unsustainable "LD hot-spots" and degraded bio-stocks and habitats;

8. the lack of awareness or sensitivity of farmers concerning viable SLM and SFM practices including new technologies;

9. The lack of mechanisms to mobilize farmers and landowners in SLM and SFM initiatives that they are aware of only through corporate action that could remedy "hotspots."

Even as private landowners are aware that neither they nor the government acting alone can alleviate crucial land management problems, the co-management approach is only in its incipient stage and has yet to demonstrate itself as a fully profitable tool for effective management.

2.4. Goals and Expected Results (Baseline Indicators established)

The project's goal is to provide multiple global and local benefits by strengthening land, forest, and reef management processes (ecosystem functions) and biodiversity conservation on all terrestrial landscapes and marine and seascapes in Grenada, especially within and around marine and terrestrial protected areas. This was to be achieved through a multifocal strategy having a ridge-to-reef approach that increases protected area management effectiveness and applies targeted land management practices to include these improvements:

(i) development of a policy-based legal, planning, and institutional/regulatory framework in support of a *sustainably managed network of TPAs and MPAs;*

(ii) development and management of landscapes and seascapes by adopting the approach of integrating *SLM and SFM/REDD+ principles and practices as a matter of public policy (integrated approach for managing forest ecosystems, protection, and sustainable use of the biodiversity, prevention of land/sea degradation, and integration of people's livelihood objectives within the management of forest and marine ecosystems*);

(iii) by piloting SFM/REDD+ and SLM practices in the Annandale/Beauséjour watershed to improve carbon stocks, reducing deforestation, reducing susceptibility to drought (and forest fires), and consequent land degradation that would impact downstream landscapes and seascapes.

The project sought to implement a ridge-to-reef approach which was envisioned to expand the existing PA system in the country through the establishment of one new terrestrial PA and four new marine PAs. The project intended to focus on reducing threats to biodiversity by addressing habitat degradation and over-exploitation of biological resources within PAs and contribute to halting and reversing current trends in land degradation. The project focus was on achieving *integrated watershed manage*ment through sustainable agriculture practices in the Beauséjour Watershed, which currently has direct and significant negative impacts on ecosystem services in protected areas. The aim was to prevent erosion and sedimentation from entering coastal and nearshore waters and create livelihood benefits for local communities while conserving important terrestrial, freshwater, and marine ecosystems.

The project would advance the implementation of the Grenada System Plan for Parks and Protected Areas and the Grenada Declaration (COP 8) to effectively conserve at least 25% of its marine and terrestrial ecosystems by 2020. The project would also provide multiple global and local benefits by strengthening land, forest, and reef management processes (ecosystem functions) and biodiversity conservation on all terrestrial landscapes and marine and seascapes in Grenada, especially within and around marine and

terrestrial protected areas. This was to be achieved through a multifocal strategy having a ridge-to-reef approach that increased protected area management effectiveness and applies targeted land management practices to include (i) development of a policy-based legal, planning, and institutional/ regulatory framework in support of a sustainably managed network of TPAs and MPAs; (ii) development and management of landscapes and seascapes by adopting the approach of integrating SLM and SFM/REDD+ principles and practices as a matter of public policy (integrated approach for managing forest ecosystems, protection, and sustainable use of the biodiversity, prevention of land/sea degradation, and integration of people's livelihood objectives within the management of forest and marine ecosystems; (iii) by piloting SFM/REDD+ and SLM practices in the Annandale/Beauséjour watershed to improve carbon stocks, reduce deforestation, and reduce susceptibility to drought (and forest fires) and consequent land degradation that would impact downstream landscapes and seascapes.

Pilot Sites

The focus of the project at the PA site level would be first to work on the 8 existing and 1 new TPA to convert them into 9 fully-functional TPAs, which together account for 5% of the landmass of Grenada, as well as 3 existing and 4 new MPAs for a total of 7 fully-functional MPAs. Four other micro-PAs are suggested for enhancements to boost the status of all as full TPAs in a complete network. Table 5 profiles the current classification/status at each of the 22 ridge-to-reef project sites and indicates their areal extent. The figure below (taken from the ProDoc) identifies ridge-to-reef site locations with their existing borders or projected boundaries, showing land classes and habitat types within and around project sites.

Official name/current designation/site status	**Land (ha)**	**Sea (ha)**	**Total area (ha)**	**Source**
Protected Area legally designated/established, approved management plan, actively managed				
Perseverance Protected Area[1]	113	-	113	Management plan
Grand Étang Forest Reserve	~1600	-	~1600	Management plan
Annandale Forest Reserve	236	-	236	Management plan
High North Forest Reserve	52	-	52	GPASP[2]
Molinière-Beauséjour Marine Protected Area	-	60	60	Management plan
Woburn Clarks Court Bay Marine Protected Area	-	438	438[4]	Management plan
Pearls	-	-	TBD	GPASP[2]
Proposed/pending designation active initiatives, draft management plan, in the parliamentary process				
Beauséjour Protected Area	60	-	60	Management Plan
Sandy Island/Oyster Bed Marine Protected Area	50[3]	737	787	Management plan
Mt. Hartman National Park and Protected Area[5]	62	-	62	GPASP[2], PIF[7]
Pond Protected Area	65	15	80[6]	Management Plan
Undesignated protected area existing management activities, but no management plan; lacks legislative designation				
Morne Gazo	25	-	25	GPASP[2],
Richmond Hill	8	-	8	GPASP[2], PIF[7]
Grand Bras	4	-	4	GPASP[2], PIF[7]
Mt. Moritz	8	-	8	GPASP[2], PIF[7]
Proposed protected area a priority area of interest established; projected initiatives				
Mt. St. Catherine	1000	-	1000	GPASP[2], PIF[7]

Official name/current designation/site status	Land (ha)	Sea (ha)	Total area (ha)	Source
High North addition	-	160	160	GPASP[2]
Levera marine area addition	25[8]	725	750	GPASP[2], PIF[7]
Molinière-Beauséjour marine area addition	-	240	240	PIF[7]
White Island marine area	130[9]	1970	2100	GPASP[2], PIF[7]
Grand Anse marine area	-	1500	1500	GPASP[2], PIF[7]
Southeast Coast marine area	5[10]	6995	7000	GPASP[2], PIF[7]

Baseline and Indicators (see section below - findings on these results)

Outcome #1	Indicator	Baseline	Target
Establishment and effective management of new and existing Protected Areas	Institutional framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs	No formal National Parks Advisory Council; Forestry Division administers 8 TPAs under suboptimal conditions; Fisheries Division administers 3 MPAs.	The formal establishment of a National Parks Advisory Council for TPAs and Management Committee for MPAs administering policy-based PAs.
	Regulatory and legal framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs	Forestry policy does not include INRM. The Fisheries division does not use INRM in its administration of MPAs. No PA System Business Plan exists	A finalized and approved *Protected Area Forestry and Wildlife Bill* with draft SROs that promote INRM practices and principles. The Fisheries division applying INRM principles and practices using enhanced law and/or regulations, within 2 years. PA System Business Plan developed and under implementation
	Expansion of protected areas system	3,711 ha of biodiverse landscapes/seascapes formally recognized and facing multiple threats: 8 TPAs managed under suboptimal conditions and 5 mini-TPAs with no management mechanism. TPAs cover 1,931 ha. 3 MPAs management under suboptimal conditions MPAs cover 1,780 ha.	16, 111 ha of biodiverse landscapes/seascapes formally recognized and managed effectively: 9 TPAs + 4 mini-TPAs effectively managed with legal demarcation, management plans, business plans, and adequate infrastructure in place. TPAs cover 2,931 ha. 7 MPAs managed under optimal conditions within 5 years. MPAs cover 13,180 ha.
	Measurable threat reduction: forest cover Direct carbon benefits,	 Continuous deforestation threatens 10,012 hectares 81,652.5tC (direct)	 10,012 hectares of the forested area maintained or increased

Outcome #1	Indicator	Baseline	Target
	Indirect carbon benefits, Mangrove, seagrass bed, and coral reef areas	322,158.3tC (indirect) The continuous destruction of 231 ha of mangrove, 1301 ha of seagrass, and 5095 ha of reef areas	81,652.5tC Directly maintained or increased 322,158.3tC Indirectly maintained or increased 231 ha of mangrove, 1301 ha of seagrass, and 5095 ha of reef areas maintained or increased
	Management of expanded PA network institutionalized	No coral reef resilience program (protocol) in place. No systematic SFM program in place No staff trained in planning accounting, bio-principal monitoring, enforcement, fire management, or co-management	Coral reef resilience program (protocol) in place within 5 years. SFM program adopted and administered in all PAs within 5 yrs. 13 PA Staff trained
	PA network infrastructure and services	Inconsistent infrastructure and facilities and services across TPAs and MPAs.	Standardized and quality infrastructure facilities and services to be available at all TPA and MPA units in the PA network.
	Community involvement in PA management through conservation and sustainable use of natural resources	0 communities adjacent to MPAs engaged in PA co-management 0 communities adjacent to TPAs engaged in PA co-management	3 communities adjacent to selected MPAs engaged in co-management 3 communities adjacent to selected TPAs engaged in PA co-management
	Benefits/profitability from conservation/ sustainable-use resource-based livelihood opportunities	No systematic collaboration for INRM linked to livelihood opportunities Minimal benefits from resource-based livelihoods	Incentive schemes to engage entrepreneurs in INRM practices linked to livelihoods A measured increase in benefits from resource-based livelihoods

Outcome #2	Indicator	Baseline	Target
Climate-resilient SLM practices applied in the Beauséjour watershed to reduce threats	Planning and management framework for SLM/INRM	No LUP regulations limiting agriculture and housing. National Forestry Policy does not consider C sequestration.	LUP regulations elaborated and implemented to limit agriculture and housing. NFP updated to include C sequestration.

Outcome #2	Indicator	Baseline	Target
adjacent to and upstream of PAs.		No intersectoral body or committee in place for implementing a watershed management plan using INRM approaches. Stakeholders not engaged in community-based rule-making for applying INRM practices. No systematic monitoring for water quality/quantity, sediment, and pollution impacts	An intersectoral committee established within Year 1 The intersectoral watershed committee engages stakeholders to formulate community-based rules for applying INRM practices within 2-3 yrs. A water quality/quantity protocol set in place within Year 2.
	Community participation in SFM.	No involvement of local stakeholders in initiatives to review and update the National Forest Policy (NFP) to consider carbon sequestration.	Community engaged in updating of NFP, and SROs promulgated by Year 3.
	Direct carbon benefits through avoided deforestation, forest enrichment, and planting in the Beauséjour watershed.	9,613tC sequestration by 3337.3 ha of private forest 4,320tC sequestration by 150 ha increase in forest cover with the removal of 40 ha of bamboo 0tC from avoided deforestation and sustainable planting products	9,613tC sequestration maintained in private forests 4320tC sequestration maintained At least 26066tC sequestration from avoided deforestation and sustainable planting products
	Turbidity levels/ sediment buildup at two MPAs downstream of Beauséjour	No turbidity index available; TBD within first 6 months of the project	15% reduction in turbidity
	Pesticide and fertilizer levels at two MPAs downstream of Beauséjour.	Grand Anse MPA: TBD within the first 6 months of the project Molinière/Beauséjour MPA: TBD within the first 6 months of the project	Grand Anse MPA: 15% reduction Molinière/Beauséjour MPA: 15% reduction
	Application of gender and community-sensitive SLM and SFM practices in 6 communities (Beauséjour, Happy Hill, Granville Vale, New Hampshire, Annandale, and Vendome)	No ongoing and systematic training. No agricultural production program implemented within the watershed. No rangeland management program implemented within the watershed. No forest management program implemented within the watershed.	6 villages trained in alternative livelihoods related to BD, SFM/SLM, and CC issues: A sustainable agricultural biodiversity program implemented by Year 3 A sustainable rangeland management program implemented by Year 3 SFM program involving forest enrichment with agroforest species to ensure SLM/SFM practices applied by Year 3
	Impact of soil erosion/stability on household incomes of farmers within the	No existing estimates of soil loss or land soil accumulation levels available. TBD within the first 6 months of the project	15% reduction of soil loss

Outcome #2	Indicator	Baseline	Target
	Beauséjour watershed	No statistics on farmer income available.[5] Initial survey to establish a baseline to be conducted during Year 1	25% increase in weekly income per farmer.
	Education and awareness levels	No education and awareness program	Public awareness campaign developed and implemented

2.5. Main stakeholders

The project was expected to engage a diverse set of stakeholders. The table below describes the principal stakeholders who had given tentative approval for the project. The project's success was dependent upon their active participation in project development and the implementation of project activities.

The FSP, in its design, recognizes different categories of stakeholders in terms of responsibilities, roles, and vested interests. For the Government Competent Authorities, there are those with direct biodiversity and ecosystem relevance whose roles and responsibilities would be virtual. The Competent Authorities, those who are beneficiaries of the enhanced environment, would be mainly recipients of an enhanced water source (NAWASA), with the Ministry of Tourism as recipients of enhanced Tourism sites to be utilized as tourism products. For the Fisheries Division as a Competent Authority, it would be an opportunity to better fulfill the mandate of ensuring optimal utilization of fisheries resources. For the Forestry Department, it would be an opportunity to better fulfill the objective of collaborating with allied agencies within the Ministry of Agriculture (extension services, agronomy, land use, etc.) for ensuring optimal utilization of forested landscapes that perform multiple ecosystem service functions.

As the providers of technical assistance for empowering local area persons, NGOs would be recipients of financial and other support as the responsible agents impacting local area communities in fulfillment of their mission of empowerment. Meanwhile, community-based organizations (farmers, fishers, and community development) would be both, recipients of assistance and facilitators of development targeted at their vested interests. Finally, for the donor-funding co-financing agencies, the project provided an opportunity to contribute to conservation and management of the BD and ecosystems functions at the local level in support of global and local benefits which were designed into their projects, whether bilateral or multilateral (Regional).

The relationships between institutions involved with project implementation and the bodies to be established by the project, as per UNDP project requirements, were outlined by the agreement as follows:

- Executive (UNDP): individual representing the project ownership to chair the group;
- Senior Supplier (Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries, and the Environment): Individual or group representing the interests of the parties concerned that provide funding for

[5] Statistical data is provided on p. 48 for gross income for each of the 6 communities participating in these pilots. However, the data does not specify the income of farmers, a sector expected to show increased revenue through the adoption and application of SFM/SLM/INRM practices through the project's interventions.

specific cost-sharing projects and/or technical expertise to the project. The Senior Supplier's primary function within the Board is to provide guidance to the technical feasibility of the project;

- Senior Beneficiary: individual or group of individuals representing the interests of those who would ultimately benefit from the project. The Senior Beneficiary's primary function within the Board is to ensure the realization of project's results from the perspective of project beneficiaries;
- Project Assurance (UNDP): Supports the Project Board Executive by carrying out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions.

Table (Project Document). Key Stakeholders considered highly relevant to the project

STAKEHOLDER (SH)	EXPECTED ROLE/CONTRIBUTION IN PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION
Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries, and Environment (MoA as chief SH) • Allied Statutory Body: Grenada Cocoa/Nutmeg Associations, for marketing products of tree-crop agriculture (Commodity Boards). • Allied Statutory Body: Marketing and National Importing Board (MNIB), for marketing Agricultural products produced by small-crop farmers.	This Competent Authority (CA) of Government is responsible for ensuring that the policy and legal framework are in place for effective management of natural resources, specifically BD and ecosystems services, and having overall responsibility for implementation of the project. This CA, as the agency with the widest scope of knowledge, skills, competencies, and historical experience for dealing with various aspects of the implementation and with legal and regulatory authority, is well placed to engage various divisions on the one hand and then engage land-based/sea-based livelihood communities on the other hand to protect the BD and ecosystems functions.
Division of Fisheries (Management)	This CA within the Ministry of Agriculture is directly responsible for conservation and management of seashore stocks, habitats, and sea space directly impacted by land-based economic activities, such as farming and various waste disposal outfalls, and can contribute to education awareness on conservation management issues.
Department of Forestry and Wildlife	The CA within the MoA is directly responsible for conservation and management of forested landscapes with their BD and ecosystem functions, notably the water source, and can contribute to education and awareness on conservation and management issues.
Land Use Division	The CA within the Ministry of Agriculture is responsible for monitoring and measurement of land and water resources and maintaining a database on the status and trends regarding Grenada's ecosystems.
Agri-Extension Division	This agency of the MoA maintains a liaison relationship with farmers (crop and livestock) to administer government support and render technical advisory services concerning sustainable agricultural technologies and practices.
Agronomy veterinary and related services	These agencies within MoA are responsible for providing specific support for farming options, such as cropping practices and preventative measures, so that farmers would be able to yield optimum benefits from their investments.
Ministry of Physical Development	This ministry is the Competent Authority responsible for controlling the exploration of aggregates from landscapes and seascapes and the authority through the Physical Planning Development Control Authority (PPDCA) that is responsible for ensuring sound SOPs for land and building construction and development. In a policy environment in which there is an urban and a rural land development regime, a sustainable land management policy might have to be negotiated through the initiatives of the project.
Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs):	The registered NGOs as private, nonprofit institutions were set up to deliver technical assistance and facilitatory services to empower individuals and

- Agency for Rural Transformation (ART), People In Action (PIA), St. Patrick's Environmental and Community Tourism Organization (SPECTO), Grenada Community Development Agency (GRENCODA)	communities, especially the economically vulnerable. The role of these organizations is to provide technical assistance and resources to CBOs and local area communities, acting as agents of the project or co-financing bodies that would provide financial resources in support. These agencies have accumulated knowledge, know-how, and experience over the years.
Community-Based Organizations: - North-East Farmers Organization, South-West Development organization, - National Farmers and Fisheries organization.	Local area vested interest groups, such as N/W Farmers' Organization, N/E Farmers' Organization, southern Fishermen's Organization, Inc., Grenada Federation of Agriculture and Fisheries organizations, Grenada Chamber of Industry and Commerce, together with commodity boards, would all play a role in the effort. CBOs would be expected to perform roles as either recipients or donors of assistance.
The Department of the Environment, now part of the Ministry of Agriculture	An agency within the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment which, when each contributes to the suite of ridge-to-reef initiatives both within the overall island landscapes/seascapes and within the targeted Beauséjour watershed (pilot area), would contribute to enhanced management and conservation of the BD and ecosystems functions in Grenada and with the concept of land/sea impacts in focus.
Ministry of Tourism	Since parts of PAs are used as National Parks and as a tourism product and such parks are now managed by the Ministry of Tourism as tourism attractions, the ministry of Tourism has responsibility for contributing to the process of expansion of the network of PAs and for facilitating the institutionalization of these parks within the protected areas network.
Allied Agencies Coast Guard, Grenada Board Of Tourism, Grenada Ports Authority Environmental Health Div. NAWASA, etc.	Such agencies as Competent Authority or as facilitators of their ministries' mandates would have roles and functions for security, safety, licensing of crafts and for quality control of water, quality control of products of BD, and ecosystems functions.
Education institutions and centers of excellence	The local St. Georges University (SGU) and regional institutions, such as The University of the West Indies (UWI) and Caribbean Environmental Health Institutes (CEHI), have considerable experience in the application of monitoring, measurement evaluation, and response (MMER) initiatives for landscape/seascape impacts when they collaborate with various regional and international agencies for such purposes.
Special initiatives of collaboration Government, GCIC GOG: Government of Grenada	The initiatives for which collaboration was employed for responses toward climate change adaptation were the following: 1. GCIC/GOG collaborated for the "outing" of GHG as refrigerants. 2. GCIC/GOG collaborated for the promotion of non-fossil energy consumption (Solar panel use) by pre-incentives to persons buying loans and equipment.
National Water and Sewerage Authority	Collaboration with various competent authorities to ensure that the water source is adequately protected from threats that would compromise potable water quality.

2.6. Theory of Change

The "R2R Project" TOC was designed to be a partnership (catalytic/incremental support) and to coordinate support to help Grenada's compliance with agreed-upon International Environmental Management and Conservation Strategies, Policies and Plans (e.g., MDGs and Aichi targets and goals) and to enable the technical and financial assistance of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The project intervention was thus a complement to the Government of Grenada's efforts on the local level to fulfill its obligations to various United Nations Conventions and Protocols (MEAs) concerning Biodiversity and Ecosystems Functions/services by applying program-based delivery systems and with co-management initiatives that would accommodate the involvement of local area communities in a direct way. This project was designed to address the GEF STAR 5 strategy for SLM, SFM/REDD+ together with focal areas such as BD, LD, and climate change mitigation (ECM). The project would uniquely co-program with concurrent grant-aid initiatives having similar goals and purposes.

Project Architecture (from original ProDoc)[v]

The project aims to reach its objective by achieving two interlinked outcomes:

1. "Establishment and effective management of new and existing Protected Areas," as a strategy to support a Grenada Protected Area System through establishing new and improving management of existing terrestrial and marine protected areas and help Grenada meet its commitments under the Caribbean Challenge to protect 25% of its nearshore habitat and 25% of its terrestrial habitat by 2020.

2. "Climate-resilient SLM practices applied in the Beauséjour watershed to reduce threats adjacent to and upstream of Protected Areas" to enhance biodiversity, reduce land degradation and improve carbon stocks.

Seven outputs are associated with these expected outcomes:

1. An Institutional Framework for Protected Area System management (under outcome 1),

2. A Legal and Regulatory Framework for Management of Protected Areas (under outcome 1),

3. An expanded Protected Areas System (under outcome 1),

4. Management of Protected Area Units institutionalized (under outcome 1),

5. Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources as a Means for Community Involvement in PA co-management (under outcome 1),

6. Strengthened planning and management framework, capacities, and awareness for participatory sustainable resource management (under outcome 2),

7. Improved SLM and SFM practices in 6 communities resulting in reduced deforestation and land and forest degradation in the landscapes surrounding PAs (under outcome 2).

In general, the TE found that the TOC was weakly presented in the project document. It was without corresponding strategies for cross-cutting areas as well as for interlinkages between the two outcomes. It

also required a visual describing the key drivers and assumptions with staked out pathways towards outcome-level results (i.e., coordination and capacity building, policy-level work, and finally demonstration i.e., co-management for project areas and SLM, REDD for INRM approaches).

3. FINDINGS

3.1. PROJECT DESIGN/FORMULATION[vi]

3.1.1. Formulation Analysis of Results Framework: Logic and Strategy

Interviewees reported that the project was overly ambitious; the logical framework represented two projects in one as there were two major outcome areas that could each have been a separate project. Additionally, interviewees reported the outcome-level target of mainstreaming biodiversity was vague and needed key messaging from the design stage. For the expected outcome area, the ProDoc must be interpreted clearly. In this case, the biodiversity language needed to be made concrete with the results translated into implementable actions, i.e., the economics and cost-effectiveness of the PA system for policy, co-management demonstration, and capacity building.

In reviewing the inception meeting notes, it was uncovered that the project design was incorrectly interpreted to denote Outcome one for land and Outcome two for water. This interpretation was simplistic, and the project was much more integrated around the idea of enabling activities and upstream work and demonstration of the concept in practice in outcome two. The inception period and first meeting needed more technical guidance to set the project off on the right track. The project required a much more cross-cutting perspective on the links between the first outcome, which focused on PA institutional improvement, and the second, which was focused on demonstration in a key at-risk watershed. Stakeholders highlighted the design needed to build in strategies for key messaging and communication, i.e., a protected areas improvement project with a focus on building institutions and human capacities for IWRM critical watersheds, PA systems management, and co-management demonstrations.

Stakeholders reported that the disconnected design (outcomes one and two), and the disjointed work planning resulted in an implementation that was disconnected from the reality on the ground. In this regard, stakeholders explained that the inception period which was meant for revisiting the design and addressing the gaps from design to implementation as well as planning strategies to make the project come alive was lacking technical and GEF support inputs. The absence of technical input and guidance was significant from the start and throughout the first period (until MTR- 2018). The stakeholders reported that the PB and PC needed the UNDP RTA technical support during the inception period and the project management was not technical enough to support the process i.e., support work planning and the design of Terms of Reference documents. In this case, the inception was found to be weakly supported, and the project started with some setbacks . This period needed solid work planning and scheduling.

Strong capacity-building strategies and indicators (performance monitoring) were also reported as needed for building natural resource-integrated management and monitoring capacity. A noteworthy recommendation from stakeholders was for a qualified coordinator to oversee key processes including building capacity for policy to facilitate integrated management.

Another significant finding was that the design and budgeting for NIM support was poorly costed. The actual cost for UNDP day-to-day support for implementation was not recognized. The lesson is to spend 80/20% of the time on design input (during the refinement/inception period) for ease of implementation. This includes the real costs of the requested UNDP program support. It is necessary to accurately assess

the connections between anticipated results and the alignment of budget in achieving these results. This involves including proper costing of UNDP support to execution including, coordination and monitoring, capacity building, and technically vetting the products. The takeaway was to include proper costing as well as a procurement plan to build capacity for monitoring and setting baselines.

Additionally, key implementing partners interviewed explained that the design of procurement and Human Resources planning components for the project should have been more robust with specific actions to be executed and documented. A critical review of the RR framework and the implementation strategies was necessary for results during the inception period as well as technical monitoring from ministries.

Finally, stakeholders reported that establishing a focus on technical environmental monitoring and sustained data collection for decision-making was vital. Interviewees explained that for the design, the PA state of the environment monitoring and management required a stronger capacity-building project strategy. For a project with a focus on coordination around common problems, bridging science to government policy and stimulating the private sector and public investments and co-management, the scope for technical monitoring, including setting a baseline and the long-term system for data collection, needed to be included. The project had included water quality monitoring on only part of the island, but this needed to be done island-wide.

Another key point is that building capacity for technical monitoring requires sustainability; for example, the project bought drones and taught workers to use them but did not include the cost of needed equipment, which is necessary to make monitoring of value. Needs should be discussed and considered early on concerning other aspects of monitoring.

3.1.2. Assumptions and Risks

Key assumptions included institutional stability and the full commitment of the government throughout project implementation. For instance, the underlying consensus among stakeholders at design was the government's willingness for PA expansion and connectivity. The assumption was that the national/international conditions would remain stable, and that the government would be willing to commit funding and resources to ensure the viability and resilience of the PA system inclusive of technical oversight of the legislation. However, this was not fulfilled by the end, as stakeholders reported that the project contributed to the legal work Forestry and Wildlife Act which, was expected to pass through the Cabinet in 2021. There were various other risks mentioned in the project document including extreme weather, fires, pests, and invasive species that might have went beyond predicted levels. In terms of relayed risk, these are described in the risk management section below but in general, the greatest assumption has been that of capacity to coordinate and manage the project and that an enabling environment exists to support this process.

Expectation from the government was that UNDP would fill in the coordination and monitoring for the management of project capacity gaps however, this was not clear and no clear benchmarks were created for technically monitoring the project at key intervals. The PSC, and its use, was partly the issue; as its role was confused with the technical work planning. Utilizing the PSC for debate on the issues and bottlenecks, i.e., procurement and recruitment issues that seem to have plagued the implementation, would have been more effective. These issues were corrected during the post MTR state but then the implementation was delayed significantly.

3.1.3. Planned Stakeholder Participation

Per the ProDoc, intense stakeholder participation was critical to this project's results. The project operated in an environment whereby 85 per cent of the land was under private ownership; therefore, the governance and management of those lands must be collaborative. The implementation arrangement allowed for the showcasing of planning and coordinating by key stakeholders using an integrated planning and collaborative management approach.

The following stakeholders were selected for work on the project steering committee as well as in technical focus groups, support to TORs and work planning: Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries (previously known as the Ministry of Agriculture Lands, Forestry, Fisheries, and Environment, MALFFE) as the Executing Agency; Forestry and National Parks Department (FNPD) under MALFFE for its role in forest ecosystems management, for administering SLM, SFM REDD+, BD, and CC mitigation and conservation, and for co-management development with local area groups and NGOs, CBOs - Land Use Division (LUD) for the application of SLM, SFM/RDD+, and CC mitigation principles and practices in collaboration with local area groups, NGOs/CBOs - Agricultural Extension Division (AED) for mobilizing and animating farmers for applying SLM, SFM/REDD+, BD and CC mitigation - Agronomy and Veterinary Division (A/VD) for promoting INRM through SLM, BD and CC mitigation practices - Marketing and National Importing Board (MNIB) for promoting sustainable agricultural production especially with respect to the pilot project at Beauséjour watershed (outcome two demonstration focus)- Fisheries Division (FD) for leading in the process of establishment of MPAs - Ministry of Tourism (Moot) to collaborate with other agencies for the establishment and expansion of PAs as either nature reserves or other attraction - National Water and Sewerage Authority (NAWASA) - Regional and local Centers of Excellence in support of sustainable management and conservation of the BD and Ecosystems services - St. George's University (SGU) - Caribbean Environmental Health Institute (CEHI), now the Caribbean Public Health Agency (CARPHA) - The University of the West Indies (UWI) - Recreational Dive-Services Providers as potential beneficiaries of PAs - Non-Government Organization (NGOs), mostly contracted for service delivery - Community-Based Organizations now identified as communities including farmers located in the Beauséjour watershed, namely Beauséjour, Happy Hill, Granville Vale, New Hampshire, Annandale, and Vendome, private landowners near/around potentially new protected areas, NEFO farmer's organizations, and fisheries' cooperatives/unions. Also, Beauséjour watershed school (students) were identified as direct stakeholders through communication and awareness-raising activities.

A key strategy for stakeholder engagement was the project board oversight meeting. Many stakeholders explained that the project needed a stakeholder element plan from inception and that the PB was muddled with the technical work planning resulting in the lack of strategic stakeholder engagement. Interviewees noted that the PSC meeting was also poorly conceived; the composition of the PSC included over ten members and had executed 12meetings which required a month's notice to convene and get a quorum. A more practical PSC design might have required a meeting of the highest-level partners, and optimally there should have been a separate technical work group to undertake critical intersectoral planning.

3.1.4. Lessons from relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design

According to the project document, the absence of effective structures to coordinate the activities of disparate agencies involved in PA management was identified. This lack of structure was evidenced by the failure of the Department of Fisheries, the Department of Forestry and National Parks, and the Ministry of Tourism, to coordinate their activities (for example, there was no coordination between the management of forests within PAs and neighboring productive landscape forests and forest fragments to ensure ecological connectivity, prevent fires, etc.) in addition to a lack of institutional capacity for activities

such as public education, enforcement, and monitoring. Furthermore, while Grenada recently expressed its intention to initiate community co-management of both terrestrial and marine PAs, there is no experience with this approach among PA managers or local communities.

Financing for protected areas has been another key issue (ProDoc, page 24). For instance, at the time of design, the Government of Grenada spent US$1.8 million/year on PA management, which was not viewed to be sufficient to enable an effective expansion of the PA system (it is estimated that a total of 40 PA units will be in place when Grenada reaches its goal of 25% coverage). In addition to insufficient government budget allocations, other factors included the lack of a PA system business plan to increase efficiencies and prioritize the use of financial resources and the existing practice whereby visitor fees are not retained by PA units or management agencies but instead go into the government's consolidated fund. Finally, management of protected areas was constrained by a lack of information on the status and trends of Grenada's ecosystems, including information on changes in ecosystem coverage over time, the composition of ecosystems and functions of various ecosystem services, and changes in species abundance and distribution.

3.1.5. Linkages between the project and other interventions within the sector

This project was designed (along with the *Grenada Forest Rehabilitation Project* and a proposed GIZ-funded project) as a key component of the government's strategy to implement the *Grenada Protected Area System Plan (2011)* and was expected to assist Grenada meet its obligations under the *Grenada Declaration*, a pledge made at the 8th Meeting of the Conference of Parties to the Convention of Biological Diversity in 2006 to effectively conserve at least 25% of its nearshore marine area and at least 25% of its terrestrial area by 2020 as a means to contribute to the sustainable livelihoods for its people and to contribute to the world's biodiversity. It was also designed to support Grenada's compliance with the Caribbean Challenge (2008), to which the country pledged to legally protect 20% of nearshore areas by 2020 via expansion and improved management effectiveness of its marine protected area system.[6]
The project was designed to enable Grenada to respond to conventions, such as UNCBD, UNCCD, and UNFCCC, more effectively, while also supporting a body of local laws and regulations (SROs) that are outcomes of the various preceding Conventions and Protocols. Each of these national strategies, policy statements, plans, reports, and assessments identify strongly and directly with livelihoods and with the conservation and management of ecosystem services and BD.

According to the ProDoc, the project had transformative "institutional change," i.e., INRM and coordination institutionalized as a process and educational transformative country-wide mind-set goals. The project was designed to achieve these goals through collaboration with others and to seek and accommodate co-financing/co-programming for planned activities, such as niche financing, from concurrent projects at the regional or local level. The implementation would be carried out in coordination with several other projects, as follows:
1. Implementing Integrated Land, Water & Wastewater Management in Caribbean SIDS Project (2012–2016) with GEF funding of US$20.4 million. In Grenada, the lead agencies are the Ministry of Agriculture through the Land Use Division and the Forestry Department. Activities would focus on the development and application of national IW-related indicators and strengthening the scientific basis for effective monitoring and assessment in the LD and related BD Focal Areas.
2. Sustainable Financing & Management of Eastern Caribbean Marine Ecosystem Project, a GEF-WB-TNC project, was launched in March 2012 with a budget of US$19.4 million, including $8.75 million from the

[6] Roberts, D (See Outcomes of the FSP Project Preparation Process (2013/14)

GEF. Component 1 of the project, "Establishment of sustainable financing mechanisms," would set up a Caribbean Biodiversity Fund (CBF) for participating OECS countries (Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines). Component 2, "Strengthening and phased expansion of Marine Protected Area Networks," would gazette at least five new marine protected areas and establish at least two demonstration sites to generate useful MPA management information and lessons for other countries in the Caribbean region. Component 3, "Deployment of a regional monitoring and information system," is intended to establish a database on status and trends in the protected area systems of the OECS countries and could serve as a decision support tool for natural resource managers and policymakers.

Grenada's Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, and Fisheries & Environment had launched the Caribbean Aqua-Terrestrial Solutions (CATS) regional development cooperation program between CARICOM and GIZ in November 2013.[7] The R2R project designers were in contact with two regional initiatives to determine the feasibility of coordinating complementary activities and identifying synergies. The two regional projects were anticipated to contribute to future planning exercises by the R2R project proponents. While there had been coordination and synergies, this coordination from the PC with the government was weakly supported.

Gender responsiveness of project design

The Evaluator learned the project sought to increase gender equality by supporting training programmes and workshops that provide gender mainstreaming and ensure participation by women and vulnerable groups. For fisher folk and farming groups, gender mainstreaming took place for capacity building in the areas of Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) and apiculture training programmes. Further to that, the provision of rainwater harvesting and irrigation equipment supported gender empowerment goals by ensuring women had access to required equipment to control their resources; equipment was also provided to rural communities. Per design, the project had expressed intentions as follows: contributing to closing gender gaps in access to and control over resources: improving the participation and decision-making of women in natural resource governance: targeting socioeconomic benefits and services for women.

3.1.6. Social and Environmental Safeguards

At the period of design and during most of the implementation, UNDP did not have a safeguard screening policy for new projects, which was not apparent in the design or monitoring. However, the project managers noted that this was highlighted during the implementation of several activities, in particular the co-management work. The project was operating with a "do no harm" principle.

3.2. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

3.2.1. Adaptive Management[vii]

The project had been operating since 2015 and was originally scheduled to close in November 2020. The Project Coordinator, who only joined in November 2018, was hired post-MTR. From the MTR onwards, the PC's job was to accelerate implementation and achieve results in the time left. Stakeholders explained

[7] http://caribbeanclimateblog.com/2013/11/25/caribbean-aqua-terrestrial-solutions-launched-in-grenada-7-countries-to-follow/

that the project had good visibility throughout as there were noted efforts for increased visibility including an updated website, public education videos, newspaper and other activities. However, some deliverables were not prioritized and although they were expected to be accomplished. An example of key activities which were not completed were the FAD project and passed legislation on protected areas. However, stakeholder feedback suggests that t the FAD activity was merely a suggested activity for sustainable livelihoods but and not an explicit requirement in the Results Framework.; As it related to sustainable livelihoods, activities were undertaken including rainwater harvesting and sustainable land management, composting, apiculture, moorings support etc. Stakeholders also indicated that there was a large public education campaign with accompanying videos and other materials.

While some stakeholders reported that funds were spent on material goods including boats and small equipment which may not have been required expenditure, others noted these were important. Stakeholders involved in implementation (PSC) reported that more collaboration with the Tourism ministry and operators (as they are the users of T/MPAs) may have been useful. In this regard, it was explained that there also needed to be a showcase of the financial viability of a national protected area system before the PA national management policies could be argued concretely. Stakeholders reported that Project management did not fully comprehend that the reality for cross sector collaboration was about influencing land-use planning and that more could have been done to secure land-use plan legislation. Otherwise, such intersectoral collaboration at the level of the community and region ecosystem would remain a voluntary issue. The Evaluator is of the view that adaptive management might have recognized the need for platforms to be created for cross sector coordination and engagement with the private sector and the public. The MTR was completed in April 2019, and, except for education, activities were marked as off-track. This was a key moment for the project team, the implementing partner and UNDP to conduct adaptive management. Two consultants met with the CO program analyst and management where it was agreed that the project had several challenges; these included delayed procurement implementation, changes of implementing partners, a dynamic implementing context, as well as project staff changes within UNDP.

Dynamic Political Context: Enabling environment context-changing challenge
A dynamic implementation context and IP issues delayed implementation significantly. The project was first implemented by Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Fisheries in 2015–2018. The synopsis of the challenge began as such: There was an issue with the Fisheries Division, within which the PIU was initially hosted. Irregularities in the overall management within the Fisheries Division were identified and eventually this Ministry was dismantled after a change in government in 2018. The Government focal point at the start was with the marine protected areas MPA coordinator and chief fisheries office; after which there was the physical relocation of the PIU, a change from the original host at Fisheries. The MPA Coordinator and Chief Fisheries Officer demitted office and the project was suspended for a while.

Subsequently, the project was assigned to the Ministry of Climate of Climate Resilience et al., which was a new ministry established in 2018. Notably, the Ministries of Agriculture and Land were no longer project counterparts. The PIU was moved into the Ministry of Climate Resilience, Environment, Forestry, Fisheries, Disaster Management and Information. It included the environment education division, which was under Education, Climate Resilience, and Disaster. A strength of the second change was better coordination built into the super-ministry as well as a supportive environment for adaptive management. Unfortunately, while the PIU potentially had a more conducive enabling environment, the PS has been changed three times, and each time the PC had to reintroduce the Project context (objectives, pending activities etc.). This not only involved a simple reintroduction to the concept but as the PS is also the Project Director/ PSC there was a significant amount of engagement required both for the knowledge and

buy-in for project implementation, also for supporting with coordination and alleviating bottleneck experience with intersectoral activities.

Compounding delays in implementation: COVID-19
Changes in staff in UNDP and Government caused delays. Between 2018 and 2020, *the ministry was dismantled*, and the Cabinet was reshuffled. The Project activities related to Terrestrial Protected Areas Management activities which was originally with tourism and Forestry, was moved to Agriculture, and Lands. The Fisheries Division was moved to another Ministry with Sport, Cooperatives, Culture, and Fisheries while the Climate Resilience and Environment Division had been moved to the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation. The resulting situation from the Cabinet reshuffle in the government and the changed ministerial portfolios/ Ministries proved challenging for coordinating activities in the initial instance of these changes.
Additionally, COVID-19 negatively influenced the prioritized project plan under the new PC substantively (March 2020- March 2021). In March 2020 the Government implemented a limited state of emergency. For over 6 weeks public offices were placed on lock-down given the need for public health restrictions on physical interaction/distancing. These circumstances hindered many previously planned substantive activities for the final year to speed up delivery and achieve results in the final year. The project had been granted one extension through March 2021. No subsequent extension was granted despite the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and the Cabinet changes.

Capacity building (implementation) approach
A key finding was the shortfall in the design and approach for capacity building. There was an opportunity to build certain skills including PA systems coordination or biodiversity mainstreaming and to consider the longer-term training needs i.e. links to universities or colleges, however, the capacity building was not strategic or sustainable. Additionally, if coordination for mainstreaming biodiversity was seen as the challenge, then, "*something fell short*" reported one knowledgeable government staff member. A key problem unearthed was the need to build longer-term strategic capacity into projects. For sustainability, identification of capacity needs for sustainability is essential because issues like sustaining human capacity were not necessarily identified. The request for co-financing, for example, could have been in-kind. Such work would be possible if there had been a "training of trainers" or a conscientious apprenticeship program built-in. During this project, there was a hold on contracts. Sustaining the capacity building however was a key result. The project team was reported to be deliberate in trying to build capacity by engaging people to work together in implementation. This was critical as a demonstrated approach of what was needed.
Key stakeholders interviewed also note, the MOA did support the national parks advisory committee which was specialized to support key functions and did identify staff to help with the capacity. It is envisioned that after project completion, this capacity will be in place to carry forward the results and work.

3.2.2. Stakeholder and Partners Engagement

Participation and public awareness:
The project made efforts to promote the use of digital and printed knowledge products and tools for wide stakeholder engagement and focused on capacity building to support activities geared toward enhanced biodiversity conservation, alternative livelihoods opportunities, and capacity to manage natural resources. The project also produced training manuals and other support materials for enhanced climate-smart agriculture to reduce land degradation and sustainable forest management to support community involvement in reforestation activities. The engagement activities with community and public were in

direct response to feedback for community engagement, review of technical reports, and enhanced access to training to support community livelihoods. The project teams participated in the Sustainable Development Council meetings, and other public events, such as Sailing Week, and other partnerships with Grenada Hotel and Tourism Association (such as Christmas on the Careenage). There were also ongoing school engagements. Most project activities were redesigned to meet the realities of COVID-19 such as the provision of equipment to farmers and fisherfolk which can support food security and livelihoods development which could serve as a supportive recovery activity for COVID-19 impacts. Activities that involved stakeholder engagement had to be carried out virtually. There was also some engagement that included social media and press releases. As part of its ongoing communications and advocacy strategy, the project maintained a website and published press releases for public communication.

Project page on the CO website:
http://www.bb.undp.org/content/barbados/en/home/operations/projects/environment_and_energy/RidgetoReef.html

Project website:
http://ridgetoreef.gd/

Webinar on Fisher folk and Farmers Going Digital
In response to COVID-19, the project partnered with colleagues in the Blue Accelerator Lab and Farm finder to boost e-commerce growth among fisher folk and farmers for the #future.

Newspaper articles:
"Royals visit "Ridge to Reef" at the Blue Economy Exhibition. 26 March 2019," https://www.nowgrenada.com/2019/03/royals-visit-ridge-to-reef-at-the-blue-economy-exhibition/
"Inspiring Grenada's Future Marine Scientists," https://www.nowgrenada.com/2019/04/inspiring-grenadas-future-marine-scientists/
"SCUBA Dive Training with R2R Project," https://www.nowgrenada.com/2019/07/scuba-dive-training-with-r2r-project/

Gender:
The gender action plan is discussed below i.e., in achieving gender mainstreaming objectives. Women groups, NGOs, civil society organizations, and women's ministries were consulted and involved in project design as well in implementation, however this could have been much more deliberate, though there was a gender input (see results table).

3.2.3. Project Finance and Co-finance

The project was financed by the GEF with a total grant of US$2,743,488. The financial arrangements and procedures for the project are governed by UNDP rules and regulations for National Implementation (NIM). Financial transactions were to be based on direct requests to UNDP from the National Project Director and/ or Project Coordinator for specific activities (included in work plans and financial reports) and for advances for petty cash where necessary and considering the difficulties of implementation in many remote areas. The arrangements for financial reporting, requests for transfer of funds, and the advance and disbursement of funds were in turn, detailed in MOUs between MoA and its implementing partners. All procurement and financial transactions were governed by national rules and regulations, and thus were compatible with the UNDP rules and regulations which was verified.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP financing (US$m)		Government (US$m)		Partner Agency (US$m)		Total (US$m)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants Loans/ Concessions In-kind support								
	250,000	250,000	15,176,822	250,000			15,426,822	500,000
Other Totals	250,000	250,000	15,176,822	250,000			15,426,822	500,000

Confirmed Sources of Co-Financing at TE Stage

Sources of Co-Financing	Name of Cofinancier	Type of Cofinancing	Investment Mobilized	Amount (US$)
	Select one:	*Select one:*		
	UNDP *Ministry of Environment* *Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry* *Ministry of Tourism*	Grant In-kind Support In-kind Support In-kind Support	• *Recurrent expenditure***	250,000 100,000 100,000 50,000
Total Co-Financing				500,000

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Total Planned (USD)	Total Expenditure (USD)
Outcome 1: Establishment and effective management of new and existing Protected Areas	**755,093**	**492,668**	**327,690**	**205,084**	**164,465**	**1,945,000**	**1,758,987.33**
Outcome 2: Climate resilient SLM practices applied in the Beausejour watershed to reduce threats adjacent to and upstream of PAs	**1,620**	**334,995**	**162,564**	**223,141**	**224,505**	**946,825**	**563,280.99**
Project Management	**27,969**	**27,969**	**27,969**	**27,969**	**27,969**	**139,841**	**119,434.26**
Grand Total	**784,682**	**855,632**	**518,223**	**456,194**	**416,939**	**3,031,666**	**2,729,142.73**

3.2.4. Monitoring and Reporting: Design (S), Implementation (MS), Overall (MS)

According to the ProDoc, the M&E would be conducted following the established UNDP and GEF procedures. The project team was responsible for gathering data and conducting risk assessments and first-hand monitoring of activities. The UNDP Multi-Country Office in Barbados provided second-tier monitoring and was responsible for conducting field visits to project sites based on agreed schedule in the annual work plans to assess project's progress. Finally, the UNDP/GEF (now, the Nature, Climate and Energy cluster) based in the UNDP Panama Regional Hub for Latin America and the Caribbean provided oversight and quality assurance to the project implementation. The Project Steering Committee also played a critical role in project monitoring and evaluations by quality assurance processes and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning. It ensured that required resources are committed and arbitrates on any conflicts within the project, or negotiates a solution to any problems with external bodies.
The Project Results Framework provided performance and impact indicators for implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The M&E plan (please see table below) included an inception report, project implementation reviews, quarterly and annual review reports, mid-term and final evaluations, and audits.

M&E Workplan and Budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US$ *Excluding project team staff time*	Time frame
Inception Workshop	▪ Project Coordinator ▪ UNDP Sub-Regional Office ▪ UNDP GEF	▪ Indicative cost: 5,000	Within first two months of project start-up

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US$ *Excluding project team staff time*	Time frame
Inception Report	▪ Project Team ▪ UNDP Sub-Regional Office	▪ None	Immediately following IW (within 2 months after IW)
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results	• Project Coordinator (with support/advice from UNDP/GEF RTA) will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members	▪ To be determined during the initial phase of implementation of the project and the IW	Start, mid-point, and end of project
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on *output and implementation*	▪ Oversight by Project Coordinator ▪ Project team	▪ None	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	▪ Project Coordinator and Team ▪ UNDP Sub-Regional Office ▪ UNDP GEF	▪ None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	▪ Project Coordinator and Team	▪ None	Quarterly
Tripartite Committee Reviews and Reports	▪ GoG counterparts ▪ UNDP/GEF	▪ None	Annually, upon receipt of APR/PIR
Steering Committee/Board Meetings	▪ Project Coordinator ▪ UNCP-Sub-Regional Office ▪ GoG representatives	▪ 2,500 (GEF) ▪ 3,000 (CoF)	Following IW, and subsequently at least twice per year
Mid-term Review, including update of METT and ESSP	▪ Project Coordinator and Team ▪ UNDP-Sub-Regional Office ▪ UNDP/GEF RCU ▪ External Consultants (evaluation team)	▪ Indicative cost: 32,468	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation, including final METT and ESSP	▪ Project Coordinator and Team ▪ UNDP-Sub-Regional Office ▪ UNDP/GEF RCU	▪ Indicative cost : 40,468	At least three months before the end of project implementation

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US$ *Excluding project team staff time*	Time frame
	▪ External Consultants (evaluation team)		
Project Terminal Report	▪ Project Team ▪ UNDP-Sub-Regional Office	▪ None	At least three months before the end of the project
Lessons learned	▪ Project Coordinator and Team ▪ UNDP-GEF RCU (suggested formats for documenting best practices, etc.)	▪ 5,000 (GEF) ▪ 4,000 (CoF) ▪ Indicative Cost Cost:US$9,000	Yearly
Audit	▪ UNDP-Sub-Regional Office ▪ Project Coordinator and Team ▪ Auditors	▪ 15,000 (indicative cost per year: 3,000)	Annually
Visits to field sites	▪ UNDP CO ▪ UNDP RSC (as appropriate) ▪ Government representatives	▪ For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Annually
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US$ 100,436 (+/- 3.3% of total budget)	

The project was rated as Moderately Satisfactory in its M&E processes. The project progress was monitored through the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform, and through project document monitoring requirements, however critical action taken on identified risks was slow. The Evaluator learned the MTR provided a good analysis of the situation but failed to go the additional step and correct the project resourcing and indicator framework with the team i.e. develop smarter indicators and set realistic targets. The Evaluator learned this was due to a lack of GEF specific guidance on the role of the MTR at the beginning of the process (See more insights below). The project did not use the MTR mechanism in the project as it could have.

ATLAS logs were used to update risks; the use of these functions has been a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard. Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR were

completed and reviewed by the TE, and the Subregional Office conducted visits to project sites. A Field Visit Report/BTOR was prepared by the UNDP Subregional Office and UNDP RSC and was circulated after the visits to the project team and PSC members.
An independent Mid-Term Review was completed (project months 28–29, see below finding) but the recommendations were not actionable (see elaborated point below). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools for Land Degradation, Biodiversity (METT scores), and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM/REDD) as approved under the GEF CEO Endorsement were not completed during the MTR. Results from the learning and knowledge-sharing project were disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information-sharing networks and forums.

The unfinished MTR provided explicit recommendations, but the results were not actionable (how) and there were no changes made to the Results and Resourcing Framework.
The MTR pointed out that while Adaptive Management was the central MTR message, it was not expressed on paper. The MTR recommendations were reported by implementing interviewees as not actionable. Post-MTR, the call was for adaptive management through reducing targets, reducing the number of sites and adjusting budgets, but again it was not made explicit through a change in the work plan or indicators , i.e., reduction of project sites for PA expansion work. The PC's job was to look at the stated challenges and then identify an opportunity to make priorities. The MTR wanted to focus on the protected area, but the question was how to do it. The management response did not action the recommendation to scale down the project sites. A lesson learned was to firmly educate the implementing partners on *what can be changed at the inception and the MTR*, so that they take concrete forward adaptive management by changing the log frame sensibly and as permitted, and it can continue to be used as a monitoring tool.

The likelihood of achieving results post-MTR: As mentioned, interviewees expressed that the MTR recommendations were not actionable. The recommendation did not list priorities, and the PC needed to select the focus and drill it down. The PC chose the Terrestrial group since it was familiar with the procedures. The question then became, which PS and Ministry. While the potential of the financial mechanism was the stated government interest, there was no clear strategy for it in the ProDoc (overambitious and spread too thin to do substantive showcasing of a financial mechanism).

ME: CTA Technical Monitoring and HR issues
The evaluator uncovered that the project staffed a Chief Technical Advisor during the early stages of implementation; however, according to interviewees, there were shortcomings, and this staffing arrangement was discontinued pre-MTR (MCO 15 September 2017 to 14 September 2018). It was recognized however, that there was a need for technical rigor and vetting work and the position was essential to results. However, the CTA re-recruitment issue was not solved, and communication was highlighted to be a key bottleneck between UNDP and the PC unit-government counterpart. The RTA provided oversight through the PIR process, but this did not equal the significant role of technical oversight for results needed in a project such as this one. While the project coordinator role is to build relationships and coordinate, *technical oversight* is an additional, specialized role and essential to results and vetting the deliverables. Additionally, the science and policy must be equally strong in such an exercise so that the policymaker can make recommendations and better manage the results, not just the deliverables. While the PC can draft the Cabinet submissions, the role still needs technical inputs for the drafts to be complete. A CTA is essential in this type of project to convince others of the importance of scientific arguments for the expansion of the protected areas and to provide substantive oversight.

Technical quality of products

Technical monitoring and support for integrated work planning were reported as weak. For instance, while reforestation activities existed, the project had never established a proper baseline. Many, activities planned, such as mangrove replanting, were not done. The project reported on anecdotal messages based on the nurseries and seagrass targets rather than proper baseline changes. While the ProDoc established a baseline at the inception, it was not monitored or refined. Interviewees noted the integrated watershed management plan was not strong and the process of developing it demonstrated capacity add-on weakness in the consultants utilized.

3.2.5. Implementing Agency and Executing Agency coordination, and operational issues (MU)

Per ProDoc, the United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP) main responsibilities related to the project were as follows:

- designate a programme officer responsible for providing substantive and operational advice and to follow up and support the project's development activities;
- advise the project on management decision-making as well as guaranteed quality assurance;
- be involved in the project's Steering Committee and other committees or groups considered part of the project structure;
- administer the financial resources agreed in the budget/work plan and approved by the project's Steering Committee, monitor financial expenditures against project budgets/work plans, and oversee the provision of financial audits of the project;
- oversee the recruitment and hiring of project staff, the selection and hiring of project contractors and consultants, and the appointment of independent financial auditors and evaluators;
- co-organize and participate in the events carried out in the framework of the project;
- use national and international contact networks to assist the project's activities and establish synergies between projects in common areas and/or in other areas that would be of assistance when discussing and analysing the project;
- provide support in the development and instrumentation of the project's gender strategy;
- Ensure that all project activities, including procurement and financial services, are carried out in strict compliance with the procedures of the UNDP/GEF.

Findings: Key issues highlighted: HR Recruitment; communication and feedback loop on red flags in coordination; support to execution and work planning and scheduling inputs; procurement; and contracting issues.

HR issues including PC recruitment

Several stakeholders interviewed reported the early project implementation did not meet the required standards for management and that implementation was a challenge. Post-MTR, it was clear that financial prudence was necessary. Additionally, that there was a clear need for stronger coordination, from the project team that was not effectively undertaken by the original project coordinator (PC). This role was key in gaining results, including giving directives, taking the initiative, and budgeting. Additionally, reports were that the original team thought they had a shortfall of budget when in fact they had underspent. The new PC was brought aboard, and then the IP changed. The second recruitment - PC was post MTR in 2019. Interviewees highlighted UNDP should have identified red flags during the recruitment of a PC with HR skills sooner. Since UNDP's role was recognize and understand difficulties, it should have intervened at some point.

Procurement from UNDP and the government was slow. A clear feedback loop and SOPs were required to streamline the process.

Quality recruitment is a key role for UNDP. The interviewees indicated procurement was slow on both sides. As identified in the MTR, the late recruitment of the Project Coordinator (November 2018) and additional operations staff (June 2019), caused significant delays in procurements and expenses, including hiring of a Project Officer to provide technical support to the Project Coordinator, as well as consultants for specific activities (i.e. Development of a business plan for PA management). It should be mentioned that the capacity of UNDP Sub-regional Office´s procurement office was reduced, due to some important staff turnover throughout project years. Adaptive measures were taken, such as the hiring of the Chief Technical Advisor and the strengthening of MCO procurement Staff. The lesson is to develop SOPs for the Government IP to validate procurement processes initiated by UNDP to help speed up NIM project implementation.

Key interviewees reported this was a gender two marker project and *a gender ToR was developed,* but it took a year to finalize recruitment.

UNDP technical oversight and MCO PC support to implementation.

Interviewees acknowledged that the communication on the risk management had a weak feedback loop, especially between UNDP MCO and PC. A lesson in instilling how a process is managed was essential but lacking. There needed to be a strong feedback loop. It has taken a threshold of caution to risk mitigation to get back on track. UNDP stepped in as the government had significant capacity issues. The government wanted the project team to guide and implement the project. Government (PSC members) and community level stakeholders reported that it was the government that needed to also play a starring role in oversight and for technically vetting products. They noted the project document was developed and validated; however, it could have benefited from clearer and set milestones for monitoring and technically vetting deliverables by UNDP and the counterparts. The evaluator agrees with these stakeholder insights.

In terms of GEF requirements, the UNDP project manager and project assurance roles should not be held by the same individual for the same project. A UNDP staff member typically holds the Project Assurance role; however, this was misunderstood in the project. Stakeholders shared the opinion that the requirement for NIM support at times became an excuse for the government not to play a larger role in the vetting of activities and following the results on a day-to-day basis. Others noted that the project coordinator was a key member for moving the policy goals and that regular briefing with the government counterparts was essential for results. While the project was focused on downstream implementation with some support to legal and policy, this was essentially a contribution to a larger government commitment and needed closer government oversight, especially in terms of policy and for noting the gaps exposed for concrete technical coordination.

The MTR made note of the quality of UNDP support to the project as suboptimal, especially during the initial project stages. This gap was identified after the MTR. Originally, although the UNDP MCO Programme Officer was involved and communicated by telephone two to three times a week with the project team (MTR), the project needed increased oversight. Limited improvement in project progress, despite this intensive support, related to the lack of a Project Coordinator.

Dynamic Staff turnaround in UNDP and Government

Late in the third quarter, the government of Grenada announced a Cabinet reshuffle that took effect from October 4, 2019. The PS/Project Director was reassigned to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the implementing partner ministry (Ministry of Climate Resilience, the Environment, Forestry, Fisheries, and Disaster Management) was dismantled. Each portfolio was merged with other ministries, e.g., the climate

resilience and the environment portfolios were added to the Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism, Climate Resilience, and Environment. Forestry was placed within the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, and Forestry, and Fisheries were added to the Ministry of Sports, Culture, the Arts, Fisheries, and Cooperatives. This reassignment significantly impacted the coordination of sub-activities as new staff/PS had to be updated and introduced to the project.

3.2.6. Risk management including social safeguards

In terms of the extent to which risks, in terms of both threats and opportunities, were properly identified during project implementation and what systems, plans, and actions were used to manage them, the following was found:

UNDP-PC-GOV communication needed a responsive feedback loop on funding use for quality and timely implementation.

A key lesson was the need for flexibility and a feedback loop for the use of funding and solving a problem quickly in the implementation. This was an exercise that required close communication on issues by UNDP and the IP, e.g., to purchase items necessary to facilitate coordination. Good communication was required with UNDP on the use of funds. In the final days of the project, an administrative issue which prevented the full utilization of project funds in an efficient manner could have been solved with close communication rather than bureaucratic back and forth. This project had US$300,000 left in October and needed a sign-off on the face form. At that point, the implementing partner had not been identified, resulting in stagnant implementation and the funds being returned. The PIU wanted to submit but could not because it needed to identify the IP, which was still being decided. In this regard, interviewees reported that UNDP also needed to change as they were too slow to respond to the request for clarification, and the problem was solvable. A solution was not found, and the money was returned. A discussion could have solved the issue of the need for a motor vehicle for the Forestry project monitoring, that had not been written into the project document.

4. PROJECT RESULTS

4.1. Progress toward Results (MS)

See description of the project indicators and color-coded status of project success indicators table below. The full results table is attached in Annex 2.

#	Description of Indicator	Target Met, Partially Met or Not Met	Status of Activities, Evidence of final major result and Spending
	Institutional framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs	**Partially Met** - Despite moderately satisfactory progress by Q4 2019 (finalization of draft amendments and tabling for 2020 legislative review by the Cabinet), the Project has experienced moderately unsatisfactory progress. This moderately unsatisfactory rate of advancement was said to be largely due to disruptions in the legislative calendar due to COVID-19 impacts. The re-establishment of NPAC remains incomplete as nominated members have not been formally approved by the Cabinet and have been 'unofficially' engaged in an initial meeting to set priorities, yet no formal date has been identified for the Cabinet's presentation of members.	**TPA and MPA planning & management instruments and guidelines have only partially been formally incorporated into the Government's Administration. Notably no overarching legislative amendment for protected areas approved by the Cabinet. Expenditure average= USD 140K**

#	Description of Indicator	Target Met, Partially Met or Not Met	Status of Activities, Evidence of final major result and Spending
	Regulatory and legal framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs	**Partially Met -** Extensive work for wide stakeholder engagement, including advocacy with civil society groups, legal/ law association members and relevant Government officials/ departments reflects satisfactory progress towards an improved regulatory and legal framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs. The existing PA Systems Business Plan has been utilized by the MPA Unit, Fisheries Department for proposed revision to fee structure. This has had some initial support from GoG officials, however, COVID-19 on the ground realities / economic decline has prompted a postponement to any adjustment to the costs associated with fee management. Within the current realities of responding/recovering from COVID-19, Project activities have been proceeding moderately well to support virtual/ remote advocacy and engagement so that when fully operational, the NMPAC and NPAC will be able to assess proposals to ensure that sustainable financing is duly addressed.	**Despite production of a sustainable financing plan and recommendations from the Project management plans towards budgetary restructuring for Protected Areas Management, the Government still utilizes a consolidated fund and has not undertaken recommended budgetary restructuring to foster strategic collaboration between fisheries, forestry and tourism to increase (double) budgetary allocations to 8 PAs as eco-sites. Expenditure average= 150K** **The Project contracted an international legal consultant to undertake drafting of legislative amendments further to stakeholder consultations and review of existing legislation relevant to Protected Areas and Wildlife Management. The Consultant produced a number of amendments. In 2019, further to identification of limited capacity for legislative drafting (Ministry of Legal Affairs had only two legislative drafting staff) a national legal consultant was recruited to work directly with the Ministry of Legal Affairs. The consultant presented to the relevant Ministers proposed amendments to fiver relevant legislation within the remit of Terrestrial Protected Areas and Marine Protected Areas: namely- In January 2020 these amendments were tabled for Cabinet, however, subsequent to the State of Emergency issued in March 2020, these matters were delayed. By September 2020 there was a Cabinet reshuffle. In January 2021 the Ministers have moved for tabling in Cabinet**
	Expansion of protected areas system	**Partially Met -** Protected Areas management has seen moderately satisfactory progress in terms of enhanced advocacy and ongoing management support to maintain the existing MPAs within acceptable management conditions. While no new MPAs nor TPAs have been approved, legal demarcation expansion for Grand Anse MPA and recognition of the Gouyave MPAs had been tabled for the Cabinet's decision in 2020. However, such matters have seen delays due to other Health and Economic priorities of Government, particularly in response to COVID-19 issues. As such, it is anticipated that within the Phase 2 transition to 'new normal working conditions' that these MPA and TPA legislative designation matters will be resumed.	**Average Met score 53. Despite investment in enhanced management of site specific co-management strategies, for reduced threat through SLM and SFM, co- management remains an informal/ and not legally recognized activity as government has not made any legislative amendments to formally recognize co-management of protected areas.** **The Project prepared for TPAs: Five Management Plans. Namely for the following areas: Morne Gazo, Grand Etang, Annadale Beausejour, Mount Hartman and Perseverance. These are considered draft management plans as they have not been officially adopted/ approved by Cabinet** **The Project prepared for MPAs: Eight Management Plans, namely for: Grand Anse, Molineure/ Beausejour, Sandy Island Oyster Bed (Carriacou), Levera, White Saline Islands, Isle La Ronde, Conference Bay, Gouyave. These management plans have not yet been adopted by Cabinet.** **Co Managment plans have been developed for Gouyave MPA, Molineur Beausejour MPA, SIOBMPA, Grand Etang TPA, Annadale/ Beausejour TPA, Grand Anse MPA**

#	Description of Indicator	Target Met, Partially Met or Not Met	Status of Activities, Evidence of final major result and Spending
			A lesson learned is that significant advocacy and engagement is required to move draft management plans to the Cabinet level. This is at the discretion of the Minister and must therefore be supported by wide stakeholder engagement to motivate the actions required. This also requires government to adopt a legislative change towards co- management given the noted heavy expenditure required for adoption and implementation of management plans.
	Measurable Threat Reduction: - Forest cover - Direct Carbon benefits - Indirect Carbon benefits - Mangrove, seagrass bed and coral reef areas	**Partially Met-** Ongoing reforestation activities have supported the maintenance and expansion of existing forest cover. Building on previous accomplishments and combined with ongoing capacity building and stakeholder engagements across CSO, there has been steady progress towards measurable threat reduction in Forest cover, direct carbon benefits and mangroves area. There has also been satisfactory progress in the maintenance of mangroves, seagrass and coral reefs. Coral reef habitats monitored by expert divers (over a decade experience in the MPA waters) are reported to demonstrate very stable overall health. Thus, moderately satisfactory progress continues to be made as the Project builds on the previous activities. Overall, the best sites for coral colony health remain predictably on those sites further from shore with more water movement, indicating that natural/ environmental factors, apart from Project interventions, have a significant role to play in the overall maintenance of the ecosystems. Notably, MPA activities and the interventions in adjacent communities are thought to have supported moderately satisfactory results that are on target for Project objectives, based on expertise analysis. Notably, a marine biologists research dive conducted in 2020 (with members having over 10 years' experience conducting research within the Project sites) indicates that : - fish life was good on all sites however there is a consistent and persistent lack of adult grazers on our reefs, particularly those closer to shore with easier access. This is not a new condition on our reefs; however, it is an important consideration for long-term reef health and food security. Parrotfish are one of the primary herbivores for a reef system and an excellent sand producer for our natural beaches and sand channels. Juvenile parrotfish were seen on all sites; however, adults were only seen on Purple Rain, Kahonee and Dragon Bay (MB MPA). - Lionfish were more prevalent on these surveys than they have been over the last year. Normally these selected reef sites are frequented regularly by recreational dive shops where Lionfish are culled for invasive species control and local consumption. Given the extended period of COVID-19 lockdown Grenada has recently undergone and	**Direct carbon benefits are estimated to have been maintained at 81,652.5tC (direct) and 322,158.3 tC (indirect) due to measures to improve forest cover through hectares of forest maintained or increased.**

#	Description of Indicator	Target Met, Partially Met or Not Met	Status of Activities, Evidence of final major result and Spending
		the quick reproductive/growth biology of the Lionfish, an increase in Lionfish on the reef was observed on all sites. Juvenile and adult Lionfish were present at all monitoring sites; however, it is anticipated that their population will decline once again once diving activities resume on the island. The two sites with substantial seagrass habitat, Flamingo Bay and Dragon Bay, show a balance of change with the seagrass in Flamingo Bay expanding over the sand channel toward the reef, and the Dragon Bay seagrass receding north away from the reef and away from the small. Sand movement plays a role with seagrasses being buried however in the case of Dragon Bay it appears boat anchoring has caused some damage and likely accelerated the receding of the seagrass bed. On the positive side this is a controllable acute stressor and can be addressed with the repair and reinstallation of moorings in this bay. - Limited coral bleaching was observed at all reef sites in the form of colony paling or multi focal spot bleaching only, no full colony or widespread bleaching was observed which is a good sign. The coral species most affected by bleaching were the Star corals (Orbicella sp.) and Starlet corals (Siderastreae sp.) colonies. These bleaching levels are considered baseline normal for summer conditions and are not thought to be indicative of elevated concern. If temperatures continue to rise and we see an extended period of water temperatures above 29 C historically more bleaching and more prolonged bleaching would be expected. - Low levels of coral disease were observed on all sites and were within acceptable baseline levels for these reefs at this time of year. Of the afflictions observed were Dark Spot Disease (DSD), Ulcerative White Spot (UWS), White Plague (WP) and the Acroporid White Band Disease (WBD).	
	Management of expanded PA network institutionalized	Partially Met - The Coral reef resilience program has proceeded moderately satisfactory with some AGRA monitoring taking place. A marine biology consultant has been recruited for the development of a coral reef resilience program protocol sustainability initiative in collaboration with the Grenada Dive Association and St George's University and SCUBA volunteers trained under the R2R Project. This protocol document is to be presented to the PS for review and approval towards the establishment of an MOU to overcome the GoG human resource capacity challenges which impact the consistency of coral reef monitoring activities. SFM has proceeded with moderately satisfactory progress as much of the on the groundwork which was initiated in first quarter 2020 has halted further to COVID-19 restrictions.	The Coral reef resilience program has proceeded moderately satisfactory with the MPA unit (Fisheries Division) undertaking monitoring in keeping with the established protocol. >13 PA Staff trained in bio principal monitoring, enforcement, fire management and co-management.
	PA network infrastructure and services	**Partially Met - PA network infrastructure and services progressed moderately unsatisfactory** While the Project continues to maintain and expand on trails for TPAs to allow for the infrastructure network to be standardized and in good condition,	**There has been enhanced quality infrastructure facilities and services available at 50% of TPAs and MPA untis in the PA netowrk. There have been enhanced buildings (Mourne Gazo facility reconstructed after hurricane Ivan destroyed it, Grand ETang reconstructed) Also significant**

#	Description of Indicator	Target Met, Partially Met or Not Met	Status of Activities, Evidence of final major result and Spending
		there is no standardized mechanism for this. A proposal was made to the Project Director/ Permanent Secretary and is yet to be agreed with the Ministry of Tourism which shares responsibility for the PA infrastructure network. In keeping with plans the refurbishment/ physical upgrades at the Grand Étang Lake House have been successfully completed. Procurement of equipment to support office and audio visual/ educational ICT equipment is underway and anticipated to be completed by September. The shipment process was delayed by international logistical challenges resulting from COVID-19 and limited operationality of national supply chains. The plan for construction of the SIOBMPA Interpretation Centre was impacted by the need to consider alternative sites for construction after the state land surveyor made recommendations for such. Having completed the process of site visits and recommendations of alternative sites, the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in reduced work on this matter as the physical planning unit and other government workers were on remote work and much of the activities requiring approval have experienced significant delays. It was anticipated that the necessary initiation activities will be completed by August.	**number of hiking trails have been modified and maintained.** **Moorings have been supplied for MPAs.**
	Community involvement in PA management through conservation and sustainable use of natural resources	Fully Met - Community involvement in PA management through conservations and sustainable use of natural resources has experienced Stakeholder consultation to engage law makers/ national law association and Government/ senior officials on co- management has been undertaken. These activities are geared towards engendering support for co management and gaining consensus on approaches to promote both sound legislation and community engagement/ participation in decision making for co management. A legal consultant has been engaged to support ongoing consultation and development of relevant reports/ recommendation towards government submission to the Cabinet, further to approval by the relevant Minister/ recommendations from Permanent Secretary. 3 Communities adjacent to selected MPAs remain engaged in co-management within the PAs albeit interrupted by COVID-19 restrictions, particularly impacting MPA management over the early 2020 periods. These activities for marine management have been recently permitted and monitoring activities/ beach visits are now permissible. Although these activities are not yet legislated/ officially approved in law, they continue with informal government approval. Included among the pre- existing communities / CSOs are now also engagement in Gouyave which is an area being put forward for an MPA with ongoing co management with the Gouyave Fisherman's Cooperative. Additionally, government has engaged with the Project and Private Sector to potentially establish relationships of a Public- Private Partnership	There has been systemic collaboration for INRM and schemes to incentivize and engage entrepreneurs through training/ capacity building, access to equipment and resultant increases in benefits from resource based livelihoods

#	Description of Indicator	Target Met, Partially Met or Not Met	Status of Activities, Evidence of final major result and Spending
		for a proposed 'co- management' arrangement with a private sector ecotourism initiative. Capacity building with Kipaji Development Initiative for record keeping and general administrative capacity building has also taken place in collaboration with the recently concluded CATSII project (which was managed by GIZ). The Carriacou FADS Fishers have also enhanced their capacity through Project support to develop offices (through donated containers) and other equipment. This central location serves both as a location for further capacity building as well as provides a hub for data collection.	
	Benefits/profitability from conservation/ sustainable-use resource-based livelihood opportunities	**Partially Met -** The Projects has seen moderately satisfactory progress in providing an incentive to engage entrepreneurs in INRM practices. These activities include procurement and distribution of equipment, capacity building, and enhanced training to improve entrepreneurial activities particularly for FADS Fishers and apiculture entrepreneurs/ rural agriculture in collaboration with the Grenada Investment Development Corporation (GIDC). At the same time, benefits/profitability from conservation/ sustainable-use resource-based livelihood opportunities had progressed moderately satisfactorily but has been challenged by COVID-19 related impacts that saw considerable negative impacts on economic activity. The Project has maintained good collaboration with the North East Farmers Organization (NEFO) who have been engaged in rainwater harvesting and enhanced drip irrigation activities to support their resource-based livelihoods. Furthermore, members of the 6 pilot community in Beauséjour (including elderly and teen participant from Happy Hill High School) have received capacity building in apiculture and hives, equipment/ suits to promote bee rearing and cross-pollination activities across farm locations as well as an enhanced earning opportunity through honey production and marketing of other by-products.	
	Planning and management framework for SLM/INRM	Partially Met - In collaboration with NAWASA there has been procurement of equipment and MOU to support ongoing water quality monitoring within the MPAs.	LUP regulations have been elaborated; however, the Cabinet has not approved these plans to date. An intersectoral Committee has been established but these meetings have been impacted by COVID-19 and other scheduling challenges making the committee less effective than intended for the design and management of engagement in INRM practices
	Community participation in SFM.	Partially Met - Although community engagement had been extensively undertaken and continued advocacy for government partners; however, no Cabinet decision for the promulgation of proposed SROs has taken place. It is hoped that with government impetus to transition back to work post many of the COVID-19 refocusing, that this matter could again be given priority attention	Extensive community engagement has not led to the actualization of SROs promulgated by the Cabinet. The Cabinet decision-making requires policy-level directives that are not only influenced through community participation in SFM.

#	Description of Indicator	Target Met, Partially Met or Not Met	Status of Activities, Evidence of final major result and Spending
	Direct carbon benefits through avoided deforestation; forest enrichment; and planting in the Beauséjour watershed.	Partially Met - Progress towards the direct carbon benefits through avoided deforestation; forest enrichment; and planting in the Beauséjour watershed has shown moderate progression and is performing moderately unsatisfactorily. Activities to remove invasive Bamboos species were initiated by the Project and collaboration with another Government of Grenada Project entitled Climate Smart Agriculture and Rural Enterprise Programme (SAEP) had seen some moderate success. This included procurement of equipment and initial capacity building, however, in the field activities had to be halted due to challenges in Government restrictions during COVID-19. Thus the activity paused and has only recently been attempting to mobilize community members to reengage in the activities to remove bamboo and reforestation.	Direct carbon sequestration is anticipated to have been maintained at baseline levels given current estimates of avoided deforestation and maintained forest enrichment with planting activities supported in the Beauséjour watershed.
	Turbidity Levels/ sediment buildup at two MPAs downstream of Beauséjour	Partially Met - The status of Turbidity Levels/sediment buildup at the two MPAs downstream of Beauséjour are anecdotally implied to have been reduced. Despite collaboration for measurements through procurement of requested equipment, there were delays in establishing/ maintaining monitoring with ongoing challenges of COVID-19. However, it is anticipated that previously delivered training and other capacity building that is reinforced through collaboration with Min. Of Agriculture Extension officer, and support for enhanced irrigation and steep slope management (training delivered by a Climate Smart Agriculture Specialist Procured by the Project) will help to support educed turbidity levels due to improved land management practices	Status of turbidity has notably fluctuated both seasonally and over the life of the project. Annecdotal reports suggest that this target has experienced minor reduction,
	Pesticide and fertilizer levels at two MPAs downstream of Beauséjour.	Partially Met - Further to previous project interventions, attempts to better monitor and quantify fertilizer levels in the downstream MPAs from Beauséjour were being conducted in collaboration with the National Water and Sewerage Authority (NAWSA) through the procurement of equipment for water quality monitoring and development of MOU for data sharing agreements. However, further to procurement and initial installation, monitoring efforts were significantly impacted as the boat was down for maintenance (awaiting equipment that could not be accessed from the port due to the limited SOE from COVID-19 restrictions) and other national security measures implemented that prevented nonessential work activities. There was no monitoring put in place and the assessment of the project results here is based on previous capacity building and reinforced training from extension officers as a qualitative measure of the ongoing activities to reduce pesticide use and resultant water quality impacts. Thus quantitative measures were not practical in establishing an accurate measure.	Despite measured reduction in pesticide and fertilizer values in Molinere Beauséjour/ MPA, this was a partial reduction (,8%) and did not achieve the intended target of 15% reduction.

#	Description of Indicator	Target Met, Partially Met or Not Met	Status of Activities, Evidence of final major result and Spending
	Application of gender and community-sensitive SLM and SFM practices in 6 communities (Beauséjour, Happy Hill, Granville Vale, New Hampshire, Annandale and Vendome)	Partially Met - The application of gender and community-sensitive SLM and SFM practices in 6 communities has been ongoing in a case-by-case approach with gender considerations undertaken during individual project activities that are initiated. Noting that the Project has not been guided by a comprehensive gender approach this is a shortcoming that is addressed by ensuring all consultants and Project interventions seek to include wide participation from women and other marginalized groups, as well as youth and elderly where practical. Apiculture training as a sustainable agriculture biodiversity program has progressed successfully with private consultant recruited to undertake initial capacity building workshops, followed by the distribution of equipment and ongoing monitoring visits to ensure successful application of skills thought to community members. Participation in this activity is wide ranging having included student from the Happy Hill Secondary School as well as famers from NEFO (which includes women and elderly). Prior to COVID-19 restrictions the Project also supported farm visits by extension officers in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands. This supports further dissemination on critical skills and training to reduce pesticide use and promote suitable rangeland management, agroforestry and agriculture biodiversity.	6 villages were provided with training in alternative livelihoods related to BD, SFM/SLM, and CC issues: - A sustainable agricultural biodiversity program was implemented by Year 3. SFM program involving forest enrichment with agro-forest species to ensure SLM/SFM. However, rangeland management programs were only partially achieved <50% coverage. Estimated expenditure= 100K
	Impact of Soil erosion/stability on household incomes of famers within the Beauséjour watershed	Partially Met - Activities related to impact of soil erosion/stability on household income of farmers within the Beauséjour watershed has been moderately satisfactory for the reporting period. Significant work has been undertaken by the recruitment of a climate smart agriculture specialist who has supported community engagement in rainwater harvesting and irrigation management. These activities have contributed physical infrastructure and equipment to farmers who are actively engaged in enhance soil management. Further to physical equipment, capacity building activities have supported knowledge transfer to maintain improved practices for managing soil erosion with the anticipation that these activities will lead to improvements in household incomes; however, this has not yet been possible to measure given the early stages of the activity. Further, given reduced household incomes due to COVID-19 challenges, it is difficult to utilize any correlations to soil stability or other land management activities undertaken by the Project during the Reporting Period.	While there are notable reductions in soil loss percentage. These were not directly correlated to increases in weekly income of farmers. As such, this target was partially achieved.
	Education and awareness levels	Fully Met - Public awareness campaigns have made highly satisfactory progress. The Public awareness Campaign developed and implemented by the Project	Public awareness campaign developed and implemented. Public education campaigns are multi-faceted and engaged a national communications consultant for

#	Description of Indicator	Target Met, Partially Met or Not Met	Status of Activities, Evidence of final major result and Spending
		has been satisfactory and remains a very successfully implemented activity. In keeping with the public awareness strategy, the Project has had an active school engagement campaign. "Ridge to Reef Student Ambassadors" initiative in collaboration with the Ministry of Education continues to be successfully implemented with Grade 3 students (7-9 years) using appropriate visual and audio aids along with interactive games and activities during targeted engagements of 45 minutes duration at 9 schools. Over 250 students have participated in the reporting period. The initiative had to be halted in 2020 due to schools closure in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Given the overall success and intended long-term benefits of the initiative, the Project is exploring the option of developing a recorded /web hosted version of the initiative to further support the sustainability of the education component. There has also been ongoing collaboration with Private Sector, Academia and Civil Society Organizations to enhance public awareness and education. This includes public displays at events and Ministries in commemoration of environmental themed activities. There was also wide participation in the Grenada Sailing Week and Grenada Dive Association – Dive Week which both included international media/ guests. Further to engagement in the education sector the Project has a strong public service announcement track record inclusive of public awareness videos, interviews and press releases. These are also hosted on the dedicated Project website and UNDP Barbados & EC to extend the regional reach/ information dissemination	both MPAs and TPAs. School interventions, summer workshop programs, newspaper advertisement, project website, television public service advertisement, social media etc. These were also enhanced by collaborating with the St George's University for interns that went into schools.

4.2. Relevance (HS)

The project was relevant and remains a major priority for Grenada. The project directly contributed to Grenada's global commitments including the Paris agreement, Sendai, the Three Rio conventions, the 2030 Agenda and Sustainable Development Goals. The project was reported by key officials during the TE as constructively supporting international and national priorities. The project intervention was directly complementing Grenada's efforts on the local level to fulfill its obligations to various United Nations Conventions and Protocols (MEAs) concerning biodiversity and ecosystem functions/services by applying program-based delivery systems and with co-management initiatives that would accommodate the involvement of local area communities in a direct way. It was designed to address the GEF STAR 5 strategy for SLM, SFM/REDD+ together with focal areas such as BD, LD, and climate change mitigation (ECM). In particular, the project design directly addressed and was consistent with the outcomes and outputs of GEF Strategic Objective 1, to improve the sustainability of protected area systems. The project was supporting the implementation of key aspects of the Grenada System Plan for Parks and Protected Areas and the Grenada Declaration (COP8) to effectively conserve at least 25% of its marine and territorial ecosystems by the year 2020.

The project has additionally addressed GEF SFM-REDD+ Objective 1, to reduce pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services by reducing the threat of deforestation from fire, slash and burn agriculture, and encroachment by housing and tourism and by increasing forest cover and carbon stocks through agroforestry and the removal of invasive species. Finally, the project has supported the goals *inter alia* of the 2004 CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas.

4.3. Effectiveness (MS)

While the exact targets and structural changes were not realized (See Indicator Framework Results above) the project document stated the project would expand and enhance the existing PA system in the country by increasing the number of TPAs from 8 to 9 (increasing the number of hectares from 1,931 ha to 2931 ha) and increasing the number of MPAs from 3 to 7 (increasing the number of hectares from 1,780 ha to 13, 180 ha). The project did provide concrete support (through public awareness, "demonstration by doing") in the implementation of key aspects of the Grenada System Plan for Parks and Protected Areas and the Grenada Declaration (COP8) to effectively conserve at least 25% of its marine and territorial ecosystems by the year 2020. The project also made good contributions, especially through demonstration which resulted in public education of land users. This project did (to a limited degree) also enhance the capabilities of Grenada for institutional, regulatory, and policy-based Strategic Planning for PAs. A highlight has been the success registered through partnership with other development projects and actors, the project contributed to the coastal zone management policy deliberations and others.

Reported achievements

While many things did not go according to the project plan, the project stakeholders reported achievements as follows:

Regarding policy, the project has been working at both upstream and downstream levels. Upstream, it worked on key policy recommendations and drafted key legal amendments. For instance, the project supported the legal review work of the forestry and wildlife act and created synergies to support the land use policy which has been put forth. Additionally, upstream, the project was able to advance legal work on the forest side but was less successful in its support of the fisheries side. The work on the demonstration of co-management (downstream work in communities) was more successful on the land side than on the marine side. The results for marine protected areas and management plans were less than had been anticipated. Feedback for instance is still needed on the arrangement of different aspects of prioritized protected areas that have management plans for adoption. Notably, however, for marine together with the GIZ project, the project advanced the law on coastal zone management, which included a stipulation for marine protected areas.

Key results as stated by interviewees

- The Forestry Department, because of this project, has a recommended park fee structure with drafted legislation for co-management. Although the project is closed, the Forest and Wildlife Act is expected to be fulfilled - through the Cabinet by end of 2021.
- CANARY (origination) an implementing partner, has supported the revision to the Forestry PA act, a major expected output of this project. As a partner, it has worked on those related deliverables. It is up to the government to take this work forward. Such work will require some further UNDP assistance and technical rigor; otherwise, this may not be realized.
- Concrete public stakeholder engagement/public awareness/education for sustainable development was achieved, including concrete engagement with community and landowners in

six beneficiary communities, strong awareness building, and alternative livelihoods. For objective 2, rainwater harvesting, education was provided to all 6 beneficiary communities and was expected to be expanded based on small grant activities, for instance, training on reducing pesticides.

- Extension officers were trained.
- There was reforestation conducted but at the baseline (see above) and with no monitoring.
- The project has trained staff and the public in conservation: community, wardens, coast guards, and others. Some have reported using the qualification to enhance their lives.
- The project provided key equipment and infrastructure upgrades.
- The project did intensive work under outcome 2 in demonstration of management and cross-sectoral coordination work for sectors in the Beau Watershed and in the protected turtle area. It changed destructive agricultural and local practices (pesticides and fishing practices). For the turtle area, it was significant that locals stopped fishing at 6 pm voluntarily. This is testimony to the value of education and public advocacy and education done by the project. As infrastructural development, a storeroom was added to an office.
- A damaged recreation site was rebuilt; the building was damaged during hurricanes Ivan and Emily 2004–2005.
- The interpretation center at Grand Étang was refurbished.
- The project engaged consultants and implemented an action plan for environmental education. The project conducted international events of significance to demonstrate biodiversity.
- A legislation review was executed which focused on combining all the existing forest-related legislation.
- The project provided equipment for clearing weeds in forestry operations.
- The project supported fisheries in the MPAs with a new boat for control and training.

4.4. Efficiency (MU)

Insofar as efficiency is a measure of how economically resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results, key gaps as recounted by the stakeholders interviewed was part of the implementation strategy taken. The basic lesson, as stated by most interviewees was that the expected outcomes around policy were influenced by the relationships enabled by the strategic role of the UNDP MCO in coordination. The project coordinator was there to create synergies for those deliverables but ultimately it was up to the policymaker to embed those documents within the vision for the expected structural reforms and enact the recommended policy changes. However, for the project-supported policy and legal work, such deliverables needed to be technically vetted and then proceed through the requisite process. A key lesson reported by interviewees was that this required a stronger role from the government in implementation, to monitor and vet the document and provide the necessary guidance through open policy windows. One key stakeholder recounted that when a policy document must be worked on and produced, the next step is to get it through The Cabinet. *Establishing benchmarks for doing this together between UNDP and IP was needed.*

Private and public landholder's involvement was needed in project implementation. The need for public and business engagement (and for driving the sustainability concept in market forces) was a key barrier to the results.

Interviewees tended to agree that the public and private stakeholders needed to have been more prominent in the project monitoring and learning techniques, i.e., to learn from the active demonstrations

for results. For instance, Grenada has an issue of large land tenure under private ownership issue. In this sense, the governance over natural resources on those lands must be done with and by the people. However, the difficulty has been achieving legalization through the Cabinet. Improving public education on the value of biodiversity is critical for project results, and the project was particularly good at bottom-up learning. The dialogue concerning the conservation and land use (i.e., for business) and the restrictions and impositions on land use must be collaborative as the situation is that Grenada's land is 85% privately owned.

As an example, with regards to land in the project areas, the Minister met with the local developer to discuss the necessary conditions to facilitate implementation and to determine the structure of the management of water conservation and protection. The work was supported but was to be oriented towards conservation. This exercise illustrated the need for communication between government and private owners. The lesson illustrated here is, when owners are part of the process and they see the value, they cooperate and co-manage. Before performing activities, planning must be done, and there will be restrictions on use and management activities that are costly. Some stakeholders explained that the country has an opportunity to focus on higher-end tourism and a strategy that places a value on nature.

Management and establishing a strong science-to-policy link

Grenada is currently undergoing an ecosystem evaluation under another project. A key evaluation finding was that project monitoring was dependent on previous contracts for marine biology data. The project had a weak baseline, and this was needed for technical monitoring and setting up data-sharing agreements between sectors. The science-to-policy link is, however, a systemic protected area monitoring issue. In this project, the environment division attempted to measure biodiversity assets and losses through *proxy measures*. The government department depended on key data for monitoring the marine protected areas, i.e., fish stock and the state of reefs. It was impossible to say how many hectares of seagrass were lost. A key lesson in this regard, was that work on scientific monitoring is needed. For future projects, St George University will do the baseline work. There will be a science-to-policy linkage built in from the beginning and a monitoring baseline set.

The minister worked with the St. George's University (SGU) and secured the relationship. Key stakeholders interviewed noted that the ministry now understands the importance of the scientific –policy – data for decision making relationship. For example, a machine was needed to test nutmeg and produce the necessary data; – this work is executed under the role of the Project Coordinator. These relationships and institutional know-how must be explained and be faceted with UNDP expertise. Policy results needed process indicators and protocols/rewards built-in for the PC to build relationships and influence.

The lesson learned for CP for Policy: Building the capacity of senior government staff is perceived as a key PC job which involves providing a regular briefing to policy superiors. Policy and capacity necessitate having buy-in while private ownership needs synergies. Additionally, as an example of relationships and the importance of high-quality HR coordination, one of the targets was to sign MOUs, while another focus of the project was to engage in participatory discussions with the local people to learn their priorities. A change in policy required the participation of a legal consultant in the process. As a lesson learned, the suggestion for future work is to always keep a timeline on delivery and benchmark partnerships. Evidence-based policy briefings are needed from the start to build that relationship between the project and the minister's office, and all stakeholders must be kept informed. The arrangement should be discussed to set the tone of a policy project implementation.

Overall Project Rating **MS**

Progress toward the mainstreaming of PA management in Grenada has experienced moderately satisfactory progress. Noteworthy progress, however, has been achieved since November concerning TPAs managed by the Forestry Division. Additional MPAs (e.g., Magazine Beach) were declared by Cabinet in January 2021. Work by the project to support MPAs, however, was not as successful as with Forestry. The reported significant delay in finalizing the formal incorporation of planning and management instruments into government administration was said to be largely due to shifted priorities incurred by the state of emergency and other COVID-19-related impacts that delayed many GOG administrative matters/legislative processes which were not directly related to the COVID-19 response. The project had been promoting advocacy among key government officials and legal stakeholders to strengthen country ownership, and to support the approval/endorsement of draft legislation and policy proposals to bolster the implementation of these management plans.

It was anticipated that the process would be completed and approved by October 2020, but this did not happen before the Terminal Evaluation. When asked why the legal and policy instruments targeted for change, i.e., the Forestry and Wildlife Act, were not adopted into legislation, the relevant stakeholders interviewed revealed that all legal work takes time, the project's window for action was *just too short*, and there was a national emergency. Stakeholders indicated that work indeed had progressed and that it was expected that the legal work would be passed by the Cabinet this year. The lack of structure in the advocacy work within the project and absence of clear plan for stakeholder consultation, hindering buy-in at the national level, was a key criticism of how the program was implemented. In addition, critics said the work planning process needed further integration, i.e., the two outcomes were linked and would make significant contributions, but the project management needed more focus on supporting cross-cutting areas across the two main outputs toward upstream outcome level results, i.e., knowledge management, partnership strategy, and monitoring for results.

Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	HS
Effectiveness	MS
Efficiency	MU
Overall Project Outcome Rating	MS

4.5. Sustainability (ML)

- **Financial sustainability (ML)**

While the project may set up a TPA or new MPA and facilitate community work within that framework, the question is sustainability; therefore, the TPA/MPA must be established and running well. The key question focused on financial sustainability and how the activities will be monitored after the project. The key to financial sustainability is to showcase financial innovation and make the economic case on the model. These are design and conceptualization issues. For instance, if a good piece of legislation is not monetized, it will not be used. The financial part of this project needs to be showcased as a demonstration.

- **Sociopolitical (ML)**

The project has sought to increase equality by supporting training programmes and workshops that provide gender mainstreaming and ensure participation by women and vulnerable groups. For fisherfolk and farming groups, gender mainstreaming took place as capacity building in the areas of Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) and apiculture training programmes. Rainwater Harvesting and irrigation equipment supported gender inclusivity and incorporated vulnerable groups in rural communities.

- **Institutional framework and governance (ML)**

In terms of the project contributing to human capacity development, the lesson based on this and other GEF projects reviewed in the region was to engage in apprenticeship-type activities. A mixture of interactions was needed between the project, locals and stakeholders to be salient for the institutional framework. Good examples have come from recent projects, i.e., GIZ and the Commonwealth Climate Finance Access Hub. In both, there was a built-in level of integration between the project and the local people for building sustained capacity, therefore the capacity and apprenticeship added to the project work with the agencies. Sometimes the GEF policy and the design need to be tweaked to get the desired resources and results. The UNDP GEF has a second project ongoing, climate-smart agriculture that is promoting similar INRM/SLM approach, i.e., coordination, watershed management, and SLM CSM biodiversity.

- **Environmental (L)**

In terms of the biodiversity topic, stakeholders explained it was hard to delink the two, environment and economy, while at the same time building government capacity; the evaluator agrees with this insight. Interviewees in government departments reported that there was a role to support coordination, i.e., external coordination, because of limited capacity. There is a role of external coordination, however, it can operate in a manner allowing the activities to be absorbed. In this sense, there are opportunities to build on the lesson of this project implementation and to hone the focus on strategic gaps.

Overall Likelihood of Sustainability (L)

This project was aimed at mainstreaming biodiversity through a concrete demonstration of PA system management, in a principle at-risk watershed and through support to key upstream areas as well as through education activities with significant stakeholder engagement. However, for the work to be sustained, the key aspect of sustainability needed is the passing and operationalization of the Forestry and Wildlife act. This is in motion and will go through the Cabinet in 2021. Additionally, the country has recently amended the land use law which will promote the cross sectoral collaboration among the different sectors to enforce it. The project provides capacity building to the technical sector on how this collaboration will work.

4.4. Country Ownership

The issue of country ownership cannot be mixed up with poor project implementation and protocols. The government asked for UNDP support to execution and take on an important technical oversight role. The priorities and relevance are outlined above and reiterated here. This project has good country ownership and was designed to fill a great need and be showcased. The enabling environment was already solid at the start including a 2001 National Protected Areas Act and a drafted Forested and Wildlife Species Act. It was an instrument for the localization of agreed-upon international entitlements and obligations concerning the conservation and management of BD and ecosystem functions, goods, and services. As such, it was to be implemented in the context of national strategies and plans, or reports and assessments that have been sponsored by relevant conventions. The project was consistent with and supports the goals of various National Development Policies in Grenada, including the *National Strategic Development*

Plan (2007), which proposes that environmental considerations should be integrally linked to national development, identifies the need to link livelihoods and environmental sustainability and advocates for better enforcement of laws to protect biodiversity. Also, both the *Tourism Master Plan (1997)* and the *National Environmental Policy and Management Strategy (NEMS, 2005)* recognize the need to strengthen Grenada's protected area system through the establishment of additional PA sites and the consolidation of legal and institutional frameworks to manage the PA system.

The project was relevant in that it directly supported Grenada's efforts to comply with its commitments related to International Environmental Conventions. In promoting the conservation and management of the country's biodiversity, the project was consistent with the Government of Grenada's priorities as set out in the *National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP, 2000)*, of which the key objectives are to provide broad-based support for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, protect key ecosystems from negative human-induced impacts, and develop and encourage sustainable utilization of biological resources that are essential to the livelihoods of local communities. The project also promotes the objectives of the *National Action Plan (NAP, 2006)* to support the *UN Convention to Combat Desertification*, including identifying the factors contributing to land degradation and the physical measures required to combat it and mitigate the effects of drought, and the *National Climate Change Policy*, which identifies the need to address linkages between climate change and biological diversity. Other national policies and plans are also supported by this project, including Grenada's *National Forest Policy*, which emphasizes the role of forests in maintaining biological diversity, promoting soil and water conservation, and generating income through ecotourism activities, and the Government's *Grenada Forest Rehabilitation Project* which is undertaking re-vegetation of forested areas in the aftermath of Hurricane Ivan.
The lesson learned according to stakeholders focused on how the project was set up, specifically, the fact that UNDP's support for national implementation created many assumptions on the part of the government. This important role needed to be clarified from the outset as to the expectations of technical leadership and implementation issues i.e., procurement and human resource inputs to avoid later misinterpretations of roles. If UNDP is being asked to facilitate/execute this, then there should be planning and costing for this support in the design including proper costing for the procurement of goods and services and HR. The government is responsible for providing support for implementation and capacity to technical vet the outputs. This arrangement was not apparent in the project design and management according to interviewees.

4.7. Gender and Women's Empowerment

As mentioned, the project designed indicators, such as an application of gender and community-sensitive SLM and SFM practices in 6 communities (Beauséjour, Happy Hill, Granville Vale, New Hampshire, Annandale, and Vendome). Gender equity is emphasized within all delivery systems. Also, UNDP's role was to support the development and instrumentation of the project's gender strategy; the project hired a gender advisor to review the work. The ProDoc outlined that the PSC was to support oversight of gender. Through design, gender mainstreaming was built in, although the gender oversight was not strongly supported by UNDP, i.e., there was no presentation of progress. The project enhanced environmental awareness and resilience outcomes by not only expanding access to training and equipment but also by supporting further capacity building to support gender-focused sustainable livelihoods. Thus, education and opportunities are available to enhance sustainable livelihoods.
Related to gender, MTR's recommendation stated: "Interviews showed that there is *no gender-differentiated approach* to project implementation despite different levels of involvement and roles of men and women in tending both agricultural land and coordination with relevant initiatives [for]

forested/protected areas (e.g., more women in banana fields or nutmeg processing stations). This may have been largely because most farmers in the Beauséjour watershed are men (4 to 1 ratio). It is recommended to contract a consultant to support both Government staff and local associations directly involved in watershed management to implement activities in gender-adapted fashion to increase women inclusiveness in the R2R approach."

The project has sought to increase gender equality by supporting training programs and workshops that provide gender mainstreaming and ensure participation by women and vulnerable groups. For fisherfolk and farming groups, gender mainstreaming took place for capacity building in the areas of Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point (HACCP) and apiculture training programs. Rainwater Harvesting and irrigation equipment supported gender mainstreaming and included vulnerable groups in rural communities.

4.8. Cross-cutting Issues

The evaluation questioned the project design (and implementation) toward key cross-cutting area results. Mainstreaming biodiversity through the PA improved the system approach, linking priorities such as resilience, poverty alleviation, good environmental governance, prevention and recovery from natural disasters. The cross-cutting design work on these links including gender, poverty reduction, women's economic empowerment, and disaster risk reduction, would need to feature in the implementation strategy as well as throughout the policy messaging and to showcase for future policy and scale-up. Several lessons were apparent; the design highlights a need to focus on implementing with adding buffer communities and to design a work plan with targeted groups in an inclusive manner. The implementation for these expressed result linkages would be a critical inquiry.

4.9. GEF additionality

Per ProDoc, under normal "business as usual," conditions i.e., recurrent activities without GEF intervention, important programs will be developed, but such programs by themselves will not overcome the barriers that currently prevent implementation of land and forest management and BD conservation practices on the Grenada landscapes and seascapes in general and within the Beauséjour pilot watershed. Activities that are expected to secure the flow of ecosystems services while ensuring ecosystem resilience to CC. The baseline programs were divided into two areas that are in line with the project's outcomes. The GEF alternative scenario thus was to integrate principles of SLM/REDD^{+} and SLM into a regulatory and institutional framework. They will strengthen integrated land and coastal zone management capacity. The project posited that the government's baseline, alone, will not generate global benefits.

These two focus additionality areas were described as "a Regulatory and Institutional Framework for Local INRM" and "the GEF Alternative to Generate Global Benefits." As mentioned, the project was designed as (catalytic/incremental support) to support Grenada's compliance with several agreed-upon International Environmental Management and Conservation strategies, policies, and plans (e.g., MDGs and Aichi targets and goals) with the technical and financial assistance of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The project has indeed made contribution to these goals. The concrete contributions are clearly provided in the results and resources assessment above. Generally, however, the project is part of a process of mainstreaming the value of biodiversity and showcasing how concretely to express this in terms of government action to create a protected areas management system and demonstration of a collaborative INRM approach including local communities in co -management. This process of change has been stated but more is needed to fully operational and grow mind set in terms of government policy and the public awareness of the value of biodiversity. It is the beginning.

4.10. Replication and Scale-up

The scale-up/replicability would be through institutionalizing integrated resource management and scaling up the co-management demonstration experiences including approving the management plans. In this regard, the project has had some stakeholder engagement and provided bottom-up support to such initiatives but is nowhere near the level of engagement that was expected with the community demonstration for financial benefits and generating the economic analysis based on demonstration of changed practices in the watershed for policy. The baseline was not conducted and this will have to be considered in phase two – operational project (operational the national forestry and wildlife policy with the national pa authority and focus on generating the fiscal benefits of co-management to support government services.

The country has a new UNDP/GEF project, built on the concept of integrated natural resource management. This new project offers some opportunity to build on the work for capacity building of INRM/IWRN/PA management. However, the sustainability and real structural changes envisioned by this project will come from efforts to legalize the collaborative planning work possibly through approving the Forestry and Wildlife Act and land use planning act and a stronger prioritization of government focus and stakeholder engagement in future actions.

Based on this project lesson, the UNDP team might put together a review of the economic and policy arguments, including the needs and gaps in staff: education, legislation, and bottlenecks, to create real intersectoral collaboration and build institutional enforcement capacity. Stakeholders say the legislation is there, but there has been no active push to improve on it and get it implemented as it needs implementation even with limited staff while collaborative planning instruments are required. It is not only about planning; it is about having a mandate for real collaboration. There must be a nationally synchronized approach focusing on formalized planning and coordination. A higher level of planning focuses on resilience and disaster risk reduction. For scale-up action consideration can be given to a work plan for schools and agriculture, biodiversity, and land use as an extension. This must be a system-level input.

4.11. Progress towards impact level results

Interviewees stated that the project seemed to focus on producing paper reports, e.g., the Watershed management plan, co-management plans. They expressed that the design may have worked better toward the expected outcomes (PA management system and SLM mainstreaming) if the focus had been more on learning by doing and showcasing the fiscal benefits of improving water quality and PA management. The best way could have been to showcase the economic benefits of integrated watershed management. In any case the stakeholders explained that the project required a monitoring framework to engage as a learning process with the key stakeholders who needed to go on this journey. They had to become involved in the monitoring strategy to buy-in to integrated watershed management and become able to translate the benefits to the private sector.

5. FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, LESSON LEARNED

5.1. Main Findings

From inception, the project monitoring process was flawed. The inception meeting was a project board meeting, and the process was to review the project document against the reality of the situation and refine the RRF. The Terminal Evaluation uncovered that there was no technical specialist from GEF or UNDP to explain methodologies and do the guided interpretation of the project and development of a

baseline. Significantly, there were no changes made to the project document. The results needed to be interpreted and the strategies for implementation agreed upon during this period. The lesson learned was to recognize the importance of this aspect of a GEF project and undertake adaptation of the project document for implementation, including revisiting the indicators, the budget, and the strategies.

Interviewees said the project was overly ambitious in design and represented two projects in one. It had two major outcome areas that could each been a separate project. Additionally, interviewees said the outcome-level target of mainstreaming biodiversity was vague in scope. For the expected outcome area, the project document must be interpreted clearly. In this case, the biodiversity language needed to be made concrete with the results translated into implementable actions, i.e., the economics and cost-effectiveness of the PA system for policy, co-management demonstration, and capacity building. The project was incorrectly interpreted to be two-pronged, with outcome one for land and outcome two for water. The project also needed key messaging and a communication strategy, i.e., it was a protected areas improvement project with a focus on building institutions and human capacities for IWRM critical watersheds, PA systems management, and co-management demonstrations.

Stakeholders said the disconnected design (outcomes one and two) could have been separate projects, and the disjointed work planning for these also resulted in a design that was disconnected from reality on the ground. The inception period was for revisiting the design and addressing the gap from design to implementation as well as planning strategies to make the project come alive. The absence of technical input and guidance was significant since the PB and PC needed the UNDP RTA technical support during the inception period. In this case, the inception was found to be weakly supported, and the project got off to a bad start. This period needed solid work planning and scheduling.
The key recommendation from stakeholders was for a qualified coordinator to oversee coordination results including building capacity for policy for integrated management. The role of capacity building to conceptualize the coordination as a result itself was not seen as a demonstration of coordination because of a capacity that must remain in the government to sustain the work.

Also, interviewees said that procurement and hourly needs must be strong and deliberate actions *in the project design stage*. A critical review of the RR framework and the implementation strategies toward results during the inception period indicated that technical monitoring should have been included as needed by ministries along with the requirement for trucks as well as boats. Again, planning should have been more comprehensive in its scope.

A strength of the second change was better coordination built into the super-ministry as well as a supportive environment for adaptive management. Unfortunately, while the PIU potentially had a more conducive enabling environment, the PS has been changed three times, and each time the PC had to reintroduce the concepts.

Compounding delays in the implementation, including COVID-19
All the staff (UNDP and government) changes caused delays. Between 2018 and 2020, the super-ministry was dismantled, and the Cabinet was reshuffled. The resilience work, originally with Tourism and Forestry, is now with Agriculture, and Lands and Fisheries is with Cooperatives, Culture, and Fisheries. The governance situation has been very volatile. The PIU has remained under one ministry, including Forestry, Agriculture, Lands, and Environment, a positive for integrated natural resource management approaches: Forestry, Agriculture and Land, Fisheries and Lands, and Environment.
Additionally, COVID-19 has negatively influenced the prioritized project plan under the new PC substantively. The project was planning substantive activities for the final year to speed up delivery and

get results in the final year. The project had been granted one extension through March 2021 and under COVID-19 applied for a second extension, but this was not approved.

UNDP support to Execution Issues, HR Recruitment communication about red flags on coordination-work planning, and scheduling, procurement, and contracting issues
Interviewees say UNDP should have identified red flags on the recruitment of PC HR skills sooner. Since UNDP was in a situation to recognize and understand such difficulties, it needed to intervene at some point. A lesson learned was the need for flexibility and a feedback loop for the use of funding and for solving a problem quickly in the implementation. This was an exercise that required close communication by UNDP and the NDP on issues, e.g., to buy things necessary to get real coordination. Good communication was required with UNDP on the use of funds. In the project's last days, an administrative issue resulted in the project not getting access to use all funds in time. It could have been solved with close communication rather than bureaucratic back and forth. The project had US$300,000 left in October and needed a sign-off on the face form. At that point, the implementing partner had not been identified, so the work did not move, and the funds were returned. The PIU was unable to submit as i the IP needed to be identified (which was still being decided). In this regard, interviewees said that UNDP also needed to change as it was slow to respond to the request for clarification, and the problem was solvable. A simple discussion could have resolved the issue about Forestry's need for a motor vehicle for transportation for project monitoring. The need for this vehicle had not been written in the project document.

Procurement from UNDP and the government was slow. A clear feedback loop and SOPs were required to streamline the process.
The interviewees mentioned that procurement was slow on both sides. The lesson is to develop SOPs and protocols to speed up implementation. Key interviews say this was a gender two marker project and *a gender ToR was developed,* but it took a year to finalize recruitment.

Project High-Level Board Oversight Meeting was mixed with the technical work planning
Interviewees mentioned that the PSC meeting was poorly conceived. The PSC executed at least 12 meetings which took a month's notice to convene. Moreover, stakeholders mentioned that work planning got muddled with PSC. A more efficient structure may have been a meeting of the highest-level partners, and optimally there should have been a separate technical work group to undertake the critical intersectoral planning work, which was in confusion.

ME: Unfinished MTR provided explicit recommendations, but the results were not actionable (how) and there was no change in the RR framework.
Stakeholders pointed out that while Adaptive Management was the central MTR message, it did not come across on paper. The MTR recommendations were reported as not very actionable. Post-MTR, the call was for adaptive management and streamlining, but this was not made explicit in the indicators or changes, i.e., reduction of project sites for PA expansion work. The PC's first job was to look at the stated challenges and identify an opportunity to make priorities. The MTR wanted to focus on the protected area, but the question was how to do it. The management response was to question how to scope down. There were checks and feedback loops. A lesson learned is to firmly educate the implementing partners on *what can be changed at the inception and the MTR* so that they take concrete forward adaptive management by changing the log frame sensibly and as permitted, and it can continue to be used as a monitoring tool. The likelihood of achieving results post-MTR: In this regard, interviewees said the MTR recommendations were not actionable. The recommendation did not list priorities, and the PC needed to select the focus and drill it down. The PC chose the Terrestrial group since it was familiar with the procedures. Which PS and which ministry for it to be under became a question. While the potential of the financial mechanism

was the stated government interest, there was no clear strategy for it in the ProDoc (overambitious and spread too thin to do substantive showcasing of a financial mechanism).

ME: Technical Monitoring and HR issues
The project staffed a CTA during the early implementation; however, according to interviewees, there were some shortcomings with inputs, and this staffing was discontinued pre-MTR. It was recognized that there was a need for technical rigor of policy and vetting work as this was essential to results. However, this issue was not solved. The RTA provided oversight through the PIR process, but this did not equal the significant role of technical oversight for results needed in a technical project such as this one. While the project coordinator is there to build relationships and do coordination, *technical oversight* is an additional role and essential to results and vetting the deliverables. Additionally, the science and policy must be equally strong in such an exercise so that the policymaker can make policy recommendations and better manage the results—not just the deliverables. While the PC can draft the Cabinet submissions, the role still needs technical inputs for the drafts to be complete. A CTA is essential in this type of project to convince others of the importance of scientific arguments for the expansion of the protected areas and to provide substantive oversight.

Technical quality of products questioned
Technical monitoring and support for technical integrated work planning were weak. For instance, while reforestation activities existed, the project had not established a proper baseline. Activities planned, such as mangrove replanting, were not done. Technical rigor is important, and in this instance, technical monitoring and capacity for it were weak both in data gathering and from a design perceptive. To support this, the project reported on anecdotal messages based on the nurseries and seagrass targets. While the ProDoc had established a baseline at the inception, it was *not monitored* annually.

Interviewees say that while some work was technically sound, the integrated watershed management plan was not so strong and demonstrated capacity add-on weakness in using only national consultants. There was an opportunity here to shadow and bring in technical expertise from the outside. The GIL management plan was mentioned as having shortfalls. The sustainable financing of international products was also said to be weak. There were no prescriptions for the government and the sub-activities were absent.

5.2. Conclusions

Several observations were noted throughout the Terminal Evaluation process, including the following:

- From a technical perspective, the project technical oversight and quality assurance from the UNDP MCO, Regional technical advisors and the Government counterparts lacked a smooth initiation and coordination during implementation. This dynamic and interruptive communicational coordination between these entities delayed the actions and compromised the scheduling. Stakeholders noted the project management from the beginning could have done more to ensure clear benchmarks for joint monitoring. For example, a key government official involved in the steering committee, indicated that UNDP, noted for their method of recruitment, *lacked the awareness of what the national project management support needs were*. Additionally, national stakeholders explained that the involvement of local consultants and stakeholders was lacking throughout the project.
- UNDP did not recruit a qualified PC for two years. Local stakeholders involved in the steering committee processes note the salary offered was not enough. Additionally, the project staff

responsible for accounting was managing the project for a long period when the priority should have been to recruit.

- Additionally, stakeholders noted there must be more national ownership in terms of HR requirements. All staff open positions should be filled promptly.
- There is a need for adequate support and resources to ensure national level implementation is well suited to local conditions, national constraints and capacity needs.
- UNDP, however, was not entirely equipped for the role it was expected to play in oversight. The government was also at fault for creating or allowing bottlenecks. These are critical lessons learned and discussed throughout the report.

The current state of the key deliverables

While developing a land-use plan was not this project's remit, it was an important driver for the structural change envisioned by the project end including the project-support work on the Forestry and Wildlife Act. The linked land-use work was under another GCC project, and according to stakeholders interviewed in government departments, viewed as complementary. The land-use policy is before the legal committee for both policy and legislation. The Forestry and Wildlife Act was approved and was expected to go to parliament this year.

Key achievements (noted by the key stakeholders *interviewed)*

- The project successfully reviewed the National Forestry and Wildlife Act with national consultants, building on the international work completed years before. The project also developed five co-management plans; however, interviewees expressed that they did not receive a rigorous review. The project was behind schedule, seemingly due to poor project management (see appendix) and the technical reviews had been rushed. The management plans required further review and technical/and public consultations. Two of these plans were showcased as good practices and have operational models that can be further assessed and scaled: Annandale National Park and Morne Gazo National Park. Work was done on the expansion of PA areas, complementing the activities and increasing the PA numbers. For instance, solid work was completed at the expansion of the marine area.
- On the marine, the Magazine Beach area was demarked as a national park. The government is taking action.
- The project was said to have been supporting the PA work directly by raising the profile of the need for PAs. Key stakeholders are seeing the actions taken.
- Under outcome two, the SLM component was said to be very useful. It supported the education and demonstration target, rain harvesting. The project showcased visible ridge-to-reef perspective. In addition, stakeholders highlighted that the education input on conservation and biodiversity value advocacy aspects impacted the more transformative mindset of the country's goals. Regarding the upstream work on legalizing forestry and wildlife protection, stakeholders explained that the government and public now understand the benefits for all: expanding and increasing the visibility of PAs for livelihoods and conservation measures.
- In general, most of the required legal products worked on is in late draft form or approved. However, stakeholders indicated that it requires implementation. A related water policy has been approved, and the country has a draft land use act awaiting approval. The Forestry and Wildlife Act is currently undergoing the legal process. Key stakeholders said additional support work was not needed in that regard. The country has approved coastal zone management policies and strategies.

- The scalable good practices that have emerged include Annandale National Park and Morne Gazo National Park. Morne Gazo has been properly demarcated. A facility was built and leased to a private individual. The government is also rehabilitating the trails. This is a success story that has also showcased the financial viability and support for the private-public partnership PPP arrangement for the management of those areas.
- Notably in the design or the interpretation of the design, the focus was on mainstreaming approaches, not on the concrete national level demonstration with a financial management plan for the national level PA system. Stakeholders explained that operationalizing the institutional and financial aspects from a national level is the next step.
- For the fishery-managed MPA, plans were developed but need more vetting.
- The project completed the demarcation of the national park with buffer zones and showcased PPP in key marine areas. COVID-19 impacted showcasing financial benefits for tourism. The government may want to assess the two practices. Additionally, these practices can be scaled and replicated by the financial aspects as a new phase.

In general, key government stakeholders interviewed indicated this project could have been a better benchmark- good practice for the region. The design ideas and concepts behind it were what was needed in the Caribbean. Grenada was ahead of other countries with enabling legislation on national parks and earmarking MPAs and TPAs and other related policy legislation in the pipeline. The lack of solid project management from the beginning affected the outputs the country was seeking. Much was done to bring awareness and capabilities to the approach and biodiversity value. It will be useful to help move the approaches forward to work on operationalizing the national park management system to focus on fiscal operations and co-management with communities and start a private-public partnership and payment for ecosystem approach related to the approved national forestry and wildlife policy and the soon-to-be approved land use policy.

Currently, several new projects are being examined including a GEF 6 project that will build on operationalizing this work in more watershed areas, namely, the UNDP/GEF 6-SLM Climate and Landscape project. The required follow-up includes further project advocacy, inclusive of an exit policy strategy for the Forestry and Wildlife Act and the government focus on operationalizing the Forestry and Wildlife Act as a national PA system including showcasing the financial aspects of the project areas system from a national perspective. The focus might be on scaling the good practices shown by the two successful co-management cases done by this project, Annandale National Park and Morne Gazo National Park.

For the remaining areas where management plans have been developed, the need is for the government to technically review those management plans, which then need to be shared with the public. Stakeholders explained that the plans were properly reviewed but required further public consultation. Forestry will have to take the lead. Forestry, Fisheries, and Environment need to conduct the review forward. Then the government can do land-use stipulation but in close consultation with the public, the landowners, and officials involved. According to interviewees, the greater land-use policy does not detail work on zoning because the land is privately owned. The policy is focused on land management and generating land information based on this. Accordingly, recommendations to properly use the land will be granted, i.e., to those holding land close to the beach who want to develop it. Mangroves cannot be removed and, therefore, no permission is granted.
A physical development law, i.e., rules on beaches, already exists. The gap was for the policy that would speak to how to manage one's land as a resource. The National Parks and Protected Areas Act speaks to the management of those lands. There has been a national parks advisory council since 1991.

The gap and need for follow-up that remains is to consider how these PA areas will be financed and fiscally managed at the national level. Establishing the forest advisory council was part of the Forestry and Wildlife Act. It is expected that continued momentum to support the legal work will set up the national management structure for revenue collection to financially manage the national parks and protected areas (pay for wardens and guards, community and public education, small infrastructure, control measures). The need is for government follow-up to continue to implement the law, to set up the facilities, and operationalize the management of the national parks, including the PES, PPPs, and the collection of the fees. Currently, these areas are managed financially by Forestry and some by Fisheries. The national management coordination and the national system were said by stakeholders involved not to have been the design's intent. The design was to develop the management plan for all the areas, but the idea to develop an overall management plan is the next step.

5.3. Recommendations

The next step is for government to take and vet the major results (including the management plans) and scale up the good practices. Government will need to operationalize the national forestry and protected area act including testing the national system financial aspects and operationalize the management plans. It is also necessary to carry through, operationalize and continue to build the capacity to manage and monitor PAs and IW/NRM cross sectoral working approaches[8].

5.4. Lessons

Lessons learned were captured beginning at page 22 of this report.

[8] Please refer to recommendations table on page 26 for further details.

ANNEXES

1) ToR

Virtual Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR)

for UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects

1. INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the *full-sized* project titled Implementing a "Ridge to Reef" Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem functions within and around Protected Areas in Grenada *(PIMS #5087)* implemented through the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment. The project started on February 10, 2015 and is in its *fifth* year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document 'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects'TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf.

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Project Summary Table

Project Title:	Implementing a "Ridge to Reef" Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem functions within and around Protected Areas in Grenada			
GEF Project ID:	5069		at endorsement (Million US$)	at completion (Million US$)
UNDP Project ID:	00091627	GEF financing:	$ 3,031,666	$ 3,031,666
Country:	Grenada	Government:	$ 15,176,822	$ 15,176,822
Region:	Latin America & the Caribbean			

Focal Area:	Biodiversity and Ecosystems			
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	2.3. Solutions at local level for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystems and environmental services, for expanded jobs and livelihoods; and 3.5. Transparent and non-discriminatory legal and regulatory frameworks and policies enabled for sustainable management of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems (in line with international conventions and national legislation)			
Executing Agency:	United Nations Development Program (UNDP)	Total Project Cost:	$ 250,000	$ 250,000
Other Partners involved:	Ministry of Climate Resilience, the Environment, Forestry, Fisheries and Disaster Management	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		February 10, 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: December 2019	Actual: February 2021

The Grenada "Ridge to Reef Project" is designed to support Grenada's compliance with a number of agreed-upon International Environmental Management and Conservation Strategies, Policies and Plans (e.g MDGs and Aichi targets and goals) with the technical and financial assistance of the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The project intervention is essentially a complement to the Government of Grenada's efforts, on the local level, to fulfill its obligations to various United Nations Conventions and Protocols (MEAs) with respect to Biodiversity and Eco-systems Functions/services by applying program based delivery systems; and with co-management initiatives that will accommodate the involvement of local area communities in a direct way. This project is therefore designed to address the GEF STAR 5 strategy for SLM, SFM/REDD+ together with focal areas such as BD, LD and climate change mitigation (ECM). The project will uniquely co-program with concurrent grant-aid initiatives having similar goals and purposes.

In particular, the project directly addresses and is consistent with the outcomes and outputs of GEF Strategic Objective #1– to improve sustainability of protected area systems. The project will support the implementation of key aspects of the Grenada System Plan for Parks and Protected areas and the Grenada Declaration (COP8) to effectively conserve at least 25% of its marine and territorial ecosystems by the year 2020. This project will enhance the capabilities of Grenada with respect to institutional, regulatory, and policy-based Strategic Planning. It will also provide Grenada with financial support for various materials that enable the process. The project will expand and enhance the existing PA system in the country by increasing the number of TPAs from 8 to 9 (increasing the number of hectares from 1,931 ha. to 2931 ha.) and increasing the number of MPAs from

3 to 7 (increasing the number of hectares from 1,780 ha. to 13, 180 ha.). Furthermore, the project will support the incorporation of a number of mini PAs into the national network as a minimum cost output. The consolidation and expansion of the PA system will be enhanced by 31 the project's support in reducing threats to BD by addressing habitat degradation and over-exploitation of biological resources within PAs.

The project will also address GEF Land Degradation Strategic Object 3 – Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape. The proposed project will contribute to arresting and reversing current trends in land and forest degradation and deforestation, focused on an area (the Beausejour Watershed) that has direct and significant negative impacts on ecosystem services in adjacent Protected Areas, through implementation of Integrated Watershed Management and application of sustainable agricultural practices that will prevent erosion and sedimentation entering coastal and near shore waters, will create livelihood benefits for local communities, and will conserve important terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems.

The project will also address GEF SFM-REDD+ Objective 1 – Reduce pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services, by reducing the threat of deforestation from fire, slash and burn agriculture, and encroachment by housing and tourism, and by increasing forest cover and carbon stocks through agro-forestry and the removal of invasive species.

The project will implement a "Ridge-to-Reef" approach that integrates BD, LD and SFM approaches, jointly implemented by government and local communities, and combines protection of biodiversity and habitats within a functional, representative and sustainable national system of terrestrial and marine protected areas with sustainable management of land and water resources in adjoining / upstream watersheds. In so doing, the project supports the Decision 11 / COP.10 of the UNCCD at its 9th Plenary Meeting in October 2011 that "encourages eligible Parties, taking into account the cross-sectoral nature of land degradation, to use existing potential to harness synergies across the Global Environment Facility focal areas in order further to reinforce the importance of sustainable land management for integrating environment and developmental aspirations globally."

Finally, the proposed project supports the following goals inter alia of the 2004 CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas: 1.2 To integrate protected areas into broader land- and seascapes and sectors so as to maintain ecological structure and function; 1.4 To substantially improve site-based protected area planning and management; 1.5 To prevent and mitigate the negative impacts of key threats to protected areas; 2.2 To enhance and secure involvement of indigenous and local communities and relevant stakeholders; 3.2 To build capacity for the planning, establishment and management of protected areas; 3.1 To provide an enabling policy, institutional and socio-economic environment for protected areas; and 3.5 To strengthen communication, education and public awareness."

The project's goal is to provide multiple global and local benefits by strengthening land, forest, and reef management processes (eco-systems functions) and biodiversity conservation on all terrestrial landscapes and marine and seascapes in Grenada, especially within and around marine and terrestrial protected areas. This will be achieved through a multi-focal strategy having a "Ridge to Reef" approach that increases protected areas' management effectiveness and applies targeted land management practices to include:

1. Development of a policy-based legal, planning and institutional /regulatory framework in support of a sustainably managed network of TPAs and MPAs;
2. Development and management of landscapes and seascapes by adopting the approach of integrating SLM and SFM/REDD+ principles and practices as a matter of public policy (integrated approach for managing forest ecosystems, protection and sustainable use of the biodiversity, prevention of

land/sea degradation, and integration of peoples livelihood objectives within the management of forest and marine eco-systems.);

3. By piloting SFM/REDD+ and SLM practices in the Annandale/ Beausejour watershed to improve Carbon stocks, reducing deforestation, reducing susceptibility to drought (and forest fires) and consequent land degradation that would impact downstream landscapes and seascapes.

Over the period of implementation, government Ministries, departments and related priorities have been changed in keeping with national and international dynamics. For example, the Government Ministries and IP and associated Permanent Secretaries have changed over the years. More recently COVID19 has caused Government focus to safeguard public health to shift priorities from previously tabled legislative amendments to protected areas legislation.

During 2020, the project's implementation was delayed as a direct result of COVID-19. Infrastructural projects namely the construction of an interpretation centre at Carriacou was significantly delayed by halts to construction activities and other government restrictions. Planned travel and in person training workshops were also cancelled to adhere to COVID19 public health restrictions. With subsequent reopening of activities within the limitations of physical distancing protocols, some virtual and limited (number restricted) activities have been able to resume. In several instances, technical capacity and limited IT resources for beneficiaries (fisherfolk and farming stakeholders in particular) also posed a challenge to implementation via virtual modalities.

3. TE PURPOSE

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The objective of this TE is to analyze the implementation of the project, to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of project achievements to deliver the stated objectives and outcomes, as well as to evaluate the project's contribution towards the implementation of a "Ridge to Reef" Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem functions within and around Protected Areas in Grenada. It establishes the relevance, performance and success of the project, including sustainability of results. The evaluation also brings together and analyses best practices, specific lessons learned, and recommendations regarding strategies employed and the implementation arrangements, that may be relevant to or replicable by other projects.

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The TE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. As a result of COVID-19, a field mission will not be undertaken. Stakeholder involvement will be undertaken through virtual meetings on Zoom, Skype etc. Stakeholder involvement would include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities. The following is an indicative list of the individuals/institutions whose views should be fully reflected in the final report.

Name	**Agency/Department**	**Contact Information**
Mr. Mohammad Nagdee	SSE Cluster Head, UNDP Barbados & the Eastern Caribbean	mohammad.nadgee@undp.org
Ms. Rudo Udika	Project Coordinator, Ridge to Reef (R2R)	rudo.udika@undp.org
Ms. Claudia Ortiz	Regional Technical Adviser	claudia.ortiz@undp.org
Mr. Elvis Morain	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry	ps@moa.gov.gd
Ms. Desiree Stephen	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Tourism, Civil Aviation, Climate Resilience & Environment	ps@tourism.gov.gd
Ms. Roxie Hutchinson	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	krphutchinson@gmail.com
Dr. Kelvin George	Director, Department of Economic and Technical Cooperation	director@detc.gov.gd
Mr. Titus Antoine	Former Director, Department of Economic and Technical Cooperation	titus_antoine@yahoo.com
Ms. Claudette Peters	St. Patrick's Environmental and Community Tourism Organization (SPECTO)	specto.grenada@gmail.com
Mr. Evans Gooding	North East Farmers Organization (NEFO)	northeastfarmersgrenada@gmail.com

Name	Agency/Department	Contact Information
Ms. Magdalene Niles	North East Farmers Organization (NEFO)	northeastfarmersgrenada@gmail.com
Mr. Aden Forteau	Technical Officer, Climate Smart Agriculture & Rural Enterprise Programme (SAEP)	technical.officer@saep.gov.gd
Mr. Brian Whyte	Carriacou Fisher Folk	carriacoufisherfolkassociation@gmail.com
Dr. Angus Friday	Blue Innovation Institute	angusfriday@gmail.com
Ms. Lotten Haagman	Grenada Hotel & Tourism Authority	lotten.ha@gmail.com
Mr. Whyme Cox	Director, Planning & Projects National Water & Sewage Authority	wcox@nawasa.gd
Ms. Marion Geiss	GIZ, Deputy Head of Office	marion.geiss@giz.de
Ms. Christine Finney	Eco Dive Grenada	info@ecodivegrenada.com
Ms. Claire Morrall	St George's University	cmorrall@sgu.edu
Mr. Ian Noel	Port Authority Grenada	allauno@hotmail.com
Mrs. Khadijah Edwards	GEF SGP	kadijah.edwards@undp.org
Mr. Trevor Thompson	Ministry of Agriculture Lands and Forestry	trevort_lud@yahoo.com
Mr. Tobias Calliste	Fisheries Officer	tobex00@hotmail.com
Mr. Olando Harvey	MPA Coordinator	landokeri@yahoo.com
Mr. Moran Mitchell	Chief Fisheries Officer (Ag)	mitchellmoran767@gmail.com
Mr. Arley Gill	Legal Consultant	salimbi@hotmail.com

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

As of 11 March 2020, the World Health Organization (WHO) declared COVID-19 a global pandemic as the new coronavirus rapidly spread to all regions of the world. Grenada's has entry restrictions for some countries and all incoming passengers are expected to undertake mandatory quarantine. If it is not possible to travel to or within the country for the TE mission then the TE team should develop a methodology that takes this into account the conduct of the TE virtually and remotely, including the use of remote interview methods and extended desk reviews, data analysis, surveys and evaluation questionnaires. This should be detailed in the TE Inception Report and agreed with the Commissioning Unit.

If all or part of the TE is to be carried out virtually then consideration should be taken for stakeholder availability, ability or willingness to be interviewed remotely. In addition, their accessibility to the internet/computer may be an issue as many government and national counterparts may be working from home. These limitations must be reflected in the final TE report.

If a data collection/field mission is not possible then remote interviews may be undertaken through telephone or online (skype, zoom etc.). International consultants can work remotely with national evaluator support in the field if it is safe for them to operate and travel. No stakeholders, consultants or UNDP staff should be put in harm's way and safety is the key priority.

A short validation mission may be considered if it is confirmed to be safe for staff, consultants, stakeholders and if such a mission is possible within the TE schedule. Equally, qualified and independent national consultants can be hired to undertake the TE and interviews in country as long as it is safe to do so.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf.

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk "(*)" indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*) , socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or

solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women's empowerment.

- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for Implementing a "Ridge to Reef" Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem functions within and around Protected Areas in Grenada

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating[11]
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	
Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately 3*5 working days* over a time period of *5 weeks* starting on February 8, 2021. *date)*. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
01/02/21	Application closes
05/02/21	Selection of TE team
08/02/21	Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation)
15/02/21 – 18/02/21 *3days (recommended 2-4)*	Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
19/02/21 – 21/02/21 *3 days*	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission
() *22/02/21 – 01/03/21* *7 days (recommended 7-15)*	TE mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits, etc.
05/03/21	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
06/02/21 – 13/03/21 *5 days (recommended 5-10)*	Preparation of draft TE report
15/03/21	Circulation of draft TE report for comments
08/03/21 – 10/03/21	Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report
11/03/21	Preparation and Issuance of Management Response
25/03/21	Expected date of full TE completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report.

7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the TE mission: *11/02/21*	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE mission: *12/03/21*	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management

3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report *(using guidelines on report content in ToR Annex C)* with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE mission: 02/03/21	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report *(See template in ToR Annex H)*	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: *10/03/21*	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.[2]

TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is UNDP Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean.

The Commissioning Unit and the Project Team will be responsible for supporting the TE Team. Assistance will be provided with arranging remote/virtual meetings, providing updated stakeholder list with contact details (phone and email) and other relevant documentation.

8. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE – one team leader with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in Latin America and the Caribbean and one team expert, from Grenada. The team leader be responsible for the overall design and writing of the TE report, etc. The team expert will assess emerging trends with respect to regulatory frameworks, budget allocations, capacity building, work with the Project Team in arranging meetings and requesting information etc.

The evaluator(s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall "team" qualities in the following areas:

Team Leader

Education

- Master's degree in Biodiversity and Conservation, Environmental Science, Natural Resources Management or other closely related field;
- Bachelor's degree and an additional five (5) years of experience would be accepted in lieu of a postgraduate degree

Experience

- At least five years demonstrated experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- At least five years' experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity and Ecosystems;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Experience working in Latin America and the Caribbean;
- Experience in relevant technical areas for at least *10 years;*
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Biodiversity and Ecosystems;
- Experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;
- Project evaluation/review experience within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Team Expert

Education

- Bachelor's Degree in Biodiversity and Conservation, Environmental Science, Natural Resources Management or other closely related field;

Experience:

- At least three years demonstrated experience with results-based management evaluation methodologies;
- At least three years' experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios;
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to Biodiversity and Ecosystems;
- Experience in evaluating projects;
- Excellent communication skills;
- Demonstrable analytical skills;

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

Consultants will be evaluated based on the following weighting criteria:

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical	**70**	**70**
• Master's degree in Biodiversity and Conservation, Environmental Science, Natural Resources Management other closely related field	20	20
• At least 2 -4 years of experience in project management, • 2 years' experience in Biodiversity Conservation, Adaptive Management or related activities	10 10	10 10
• Previous work experience in a UN organization or knowledge of the national Government system	15	15

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
• Sound cross-cultural, gender-awareness, interpersonal and networking skills	15	15
Financial	**30**	**30**

9. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

10. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%:

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

The following provisions are for the impact of COVID-19 on the production of deliverables and any reduced payment should this occur:

In line with the UNDP's financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the TE, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

11. APPLICATION PROCESS[3]

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a. **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template[4] provided by UNDP;
b. **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form[5]);
c. Brief description **of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
d. **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (insert mailing address) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of Implementing a "Ridge to Reef" Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem functions within and around Protected Areas in Grenada or by email at the following address ONLY: *(insert email address)* by *(time and date)*. Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

12. TOR ANNEXES

(Add the following annexes to the final ToR)

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

[1] Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U)

[2] Access at: http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml

[3] Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx

[4]https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx

[5] http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

2) RESULTS AND RESOURCES FRAMEWORK

Part V (I) - PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK:					
The Project Would Contribute to Achieving Country Programme Outcomes in the CPAP or CPD: protecting biodiversity and ecosystems functions in and around protected areas.					
Country Programme Outcome Indicators: strengthened national capacities for protected areas management to conserve and manage the biodiversity and ecosystems functions.					
Primary Applicable Key Environmental and Sustainable Development Result Area: Mainstreaming protected areas management, viability of protected areas system and application of management effectiveness tracking tools in the context of global benefits.					
Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Programs: SOI-Improve Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems.					
Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes: Outcome 1.1 – Improved Management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas (BD-1); Outcome 3.2- Integrated Landscape management practices adopted by 6 local area communities (LD-3); Outcome 1.3 – Good management practices adopted by relevant economic factors (vested interests) (SFM/REDD-1)					
Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: indicator 1.1 5 new PAs and coverage of 12,400 ha of unprotected ecosystems (BD-1); 3.2 INRM tools and methodologies tested (LD-3); 3.4 Information on INRM technologies and food practice guidelines disseminated (LD-3), 1.3 types and quantity of services generated through SFM (SFM/REDD-1) all scored as recorded by management effectiveness tracking tool (METT).					
Project Objective	**Indicator**	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Means of Verification**	**Risks and Assumptions**
To ensure that biodiversity (BD) and ecosystems functions within and around Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and Terrestrial Protected Areas (TPAs) in Grenada are better protected from threats through the adoption of an integrated "Ridge to Reef" approach that increases Protected Area (PA) management effectiveness and applies targeted sustainable land management practices.	PA management in Grenada is mainstreamed	- TPAs managed by Forestry Division and MPAs managed under the Fisheries Division with varying degrees of recognition and planning & management tools.	- TPA and MPA planning & management instruments and guidelines formally incorporated into the Government's Administration	PA planning and management instruments and guidelines. M/E records kept by the Project management unit	**Assumptions:** Institutional stability and commitment of GoG throughout project implementation. Consensus among stakeholders for PA expansion and connectivity. National/International conditions remain stable. Willingness of government to commit funding and resources to make the PAs system viable and resilient. **Risks**: Extreme weather, fires, pests and invasive species are beyond predicted levels.
	Financial sustainability to increase viability and resilience of the PA system in Grenada	- Insufficient financial resources for basic functions in the Forestry and Tourism Divisions as reflected by Financial Scorecard: 70 = 32% - No formal coordination mechanism for investments in maintenance of the PA system.	- Budgetary restructuring to foster strategic collaboration between fisheries, forestry and tourism to increase (double) budgetary allocations to 8 PAs as eco-sites, as reflected by increase in Financial Scorecard: 90 = 42% - Inter-sectoral coordination committee established to oversee investments in PAs	Forestry, fisheries tourism and program recurrent and capital budgets. METT Financial Scorecard applied at PPG, MTR, and TE M/E Records	
	Average METT scores of 6 existing TPAs and 3 MPAs	53	62	METT Scorecard applied at PPG, MTR, and TE	

	Improved capacity for planning, implementation and monitoring of site-specific co-managed strategies for threat reduction through SLM and SFM in PAs.	Avg score on Capacity Development Scorecard[9]: Q 2: 2 Q10: 1 Q 11: 1 Q 13: 2 Q 14: 0 <u>Areas to be improved:</u> Co-management is identified as the governance model for SLM, SFM and TPA management, but no formal mechanisms are instituted. Outdated laws, low public knowledge of the various legislation, and inadequate regulatory framework constrain enforcement. Environmental information used to support decision-making processes is unavailable, under-utilized, incomplete or out-of-date. Capacity and technological needs are, when available, obtained through external financing. Monitoring is done irregularly, with or without an adequate monitoring framework.	Avg score on Cap Dev SC increases by at least 1 point: Q 2: 3 Q10: 2 Q 11: 2 Q 13: 3 Q 14: 1 <u>Specific improvements:</u> Develop and implement co-management mechanisms for SFM, SLM and TPA management (Outcome 1). Review and update existing policies and legislation; implement site specific mgt plans for PAs; endorse an interagency collaboration mechanism for SLM. (Outcomes 1 & 2) Develop and implement a protocol that facilitates information updating, access and sharing for decision-making (Outcomes 1 & 2). Develop a capacity development strategy to augment technical skills within the resident organizations per the priorities of the NAP. National monitoring system with proper capacity building (Outcome 1).	GEF Capacity Development Scorecard applied at PPG, MTR and TE	

[9] Q2 = Existence of operational co-management mechanisms.
Q10 = Existence of an adequate environmental policy and regulatory frameworks
Q11= Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making.
Q13= Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer.
Q14= Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process.

Outcome #1	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
- Establishment and effective management of new and existing Protected Areas	Institutional framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs	- No formal National Parks Advisory Council; Forestry Division administers 8 TPAs under suboptimal conditions; Fisheries Division administers 3 MPAs.	- Formal establishment of a National Parks Advisory Council for TPAs and Management Committee for MPAs administering policy-based PAs, PoA.	- SROs Published in the Government Gazette to enable the TPA and MPA Strategic Management bodies to function.	**Assumptions:** Government of Grenada adopts the Ridge to Reef Project as a key initiative for fulfilling its obligations for conservation and management of its BD to meet local and Global objectives. **Risks:** Contingency-based planning and management persists.
	Regulatory and legal framework for management effectiveness in and around Pas	- Forestry policy does not include INRM. - Fisheries division does not use INRM in its administration of MPAs. - No PA System Business Plan exists	- A finalized and approved *Protected Area Forestry and Wildlife Bill* with draft SROs that promote INRM practices and principles. - Fisheries division applying INRM principles and practices using enhanced law and/ or regulations, within 2 years. - PA System Business Plan developed and under implementation	New parent legislation published in the Government gazette and with associated SROs.	
	Expansion of protected areas system	3,711 ha of bio-diverse landscapes/seascapes formally recognized and facing multiple threats: - 8 TPAs managed under suboptimal conditions and 5 mini TPAs with no management mechanism. o TPAs cover 1,931 ha. - 3 MPAs management suboptimal conditions o MPAs cover 1,780 ha.	16, 111 ha of bio-diverse landscapes/seascapes formally recognized and managed effectively: - 9 TPAs + 4 mini-TPAs effectively managed with legal demarcation, management plans, business plans, and adequate infrastructure in place. o TPAs cover 2,931 ha. - 7 MPAs managed under optimal conditions within 5 years. o MPAs cover 13,180 ha.	Project records: - Technical reports - GIS maps - Project evaluation reports - Planning and policy documents - Tracking Tools - Field assessment	**Assumptions:** Increased support from GoG**.** Effective management measures adopted. **Risks** Unpredicted natural hazards
	Measurable Threat Reduction: - Forest cover - Direct Carbon benefits - Indirect Carbon benefits - Mangrove, seagrass bed and coral reef areas	- Continuous deforestation threatens 10,012 hectares - 81,652.5 tC (Direct) - 322,158.3 tC (Indirect) - Continuous destruction of 231 Ha of mangrove, 1301 Ha of seagrass and 5095 Ha of reef areas	- 10,012 hectares of forested area maintained or increased - 81,652.5 tC Direct maintained or increased - 322,158.3 tC Indirect maintained or increased - 231 Ha of mangrove, 1301 Ha of seagrass and 5095 Ha of reef areas maintained or increased	- Tracking Tools applied at PPG, MTR, and TE - Technical reports - GIS maps - Satellite imagery - Field assessments	**Risks** Unpredicted natural hazards **Assumptions** Consensus and interest among local stakeholders. Collaboration with Academia and Centres of excellence in data procurement and application of SLM/SFM practices

Outcome #1	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Management of expanded PA network institutionalized	- No coral Reef resilience program (protocol) in place. - No systematic SFM program in place - No staff trained in planning accounting, bio principal monitoring, enforcement, fire management and co-management	- Coral reef resilience program (protocol) in place within 5 years. - SFM program adopted and administered in all PAs within 5 yrs. - 13 PA Staff trained	- MMER protocol designed adopted and administered - CCM measures adopted and recorded - Records of staff training - Training Docs. - Capacity development Scorecard	
	PA network infrastructure and services	- Inconsistent infrastructure and facilities and services across TPAs and MPAs.	- Standardized and quality infrastructure facilities and services available at all TPA and MPA units in the PA network.	- Field inspections - Documentation and records	**Assumptions:** Adequate investments: Entrepreneurs willing to assist and collaborate in the project.
	Community involvement in PA management through conservation and sustainable use of natural resources	- 0 communities adjacent to MPAs engaged in PA co-management - 0 communities adjacent to TPAs engaged on PA co-management	- 3 communities adjacent to selected MPAs engaged in co-management - 3 communities adjacent to selected TPAs engaged in PA co-management	- Planning and policy documents and records. - Project records - METT scorecard	**Assumptions:** Community interest in engaging in PA management activities
	Benefits/profitability from conservation/ sustainable-use resource-based livelihood opportunities	- No systematic collaboration for INRM linked to livelihood opportunities - Minimal benefits from resources based livelihoods	- Incentive schemes to engage entrepreneurs in INRM practices linked to livelihoods - Measured increase in benefits from resource based livelihoods	- Project records - METT scorecard	

Outputs:

1.1 Institutional framework for PA System Management that would develop and administer a policy-based strategic plan of action for an expanded PA network, one advisory body for TPAs while the other is for MPAs; with the aid of policy instruments.

1.2 A legal and regulatory framework established through the finalization and approval of the bill for "Protected Area, Forestry and Wildlife" enhanced with SROs and operations management policy instruments that would the consolidate legal process to include private lands in the PA system. Accompanied by an adapted MPA Act as a response to community wide consultations with key stakeholders.

Outcome #1	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
1.3 Expanded PA system through the creation of a new TPA (1000 ha), enhanced management of 8 suboptimally managed TPAs, as well as low-cost improvements for 4 small-hectare TPAs; and the creation of 4 new MPAs (11,400 ha). 1.4 Management of Protected Area Units Institutionalized as a TPA network and with a MPA network. 1.5 Conservation and sustainable use of natural resources as a means for community involvement in PA co-management.					

Outcome #2	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
- Climate resilient SLM practices applied in the Beauséjour watershed to reduce threats adjacent to and upstream of PAs.	Planning and management framework for SLM/INRM	- No LUP regulations limiting agriculture and housing. - National Forestry Policy does not consider C sequestration. - No intersectoral body or committee in place for implementing a watershed management plan using INRM approaches. - Stakeholders not engaged in community-based rule-making with respect to applying INRM practices. - No systematic monitoring for water quality/quantity, sediment and pollution impacts	- LUP regulations elaborated and implemented to limit agriculture and housing. - NFP updated to include C sequestration. - Intersectoral committee established within Year 1 - The intersectoral watershed committee engages stakeholders to formulate community-based rules for applying INRM practices within 2-3 yrs. - A water quality/quantity protocol set in place within Year 2.	- Capacity development scorecard - Project records of engagements between and among stakeholders. - Minutes of intersectional committee meetings. - Water quality and quantity protocol - Updated National Forest Policy document.	**Assumptions:** Optimal community uptake of the watershed management plan of action. Practical evidence of accommodation of TEK, LK and ideals of local area, persons accommodated in watershed management plan. Collaboration is ongoing between and among competent authorities relevant to the exercise.
	Community participation in SFM.	- No involvement of local stakeholders in initiatives to review and update the National Forest Policy (NFP) to consider carbon sequestration.	- Community engaged in updating of NFP; and SROs promulgated by Year 3.	- Project records of engagements between and among stakeholders. - Updated NFP and related SROs	

Outcome #2	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Direct carbon benefits through avoided deforestation; forest enrichment; and planting in the Beauséjour watershed.	- 9,613tC sequestration by 3337.3 ha of private forest - 4,320tC sequestration by150ha increase in forest cover with removal of 40ha of bamboo - 0 tC from avoided deforestation and sustainable planting products	- 9,613tC sequestration maintained in private forests - 4320tC sequestration maintained - At least 26066tC sequestration from avoided deforestation and sustainable planting products	-Tracking Tools -Technical reports	**Assumptions:** Competent Authorities are consistent with M&E for multiple impacts. **Risks:** Failures in the M&E plan.
	Turbidity Levels/ sediment buildup at two MPAs downstream of Beauséjour	No turbidity index available; TBD within first 6 months of project	15% reduction in turbidity	-Turbidity and soil accumulation - Monitor and measurement protocol. UN FAO LADA tools.	
	Pesticide and fertilizer levels at two MPAs downstream of Beauséjour.	Grand Anse MPA: TBD within the first 6 months of project Molinière/ Beauséjour MPA: TBD within the first 6 months of project	Grand Anse MPA: 15% reduction Molinière/ Beauséjour MPA: 15% reduction	Water quality measurement using protocol for Pesticide and fertilizer (Agrochemicals) in seawater at MPAs	
	Application of gender and community-sensitive SLM and SFM practices in 6 communities (Beauséjour, Happy Hill, Granville Vale, New Hampshire, Annandale and Vendome)	No ongoing and systematic training: - No agricultural production program implemented within the watershed. - No rangeland management program implemented within the watershed. - No forest management program implemented within the watershed.	6 villages trained in alternative livelihoods related to BD, SFM/SLM, and CC issues: - A sustainable agricultural biodiversity program implemented by Year 3 - A sustainable rangeland management program implemented by Year 3 - SFM program involving forest enrichment with agroforest species to ensure SLM/SFM practices applied by Year 3	- Landscape management plans in place - Technical reports - Field verification notes - Tracking Tools - Capacity Development scorecard	**Assumptions:** Optimal uptake by farmers and landowners. Innovative alternatives accepted to replace bamboo as a tool to avoid land slippage. Due recognition of gender equity is emphasized within all delivery systems
	Impact of Soil erosion/stability on household incomes of famers within the Beauséjour watershed	No existing estimates of soil loss or land soil accumulation levels available. TBD within first 6 months of project	15% reduction of soil loss	Field inspections/ UNFAO-LADA tools: -sediment traps -Soil Accumulation measurements	**Assumptions:** No serious CC impacts Farmers uptake of initiates to enhance profitability of their farms

Outcome #2	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
		No statistics on farmer income available[10]. Initial survey to establish baseline to be conducted during Year 1	25% increase in weekly income per farmer.	-Suspended sediments -Comparative household surveys of farming communities (RAS method)	**Risk:** Lack of cooperation by farmers. Private profitability is not highlighted sufficiently.
	Education and awareness levels	- No education and awareness program	- Public awareness campaign developed and implemented	- Project records - Farmer/landowner engagement records - Tracking Tools	**Assumptions:** Emphasis on community-wide education and awareness. Due recognition of gender equity is emphasized within all delivery systems
Outputs: 2.1 Strengthened planning and management framework, capacities and awareness for participatory sustainable resource management. 2.2 Improved SLM and SFM practices in 6 communities resulting in reduced deforestation and land and forest degradation in the landscapes surrounding PAs involving: sustainable agricultural production initiatives to conserve and enrich soil and water management; enhanced capacity of farmers and farm organizations and to improve product quality and marketing; sustainable rangeland management initiative for community-based control of overgrazing that impacts on landscape and seascape quality; sustainable forest management initiative that uses agroforests species to enrich and rehabilitate deforested landscapes.					

[10] Statistical data is provided on p. 48 for gross income for each of the 6 communities participating in these pilots. However, the data does not specify the income of farmers, a sector expected to show increased revenue through the adoption and application of SFM/SLM/INRM practices through the project's interventions.

Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	End of project target level	Level at 30 June 2019	April 2021 Target met, Partially met or not met
PA management in Grenada is mainstreamed	- TPAs managed by Forestry Division and MPAs managed under the Fisheries Division with varying degrees of recognition and planning & management tools.	- TPA and MPA planning & management instruments and guidelines formally incorporated into the Government's Administration	Progress towards main streaming of PA management in Grenada has experienced moderately satisfactory gains and is partially completed. PA management has been partially mainstreamed through a series of direct project interventions and support activities undertaken during the year. Specifically, the project supported the development and completion of management plans for two proposed MPAs (Morne Gazo and Mt St Catherine) and facilitated stakeholder consultations for the development of Management Plans in support of the establishment of 4 additional MPAs. More generally, a standardized process for the development of Protected Areas (PA) Management Plans was developed and proposed to Government. The project is undertaking advocacy among key government officials to strengthen country ownership to support the approval/endorsement of draft legislation and policy proposals to support the implementation of these	**Partially Met.** Progress towards main streaming of PA management in Grenada has experienced moderately unsatisfactory progress as the target is yet to be achieved. Noteworthy progress however has been achieved since Nov- present in relation to TPAs managed by the Forestry Division. Since 2021 the Forestry Division has been under the supervision of the Chief Land Use officer who has supported the Ministry in activities to better delineate and potentially designate additional protected areas. Priority development activities are being operationalized where possible. Staff have been engaged in activities to provide feedback and support for protected areas management. Project activities have not been fully implemented. Staff are looking to get support for the procurement of additional surveillance equipment, vehicles for monitoring/patrols and conservation management. Recruitment of a TPA consultant to support the Ministry on identification and delineation of additional TPAs reached the stage of development of ToR for recruitment. Contract not implemented due to unavailability of funds further to the closure of R2R. Additional MPAs (e.g., Magazine Beach) have been declared by Cabinet in January 2021. Work to support MPAs have not been fully implemented. Noteworthy progress has been achieved since Nov- present in relation to TPAs managed by the Forestry Division. Since 2021 the Forestry Division has been under the supervision of the Chief Land Use officer who has supported the Ministry in activities to better delineate and potentially designate additional protected areas. Priority development activities are being operationalized where possible. Staff have been engaged in activities to provide feedback and support for protected areas management. Project activities have not been fully implemented. Staff are looking to get support for the

Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	End of project target level	Level at 30 June 2019	April 2021 Target met, Partially met or not met
			Management plans. The review process is anticipated to be completed and approved by September 2019. The project contributed to improvements in coordination and oversight through support for the re- establishment of the National Marine Protected Areas Committee and it is anticipated that this committee will be appointed by the Cabinet within the July-August 2019 schedule. Similarly, progress towards the establishment of the National Parks Advisory Committee was also made.it is anticipated that this will be completed by September 2019. In collaboration with civil society organizations such as Carriacou FAD Fishers Association and in coordination with the GEF-funded, World Bank implemented, project P128437: Ocean Partnership for Sustainable Fisheries and Biodiversity Conservation Models for Innovation and Reform, the project supported training in the use and regulation of Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs) which are expected to support MPA management effectiveness. More generally, a standardized process for the	procurement of additional surveillance equipment, vehicles for monitoring/patrols and conservation management. Recruitment of a TPA consultant to support the Ministry on identification and delineation of additional TPAs reached the stage of development of ToR for recruitment. Contract not implemented due to unavailability of funds further to the closure of R2R. Additional MPAs (e.g., Magazine Beach) have been declared by the Cabinet in January 2021. Work to support MPAs have not been fully implemented. The significant delay in finalizing the formal incorporation of planning & management instruments into Government Administration is largely due to shifted priorities due to State of Emergency and other COVID-19 related impacts that have delayed many GoG administrative matters/ legislative processes which are not directly related to the COVID-19 response. The project is undertaking advocacy among key government officials and legal stakeholders to strengthen country ownership to support the approval/endorsement of draft legislation and policy proposals to support the implementation of these Management plans. The process is anticipated to be completed and approved by October 2020

Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	End of project target level	Level at 30 June 2019	April 2021 Target met, Partially met or not met
			development of Protected Areas (PA) Management Plans was developed and proposed to Government. The review process is anticipated to be completed and approved by September 2019. This will be critical for developing management plans for TPAs where there is currently no standard template for these plans and, as a result, no progress has been made in this area. The Project also supported the development of the National Forest Policy and Strategic Plan and Revised Environmental Management Act 2014 for Grenada. This activity was undertaken in partnership with Government counterparts and the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) as part of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) Global Climate Change Alliance Project on Climate Change Adaptation and Sustainable Land Management in the Eastern Caribbean (Land Resilience – Promoting a Climate for Change) funded by the European Union. During the period, the IP underwent a merger with another Ministry which created some unanticipated challenges. However, overall positive relations have been	

Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	End of project target level	Level at 30 June 2019	April 2021 Target met, Partially met or not met
			maintained with Government officials, as well as Ministerial level support. Thus, the Project continues to work with government and other key stakeholders to support initiatives for continued public consultation and buy-in to proposed legislative and administrative amendments.	

Financial sustainability to increase viability and resilience of the PA system in Grenada	- Insufficient financial resources for basic functions in the Forestry and Tourism Divisions as reflected by Financial Scorecard: 70 = 32% - No formal coordination mechanism for investments in maintenance of the PA system.	- Budgetary restructuring to foster strategic collaboration between fisheries, forestry and tourism to increase (double) budgetary allocations to 8 PAs as eco-sites, as reflected by increase in Financial Scorecard: 90 = 42% - Inter-sectoral coordination committee established to oversee investments in PAs	Attaining financial sustainability to increase viability and resilience of the PA system of Grenada has been initiated and is partially completed. No financial sustainability assessment (scorecard) has been undertaken during the period and hence its' status is unchanged. There has been moderately satisfactory progress towards target of fostering strategic collaboration between fisheries, forestry and tourism to increase budgetary allocations. Although there has not been a restructuring to support the doubling of budgetary allocation there has been increased collaboration for better utilization of available funds, particularly for Marine Protected Areas Management. While the restructuring of the financial framework for the PA system has not been completed, the project supported Government's increased collaboration for better utilization of available funds, particularly for Marine Protected Areas Management. The Project has completed a Business Plan to support the Government in developing a mechanism for improved financial resources management towards the sustainable finance management for PAs. This document has been further utilized by consultants working on updating/revisions of Management Plans for existing PAs or the development of Management Plans for proposed PAs. Thus, there is a recognized need for continued progress for sustainable financing of PAs, considering government financial constraints. In further support of sustainable financing, the CEO of the Protected Areas National Trust	**Partially Met** - There has been moderately satisfactory progress towards this target. In January 2021, the new Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation, Climate Resilience and the Environment appointed a new Board for the Grenada Tourism Authority (GTA). This Board has created a sub- committee on community tourism and responsible travel. This Committee has included in its mandate to address and provide recommendations towards the funding of protected areas. The Committee has also been in discussion with the PCU regarding the establishment of appropriate sustainable financing for Protected Areas Management. This activity is still under implementation by the GTA Despite establishment of a committee to oversee investment in PAs, proposed financial restructuring through adjusted/ increased user fees has been postponed given consideration of economic hardships due to COVID-19 pandemic. GoG seems to prefer to delay fee adjustments during the COVID-19 related impacts particularly impacting the tourism sector. Thus, although the government has prioritized an economic stimulus response to COVID-19 which includes support to ecotourism/ tour operators that utilize PAs, there has been a deliberate delayed for any formal (re)consideration	TE comment – It does not seem that there was a good plan for institutional arrangement and financial sustainability. What in fact did this project do to support this work and to advice on the model from around the world?

			Fund - the framework that will be responsible for establishing a mechanism for investing in the operation and maintenance of PAs - has been appointed. Notably, this appointee is a former member of the project's Steering Committee and this relationship will facilitate greater involvement by the project in supporting the work of the Trust Fund. The project facilitated significant stakeholder consultation and senior government endorsement towards establishment of interim Intersectoral Committee with mandate for strategic oversight of investments/ sustainable financing of MPAs. The Cabinet approval of the committee is expected within the July-August 2019 schedule.	of fee structure and/ or budgetary restructuring for PAs.	
Average METT scores of 6 existing TPAs and 3 MPAs	53	*(not set or not applicable)* 62	METT scores have only been partially completed in the past year due to several administrative challenges in mobilizing the relevant stakeholders. (METT is pending for TE. METT was not conducted at MTR) Notwithstanding this, METT Scores conducted at = Molinère Beauséjour (MB) MPA and Sandy Island Oyster Bed (SIOB) MPA reflect that progress has been achieved (this represents satisfactory progress at 2/6 sites). It is anticipated that continued satisfactory progress will be reflected in METT scores undertaken by project end February 2020 as completed and ongoing initiatives, including capacity building and the enhanced PA system coordination mechanism, will enhance the management effectiveness of the PA system.	**Partially Met** - Delayed recruitment prevented this activity Given disruptions to work force and temporary lockdowns due to COVID-19 related State of Emergency restrictions, METT Scores have not been conducted. It is anticipated that these activities can be undertaken by August/ September 2020. Given that the Project has previously been challenged to conduct METT scores across the PAs, there remains heavy reliance on qualitative feedback from stakeholders. In this regard satisfactory progress has been identified as probable given the Project investments across PAs and the enhanced capacity and coordination of activities within PAs.	

Improved capacity for planning, implementation and monitoring of site-specific co-managed strategies for threat reduction through SLM and SFM in PAs.	Avg score on Capacity Development Scorecard : Q 2: 2 Q10: 1 Q 11: 1 Q 13: 2 Q 14: 0 Areas to be improved: Co-management is identified as the governance model for SLM, SFM and TPA management, but no formal mechanisms are instituted. Outdated laws, low public knowledge of the various legislation, and inadequate regulatory framework constrain enforcement. Environmental information used to support decision-making processes is	*(not set or not applicable)* Avg score on Cap Dev SC increases by at least 1 point: Q 2: 3 Q10: 2 Q 11: 2 Q 13: 3 Q 14: 1 Specific improvements: Develop and implement co-management mechanisms for SFM, SLM and TPA management (Outcome 1). Review and update existing policies and legislation; implement site specific mgt plans for PAs; endorse an interagency collaboration mechanism for SLM. (Outcomes 1 & 2) Develop and implement a protocol that facilitates information updating, access and sharing for decision-making (Outcomes 1 & 2). Develop a capacity development strategy to augment technical skills within the resident organizations per the priorities of the NAP. National monitoring system with proper capacity building (Outcome 1).	Activities towards Improved capacity for planning, implementation and monitoring of site-specific co-managed strategies for threat reduction through SLM and SFM in PAs have been initiated. However, the scorecard is pending for the TE (was not conducted at MTR). While there has been some progress in improving capacities for co-management oversight, no capacity scorecard was completed during the period to measure these changes. No legislation has been approved to officially designate co-management or co-management responsibilities. It is anticipated that with the support of an establishment MPA Committee this legislature would be approved. In its absence, there is continued informal arrangements with a major role being filled by civil society organizations (CSOs). To this end, there has been ongoing engagement and capacity building with CSOs towards improved planning, implementation and monitoring of site-specific co-managed strategies for SLM and SFM, particularly with the North East Farmers Organization (which supports strategies adjacent the MB-MPA) and the Kipaji and Carriacou Fishers (which support co-managed strategies for SIOB-MPA). The 2018 transition to a Ministry of Climate Resilience, Environment, Forestry, Fisheries, Disaster Management and Information has facilitated enhanced coordination and inter-agency collaboration between the Environment Division, Fisheries Division & Forestry Department to support SLM. This re-structured Ministry has supported enhanced decision-making and information sharing	**Partially Met** - In collaboration with the PCU the Ministry is building the monitoring capacity of Forestry Staff for monitoring. Co-management capacity building has been facilitated by Project staff and other consultants. There is also an ongoing engagement with the Extension Officers and SAEP Project to enhance SLM and SFM Through 2019 – Q1 2020 there has been active engagement and capacity building with various CSOs towards improved planning, implementation and monitoring of site-specific co-managed strategies for SLM and SFM, particularly with the North East Farmers Organization (which supports strategies adjacent the MB-MPA), as well as with Gouyave Fishermen's Corporative (adjacent to the proposed Gouyave MPA), the Kipaji CSO and Carriacou Fisher Folks (which support co-managed strategies for SIOB-MPA). Lockdowns and restrictions on social gatherings/ work related restrictions have prevented previously planned undertaking of capacity development exercises in 2020. The Project has also been working collaboratively with the Caribbean Youth Environment Network and Legal practitioners to promote enhanced dialogue	

	unavailable, under-utilized, incomplete or out-of-date. Capacity and technological needs are, when available, obtained through external financing. Monitoring is done irregularly, with or without an adequate monitoring framework.		among national stakeholders, including National Adaptation Plan focal points. It is also anticipated that the establishment of the MPA Management Committee and National Parks Advisory Council will facilitate greater strategic alignment towards legislative approval of appropriate co-management arrangements across PAs. There is still no national monitoring system, and it is anticipated that appointment of relevant MPA Management Committee and NPAC will support this activity. These committees will be supported by deliverables already produced by the Project including PA legislative review deliverables and deliverables identifying systemic barriers to PA Management effectiveness.	and appreciation for co-management for enhanced public knowledge and advocacy for relevant laws. These activities are thought to harness various professional specialist skills and civil society activism for enhanced inclusion/ (public) participation in the review and update of existing policies and legislation.	
The progress of the objective can be described as:		**Off track**			
Outcome 1 **Establishment and effective management of new and existing Protected Areas**					
Description of Indicator	**Baseline Level**	**End of project target level**	**Level at 30 June 2019**	**Target Met, Partially Met or Not Met**	
Institutional framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs	- No formal National Parks Advisory Council; Forestry Division administers 8 TPAs under suboptimal conditions; Fisheries Division administers 3 MPAs.	- Formal establishment of a National Parks Advisory Council for TPAs and Management Committee for MPAs administering policy-based PAs, PoA.	Activities to support the institutional framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs has been initiated and moderate progress has been made. To date, members of the National MPA Committee have been appointed by the Cabinet. Furthermore, the Government has given its commitment for the re-establishment of the National Parks Advisory Council members which will be selected for appointment by September 2019.	**Partially Met** - Despite moderately satisfactory progress by Q4 2019 (finalization of draft amendments and tabling for 2020 legislative review by the Cabinet), the Project has experienced moderately unsatisfactory progress in Q1- Q2 2020. This moderately unsatisfactory rate of advancement towards this target is largely due to disruptions in the legislative calendar due to COVID-19 impacts.	

			Ongoing dialogue with PS of Tourism Ministry to resolve any conflicting responsibilities/roles with that of PS Ministry Climate Resilience et al.	The re-establishment of NPAC remains incomplete as nominated members have not been formally approved by the Cabinet and have been 'unofficially' engaged in initial meeting to set priorities, yet no formal date has been identified for Cabinet presentation of members.	
Regulatory and legal framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs	- Forestry policy does not include INRM. - Fisheries division does not use INRM in its administration of MPAs. - No PA System Business Plan exists	- A finalized and approved Protected Area Forestry and Wildlife Bill with draft SROs that promote INRM practices and principles. - Fisheries division applying INRM principles and practices using enhanced law and/ or regulations, within 2 years. - PA System Business Plan developed and under implementation	Consultant work and continued stakeholder engagement with relevant Government officials/ departments reflects that progress towards an improved regulatory and legal framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs has been initiated and is partially completed. In this regard, significant progress has been made towards the finalized and approved Protected Area Forestry and Wildlife Bill. it is anticipated that this process will be completed in 2019 Through the Project a consultant has facilitated a Drafting Instructions for Amendments to Protected Area Legislation: The National Parks and Protected Areas Act, Forest Soil and Water Conservation Act, Fisheries Act and The National Heritage Protection Act. These policy-level documents make reference to technical considerations and makes reference to governance, capacity and funding issues. These documents are under review by the relevant Government counterparts. It is anticipated that through ongoing stakeholder consultations, relevant recommendations would be adopted to enhance existing legislation through formal incorporation into the Governments Administration before project end. The Project has completed a Business Plan to support the Government in developing a	Partially Met - Extensive work for wide stakeholder engagement, including advocacy with civil society groups, legal/ law association members and relevant Government officials/ departments reflects satisfactory progress towards an improved regulatory and legal framework for management effectiveness in and around PAs. The existing PA Systems Business Plan has been utilized by the MPA Unit, Fisheries Department for proposed revision to fee structure. This has had some initial support from GoG officials, however, COVID-19 on the ground realities / economic decline has prompted a postponement to any adjustment to the costs associated with fee management. Within the current realities of responding/recovering from COVID-19, Project activities have been proceeding moderately well to support virtual/ remote advocacy and engagement so that when	

			mechanism for improved financial resources management towards the sustainable financing for PAs. It is anticipated that the re-established NMPAC (for MPAs) and NPAC (for TPAs) will be guided by this document as one of their priority mandates is to support sustainable financing of PAs. This document has also been utilized by consultants working on updating/revisions of Management Plans for existing PAs (TPA: Morne Gazo, Perseverance, Mt Hartman, Annandale/ Beauséjour. MPAs: Sandy Island Oyster Bed, Molinière Beauséjour, Grand Anse) or the development of Management Plans for proposed PAs (TPA: Mt St Catherine. MPAs: Levera, South Carriacou Islands, Conference Bay, Isle La Ronde). Thus, Project activities seek to ensure that when fully operational, the NMPAC and NPAC will be able to assess the proposed Management Plans to ensure sustainable financing is adequately addressed before approval.	fully operational, the NMPAC and NPAC will be able to assess proposals to ensure that sustainable financing is duly addressed	
Expansion of protected areas system	3,711 ha of bio-diverse landscapes/seascapes formally recognized and facing multiple threats: - 8 TPAs managed under suboptimal conditions and 5 mini TPAs with no management mechanism. o TPAs cover 1,931 ha. - 3 MPAs management suboptimal conditions o MPAs cover 1,780 ha.	*(not set or not applicable)* 16, 111 ha of bio-diverse landscapes/seascapes formally recognized and managed effectively: - 9 TPAs + 4 mini-TPAs effectively managed with legal demarcation, management plans, business plans, and adequate infrastructure in place. o TPAs cover 2,931 ha. - 7 MPAs managed under optimal conditions within 5 years. o MPAs cover 13,180 ha.	The progress towards achieving Expansion of protected areas system has been initiated and has shown moderately satisfactory progress. thus, while the target of 16,111 ha of biodiverse landscapes is not fully on track, this is mainly in response to the MTR which indicated that the Project should focus instead on enhanced management of a reduced area. Currently approx. over 3,711 ha of PA (TPA and MPA) are formally recognized and are also being actively managed, with varying degrees of effectiveness. Government officials within Forestry and Fisheries indicate that staffing challenges/ human capacity is a key driver for limitations in the effectiveness of management. Ongoing Project consultations with Ministries continues to advocate for sustainable approaches towards adequate staffing. In this	Partially Met - Protected Areas management has seen moderately satisfactory progress in terms of enhanced advocacy and ongoing management support to maintain the existing MPAs within acceptable management conditions. While no new MPAs nor TPAs have been approved, legal demarcation expansion for Grand Anse MPA and recognition of the Gouyave MPAs had been tabled for Cabinet decision in 2020. However, such matters have seen delays due to other Health and Economic priorities of Government,	

			regard the Project is also supporting capacity building activities to improve the management effectiveness, revision of Management Plans for existing PAs and investment in into improved trails/ infrastructure. While the number of recognized PAs has not increased since 2018, there has been enhanced management activities across PAs and work towards development of Management plans for proposed/ new PAs. Non approval of PAs has been due mainly to government directive to re-establish NMPAC and NPAC to better support PA governance and sustainable management/ financing mechanisms for all existing PAs. It is anticipated that through this mechanism, the NMPAC and NPAC would be empowered to advise the Minister accordingly for the approval of any proposed/ additional PAs. Thus, it is anticipated that the operationalization of the NMPAC and NPAC would facilitate the attainment of the expansion of protected areas. At present, 4 TPAs are managed under sub optimal conditions. Completed consultant work has resulted in revised management plans for 3 TPAs (namely: Perseverance, Mt Hartman, Annandale/ Beauséjour). Added to this, the management plan has been completed for the proposed TPA of Mt St Catherine (approx. covering 1,000 ha). In relation to Morne Gazo, consultant is still underway with support of Forestry Department to develop a co-management arrangement for the Reserve. However, there is need for the appointment of NPAC for approval and implementation of such proposed co-management arrangements. Thus, activities to improve Management of TPAs has been initiated through the development of management plans which are in the process of being finalize by consultants and or reviewed by Government counterparts.	particularly in response to COVID-19 issues. As such, it is anticipated that within the Phase 2 transition to 'new normal working conditions' that these MPA and TPA legislative designation matters will be resumed	

			It is anticipated that these plans would facilitate the effective management of approximately over 3,168 ha of TPA cover and 11,170 ha of MPA. In addition to this Rangers have been involved in capacity building and are employed for management of key TPAs. > . Grand Anse has a recognized civil society organization that has been established with local fisherfolk and private sector interests towards co- management of the areas. Molinière/Beauséjour is serviced primarily by the MPA Unit within the department of fisheries who is responsible for warden patrols, fee collection and maintenance of demarcation structures. Sandy Island Oyster Bed MPA is effectively managed with a focal point/acting manager from the Ministry of Carriacou and Petite Martinique Affairs who is supported by an Outreach Officer and four Rangers. Woburn/Clarkes Court has seen some modest improvement in demarcation and signage but still does not have an effective management structure in place. It is anticipated that this will be addressed by through the appointment of the National MPA Management Committee.		

Measurable Threat Reduction: - Forest cover - Direct Carbon benefits - Indirect Carbon benefits - Mangrove, seagrass bed and coral reef areas	- Continuous deforestation threatens 10,012 hectares - 81,652.5 tC (Direct) - 322,158.3 tC (Indirect) - Continuous destruction of 231 Ha of mangrove, 1301 Ha of seagrass and 5095 Ha of reef areas	- 10,012 hectares of forested area maintained or increased - 81,652.5 tC Direct maintained or increased - 322,158.3 tC Indirect maintained or increased - 231 Ha of mangrove, 1301 Ha of seagrass and 5095 Ha of reef areas maintained or increased	Measurable threat reduction in Forest cover, direct carbon benefits and mangroves area demonstrate moderate progress. Reduction in deforestation has seen marginal gains due to continued collaboration with CSOs and extension officers. Anecdotal reports indicate reduced instances of slash and burn/ deforestation for agriculture purposes and there have been no instances requiring deployment of fire fighting in any PA as opposed to previous years. There has also been meaningful consultation with "illegal" charcoal producing individuals to significantly limit exposure to PA (Mt Hartman TPA in particular). Furthermore, activities have been initiated to aid in the reforestation and removal of invasive bamboo species in the Annandale / Beauséjour area. The Watershed Management plan for this area has been completed and it is anticipated that once it is reviewed by Government counterparts and approved by the Cabinet for implementation there would be a significant increase in forest cover, direct carbon benefits, sea grass beds and coral reef areas. Activities to address measurable threat reduction for seagrass beds and coral reef areas have been initiated and this project target has shown moderately satisfactory progress. Mangrove replanting activities have progressed over 200 Ha (mainly through the support of a TNC- The Nature Conservancy Project). The coral restoration program has made significant progress in maintaining coral reef areas within the Molinère /Beauséjour MPA. Through the training of community members in SCUBA, biodiversity monitoring and coral	Partially Met- Ongoing reforestation activities have supported the maintenance and expansion of existing forest cover. Building on previous accomplishments and combined with ongoing capacity building and stakeholder engagements across CSO, there has been steady progress towards measurable threat reduction in Forest cover, direct carbon benefits and mangroves area. There has also been satisfactory progress in the maintenance of mangroves, seagrass and coral reefs. Coral reef habitats monitored by expert divers (over a decade experience in the MPA waters) are reported to demonstrate very stable overall health. Thus, moderately satisfactory progress continues to be made as the Project builds on the previous activities. Overall, the best sites for coral colony health remain predictably on those sites further from shore with more water movement, indicating that natural/ environmental factors, apart from Project interventions, have a significant role to play in the overall maintenance of the ecosystems. Notably, MPA activities and the interventions in adjacent communities are thought to have supported moderately	

			gardening livelihood opportunities have been supported. Ongoing activities include coral replanting and cleaning to support rehabilitation, particularly in Grand Anse, Molinière Beauséjour, and Sandy Island Oyster Bed MPAs. There is also an actively managed bio-rock site in Gouyave which is proposed as an MPA. Measurable threat reduction has proceeded moderately unsatisfactorily due in large part to an inconsistent framework for monitoring and evaluation. In absence of proper monitoring over time, there has been an ad hoc approach to providing qualitative measures. Key challenges noted by Government counterparts include defective/ insufficient equipment and capacity/ staffing challenges. Support for biophysical monitoring through use of drone technology has been implemented in collaboration with other donor projects. Further training in geospatial technology and procurement of necessary equipment in anticipated to support better monitoring and evaluation.	satisfactory results that are on target for Project objectives, based on expertise analysis. Notably, Marine biologists research dive conducted in 2020 (with members having over 10 years' experience conducting research within the Project sites) indicates that : - fish life was good on all sites however there is a consistent and persistent lack of adult grazers on our reefs, particularly those closer to shore with easier access. This is not a new condition on our reefs; however, it is an important consideration for long-term reef health and food security. Parrotfish are one of the primary herbivores for a reef system and an excellent sand producer for our natural beaches and sand channels. Juvenile parrotfish were seen on all sites; however, adults were only seen on Purple Rain, Kahonee and Dragon Bay (MB MPA). - Lionfish were more prevalent on these surveys than they have been over the last year. Normally these selected reef sites are frequented regularly by recreational dive shops where Lionfish are culled for invasive species control and local consumption. Given the extended period of COVID-19 lockdown Grenada has recently undergone and the quick reproductive/growth biology of the Lionfish, an increase in Lionfish on the reef was observed on all	

				sites. Juvenile and adult Lionfish were present at all monitoring sites; however, it is anticipated that their population will decline once again once diving activities resume on the island. - - The two sites with substantial seagrass habitat, Flamingo Bay and Dragon Bay, show a balance of change with the seagrass in Flamingo Bay expanding over the sand channel toward the reef, and the Dragon Bay seagrass receding north away from the reef and away from the small. Sand movement plays a role with seagrasses being buried however in the case of Dragon Bay it appears boat anchoring has caused some damage and likely accelerated the receding of the seagrass bed. On the positive side this is a controllable acute stressor and can be addressed with the repair and reinstallation of moorings in this bay. - - Limited coral bleaching was observed at all reef sites in the form of colony paling or multi focal spot bleaching only, no full colony or widespread bleaching was observed which is a good sign. The coral species most affected by bleaching were the Star corals (Orbicella sp.) and Starlet corals (Siderastreae sp.) colonies. These bleaching levels are considered baseline normal	

					for summer conditions and are not thought to be indicative of elevated concern. If temperatures continue to rise and we see an extended period of water temperatures above 29 C historically more bleaching and more prolonged bleaching would be expected. - Low levels of coral disease were observed on all sites and were within acceptable baseline levels for these reefs at this time of year. Of the afflictions observed were Dark Spot Disease (DSD), Ulcerative White Spot (UWS), White Plague (WP) and the Acroporid White Band Disease (WBD).	
Management of expanded PA network institutionalized	- No coral Reef resilience program (protocol) in place. - No systematic SFM program in place - No staff trained in planning accounting, bio principal monitoring, enforcement, fire management and co-management	*(not set or not applicable)*	- Coral reef resilience program (protocol) in place within 5 years. - SFM program adopted and administered in all PAs within 5 yrs. - 13 PA Staff trained	Management of expanded PA network institutionalized is underway with moderate achievement. The AGRRA (Atlantic and Gulf Rapid Reef Assessment) protocol is adopted and used by the Fisheries Division. The Project particularly supports training of volunteers in SCUBA and AGRA. These trainings have taken place in Grenada and Carriacou. SFM has seen moderate progress. This activity is currently in first phase of development by national consultant and to be administered over duration of Project. It is anticipated that there will be satisfactory progress in the coming months through 2020 given the required time for implementation of pilot strategy for bamboo removal and subsequent replanting with indigenous species	Partially Met - The coral reef resilience program has proceeded moderately satisfactory with some AGRA monitoring taking place in the 4th quarter 2019. A marine biology consulted has been recruited for the development of a coral reef resilience program protocol sustainability initiative in collaboration with the Grenada Dive Association and St George's University and SCUBA volunteers trained under the R2R Project. This protocol document is to be presented to the PS for review and approval towards the establishment of an MOU to overcome the GoG human resource capacity challenges	

				in controlled stages, to ensure that the activity does not result in excessive erosion along the steep slopes.	which impact the consistency of coral reef monitoring activities. SFM has proceeded with moderately satisfactory progress as much of the on the groundwork which was initiated in first quarter 2020 has halted further to COVID-19 restrictions.	
PA network infrastructure and services	- Inconsistent infrastructure and facilities and services across TPAs and MPAs.	*(not set or not applicable)*	- Standardized and quality infrastructure facilities and services available at all TPA and MPA units in the PA network.	PA network infrastructure and services has shown moderately satisfactory progress Renovation works have been completed for the Perseverance Dove Ranger station. More recent activities towards achieving PA network infrastructure and services have included work done to improve trails in TPAs (in particular, Morne Gazo and Grand Étang areas) and improvement work to rehabilitate the infrastructure/ building at Grand Étang. In support of the construction of the Interpretation Centre for SIOB MPA, consultation with key stakeholders has provided the requirements required for the building to meet with climate smart design and appropriate operations. There were challenges with the initiation for construction as state land had to be identified and approved for use. The jurisdiction for these activities are within the mandate of two different Ministries (i.e., Ministry for Carriacou and Petite Martinique Affairs and Ministry of Agriculture respectively). Thus, applications and approvals for use of land was delayed by	Partially Met - PA network infrastructure and services progressed moderately unsatisfactory While the Project continues to maintain and expand on trails for TPAs to allow for the infrastructure network to be standardized and in good condition, there is no standardized mechanism for this. A proposal was made to the Project Director/ Permanent Secretary and is yet to be agreed with the Ministry of Tourism which shares responsibility for the PA infrastructure network. In keeping with plans the refurbishment/ physical upgrades at the Gran Étang Lake House have been successfully completed. Procurement of equipment to support office and audio visual/ educational ICT equipment is underway and anticipated to be completed by September. The shipment process was delayed by international logistical challenges resulting from COVID-19 and limited	

				the need for the Cabinet's approval, which had to be requested by these separate Ministries. Concurrent to the groundwork and lobbying required for these Ministries to make the Cabinet's requests for approval to construct the Interpretation Centre, relevant procurement has been initiated to standardized approach to 'climate smart' building design for Interpretation Centres. It is anticipated that the project will support the rehabilitation construction and planning of the infrastructure of the SIOB MPA interpretation center and repair/refurbishment of the Grand Étang lake house by project end.	operationality of national supply chains. The construction of the SIOBMPA Interpretation Centre was impacted by the need to consider alternative sites for construction after the state land surveyor made recommendations for such. Having completed the process of site visits and recommendations of alternative sites, the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in reduced work on this matter as the physical planning unit and other government workers were on remote work and much of the activities requiring approval have experienced significant delays. It is anticipated that the necessary initiation activities will be completed by August.	
Community involvement in PA management through conservation and sustainable use of natural resources	- 0 communities adjacent to MPAs engaged in PA co-management - 0 communities adjacent to TPAs engaged on PA co-management	*(not set or not applicable)*	- 3 communities adjacent to selected MPAs engaged in co-management - 3 communities adjacent to selected TPAs engaged in PA co-management	The involvement of community in PA management through conservation and sustainable used of resources has been initiated and has shown moderately satisfactory progress. Attempts to engage Government/ senior officials on co- management has been undertaken. Initial briefing note produced and submitted as a guidance document for consideration. The Project intends to engage a relevant consultant and anticipates hosting co-management sensitization once both NMPAC and NPAC are operational.	Partially Met - Community involvement in PA management through conservations and sustainable use of natural resources has experienced Stakeholder consultation to engage law makers/ national law association and Government/ senior officials on co- management has been undertaken. These activities are geared towards engendering support for co-management and gaining consensus on approaches to promote both sound	

				Legal review to assess the issue of co-management has been completed and is to be reviewed by the Government counterpart. A protocol for co-management has not yet been established however it is anticipated that once the National Park Council and MPA committee are established a protocol will be developed. 3 Communities adjacent to selected MPAs were engaged in co-management within the Intersectoral Committee for Annandale Beauséjour watershed. The Committee in collaboration with the NEFO have identified community members for engagement in the following activities: rangeland management, removal of invasive bamboo and agroforestry, rainwater harvesting and climate smart agriculture. These activities have been designed in collaboration with recommendations made in the Watershed Management Plan deliverable produced under the R2R Project. It is anticipated that community members would be involve in the installation of rainwater harvest unit within the Annandale Beauséjour watershed by October 2019. While the NPAC is not yet appointed, this community engagement is conducted as a Project activity and not yet formally recognized by Government. 1 community adjacent to selected TPAs is actively engaged in co-management Kipaji Development Initiative in Carriacou is engaged in supporting co-management. The group has received support for capacity building related to communications with community and other stakeholders. They are also trained in marine conservation practices.	legislation and community engagement/ participation in decision-making for co-management. A legal consultant has been engaged to support ongoing consultation and development of relevant reports/ recommendation towards government submission to the Cabinet, further to approval by the relevant Minister/ recommendations from Permanent Secretary. 3 Communities adjacent to selected MPAs remain engaged in co-management within the PAs albeit interrupted by COVID-19 restrictions, particularly impacting MPA management over the early 2020 periods. These activities for marine management have been recently permitted and monitoring activities/ beach visits are now permissible. Although these activities are not yet legislated/ officially approved in law, they continue with informal government approval. Included among the pre-existing communities / CSOs are now also engagement in Gouyave which is an area being put forward for an MPA with ongoing co-management with the Gouyave Fisherman's Cooperative. Additionally,	

					government has engaged with the Project and Private Sector to potentially establish relationships of a Public-Private Partnership for a proposed 'co- management' arrangement with a private sector ecotourism initiative. Capacity building with Kipaji Development Initiative for record keeping and general administrative capacity building has also taken place in collaboration with the recently concluded CATSII project (which was managed by GIZ). The Carriacou FADS Fishers have also enhanced their capacity through Project support to develop offices (through donated containers) and other equipment. This central location serves both as a location for further capacity building as well as provides a hub for data collection.	
Benefits/profitability from conservation/ sustainable-use resource-based livelihood opportunities	- No systematic collaboration for INRM linked to livelihood opportunities - Minimal benefits from resources based livelihoods	*(not set or not applicable)*	- Incentive schemes to engage entrepreneurs in INRM practices linked to livelihoods - Measured increase in benefits from resource based livelihoods	Activities to support Benefits/profitability from conservation/ sustainable-use resource-based livelihood opportunities has been initiated and this project target is partially completed. Several incentive schemes were implemented during the year.	Partially Met - The Projects has seen moderately satisfactory progress in providing incentive to engage entrepreneurs in INRM practices. These activities include procurement and distribution of equipment, capacity building and enhanced training to improve entrepreneurial activities particularly for FADS Fishers	

				Grenada North East Farmers Organization (NEFO) has received capacity building and project interventions to support sustainable land management and climate smart agriculture for improved natural resources management adjacent to PA. Baseline measurements for socioeconomic monitoring are being undertaken with this organization. Carriacou FADs Fishers - to support capacity building on the assembly and use of FADs and safety at sea practices and equipment. Baseline measurements for socioeconomic monitoring are being undertaken with this group Grand Anse	and apiculture entrepreneurs/ rural agriculture in collaboration with the Grenada Investment Development Corporation (GIDC). At the same time, benefits/profitability from conservation/ sustainable-use resource-based livelihood opportunities had progressed moderately satisfactorily but has been challenged by COVID-19 related impacts that saw considerable negative impacts on economic activity. The Project has maintained good collaboration with the North East Farmers Organization (NEFO) who have been engaged in rainwater harvesting and enhanced drip irrigation activities to support their resource- based livelihoods. Furthermore, members of the 6 pilot community in Beauséjour (including elderly and teen participant from Happy Hill High School) have received capacity building in apiculture and hives, equipment/ suits to promote bee rearing and cross pollination activities across farm locations as well as an enhanced earning opportunity through honey production and marketing of other by- products	
The progress of the objective can be described as:		**Off track**				
Outcome 2						

Climate resilient SLM practices applied in the Beauséjour watershed to reduce threats adjacent to and upstream of PAs.						
Description of Indicator	**Baseline Level**	**Midterm target level**	**End of project target level**	**Level at 30 June 2019**	**Cumulative progress since project start**	
Planning and management framework for SLM/INRM	- No LUP regulations limiting agriculture and housing. - National Forestry Policy does not consider C sequestration. - No intersectoral body or committee in place for implementing a watershed management plan using INRM approaches. - Stakeholders not engaged in community-based rule-making with respect to applying INRM practices. - No systematic monitoring for water quality/quantity, sediment and pollution impacts	*(not set or not applicable)*	- LUP regulations elaborated and implemented to limit agriculture and housing. - NFP updated to include C sequestration. - Intersectoral committee established within Year 1 - The intersectoral watershed committee engages stakeholders to formulate community-based rules for applying INRM practices within 2-3 yrs. - A water quality/quantity protocol set in place within Year 2.	Planning and management framework for SLM/INRM has shown moderate progression. The LUP has been updated through the OECS commission GCCA project and is awaiting Cabinet approval. There has been no change regarding the national Forest policy considering C sequestration. Stakeholders have been engaged in an intersectoral watershed committee. Fisheries Division continues to monitor the quality of water within the MPAs. Additional capacity building has been supported through collaboration with the T.A. Marryshow Community College. The Water Quality Monitoring course trained 15 participants from agencies including Ministry of Climate Resilience et al., Ministry of Agriculture, the National Water and Sewage Authority (NAWASA), and Her Majesty's Prisons. Since its establishment, the Intersectoral Committee has engaged with relevant community stakeholders for INRM. The committee was involved in the review of the Annandale and Beauséjour watershed management plan which is currently being reviewed by Government counterparts. The committee has initiated activities to engage members of the community in the construction of Septic Tank units in pilot area	Partially Met - In collaboration with NAWASA there has been procurement of equipment and MOU to support ongoing water quality monitoring within the MPAs.	

				of New Hampshire to reduce nutrient runoff into the Beauséjour/Annandale MPA.		
Community participation in SFM.	- No involvement of local stakeholders in initiatives to review and update the National Forest Policy (NFP) to consider carbon sequestration.	*(not set or not applicable)*	- Community engaged in updating of NFP; and SROs promulgated by Year 3.	Community Participation in SFM has been initiated and moderate progression. Regular engagement with communities is ongoing, particularly for consultations regarding enhanced management of Protected Areas and development of management plans, with relevance to NFP Collaboration with CANARI has also facilitated significant stakeholder engagement in preparation of the NFP. Relevant documentation is before Minister for decision on whether to take to the Cabinet. It is anticipated that appointment of the NPAC will support review and advisory services to further the approval of the Policy and relevant SROs (Statutory Rules and Orders)	Partially Met - is has been moderately unsatisfactory progress and community engagement had been extensively undertaken and continued advocacy for government partners however no Cabinet decision for promulgation of proposed SROs has taken place. It is hoped that with government impetus to transition back to work post many of the COVID-19 refocusing, that this matter could again be given priority attention	
Direct carbon benefits through avoided deforestation; forest enrichment; and planting in the Beauséjour watershed.	- 9,613tC sequestration by 3337.3 ha of private forest - 4,320tC sequestration by150ha increase in forest cover with removal of 40ha of bamboo - 0 tC from avoided deforestation and sustainable planting products	*(not set or not applicable)*	- 9,613tC sequestration maintained in private forests - 4320tC sequestration maintained - At least 26066tC sequestration from avoided deforestation and sustainable planting products	Direct carbon benefits through avoided deforestation; forest enrichment; and planting in the Beauséjour watershed has shown moderate progression. It is anticipated that activities to remove invasive Bamboos species will be initiated by October 2019. Consultant has been brought on to advise on appropriate strategy that includes REDD+ considerations and community involvement in Annandale/ Beauséjour Forest. Government support for this activity has been gathered and has been mentioned at the Cabinet level.	Partially Met - Progress towards the direct carbon benefits through avoided deforestation; forest enrichment; and planting in the Beauséjour watershed has shown moderate progression and is performing moderately unsatisfactorily. Activities to remove invasive Bamboos species were initiated by the Project and collaboration with another Government of Grenada Project entitled Climate	

				The activity is to support in coordination with the ISC with inputs from the watershed management plan which was also completed during this period.	Smart Agriculture and Rural Enterprise Programme (SAEP) had seen some moderate success with procurement of equipment and initial capacity building, however in the field activities had to be halted due to challenges in Government restrictions during COVID-19. Thus , the activity had been on pause and has only recently been attempting to mobilize community members to reengage in the activities related to removal of bamboo and reforestation.	
Turbidity Levels/ sediment buildup at two MPAs downstream of Beauséjour	No turbidity index available; TBD within first 6 months of project	*(not set or not applicable)*	15% reduction in turbidity	The status of Turbidity Levels/sediment buildup at the two MPAs downstream of Beauséjour are anecdotally implied to have been reduced. Inadequate and or defective (damaged and/ or otherwise malfunctioned) has hindered monitoring. Project agreed to support procurement for procurement/ replacement of defective equipment. Thus, it is anticipated that monitoring of sediment buildup should occur during the November- December period. Currently, the project has initiated activities to reduce Turbidity using Consultancy services for SFM/FLM practices in the Beauséjour/Annandale watershed. It is expected that after consultancy is over turbidity levels/sedimentation buildup would have been reduced. Extension officers have been supported by the Project to provide capacity building to farmers to promote sustainable land use practices to reduce erosion (sedimentation into the rivers). Further, capacity buildings including use of	Partially Met - The status of Turbidity Levels/sediment buildup at the two MPAs downstream of Beauséjour are anecdotally implied to have been reduced. Despite collaboration for measurements through procurement of requested equipment, there were delays in establishing/ maintaining monitoring with ongoing challenges of COVID-19. However, it is anticipated that previously delivered training and other capacity building that is reinforced through collaboration with Min. Of Agriculture Extension officer, and support for enhanced irrigation and steep slope management (training delivered by a Climate Smart Agriculture Specialist Procured by the Project) will help to support educed turbidity levels due to	

				mulch to protect exposed surfaces is anticipated to reduce erosion. The Project has also undertaken a consultancy to promote use of removed bamboo for cross beds to reduce soil creep and erosion. It is anticipated that reforestation activities and continued collaboration with pilot community will see reduced sedimentation level. This will be verified through monitoring when equipment are procured and utilized by Government counterparts.	improved land management practices	
Pesticide and fertilizer levels at two MPAs downstream of Beauséjour.	Grand Anse MPA: TBD within the first 6 months of project Molinière/ Beauséjour MPA: TBD within the first 6 months of project	*(not set or not applicable)*	Grand Anse MPA: 15% reduction Molinière/ Beauséjour MPA: 15% reduction	The reduction of pesticide and fertilizer levels at two of the MPAs downstream of Beauséjour is measurably reduced. Monitoring is undertaken by Fisheries. While there has been moderately satisfactory progress, the rate of reduction is not yet within acceptable levels as phosphate and ammonia concentrations are anecdotally reported to exceed acceptable levels. At the same time, the Project continues to provide training and build capacity for farmers to reduce the use of pesticides. Field visits indicate that farmers are using composting and suitable practices as fertilizer, thus reducing input into MPA downstream. To further reduce pesticide use and promote suitable alternatives, a pesticide manual has been produced in collaboration with the Pest Management Unit of the Ministry Climate Resilience et al	Partially Met - Further to previous project interventions, attempts to better monitor and quantify fertilizer levels in the downstream MPAs from Beauséjour were being conducted in collaboration with the National Water and Sewerage Authority (NAWSA) through the procurement of equipment for water quality monitoring and development of MOU for data sharing agreements. However, further to procurement and initial installation, monitoring efforts were significantly impacted as the boat was down for maintenance (awaiting equipment that could not be accessed from the port due to the limited SOE from COVID-19 restrictions) and other national security measures implemented that prevented nonessential work activities.	

					Thus, the Project has had to rely on previous capacity building and reinforced training from extension officers as a qualitative measure of ongoing activities to reduce pesticide use and resultant water quality impacts, as quantitative measures have not been practical in establishing an accurate measure.	
Application of gender and community-sensitive SLM and SFM practices in 6 communities (Beauséjour, Happy Hill, Granville Vale, New Hampshire, Annandale and Vendome)	No ongoing and systematic training: - No agricultural production program implemented within the watershed. - No rangeland management program implemented within the watershed. - No forest management program implemented within the watershed.	*(not set or not applicable)*	6 villages trained in alternative livelihoods related to BD, SFM/SLM, and CC issues: - A sustainable agricultural biodiversity program implemented by Year 3 - A sustainable rangeland management program implemented by Year 3 - SFM program involving forest enrichment with agroforest species to ensure SLM/SFM practices applied by Year 3	The application of gender and community-sensitive SLM and SFM practices in 6 communities has been initiated and is partially completed. Gender considerations are mainly undertaken on an ad hoc basis during individual project activities. The Project has not been guided by a comprehensive gender approach. Planned apiculture activities have been stalled due to the absence of key government training facilitators. The Project has recently sought to contract a consultant to facilitate the activities. this activity though initiated is only partially implemented. There has also been support for capacity through farm tours for farmers to learn SLM practices, training in soil and water management, waste management, pesticides use and safety, composting, good agricultural practices, enhanced agricultural production, and biogas and crop management. The Project has also supported the development of a pesticide manual to support more sustainable alternatives for pesticides. This has been completed and relevant literature made available to stakeholders.	Partially Met - The application of gender and community-sensitive SLM and SFM practices in 6 communities has been ongoing in a case by case approach with gender considerations undertaken during individual project activities that are initiated. Noting that the Project has not been guided by a comprehensive gender approach this is a shortcoming that is addressed by ensuring all consultants and Project interventions seek to include wide participation from women and other marginalized groups, as well as youth and elderly where practical. Apiculture training as a sustainable agriculture biodiversity program has progressed successfully with private consultant recruited to undertake initial capacity building workshops, followed by the distribution of equipment and ongoing monitoring visits to ensure	

				The completion of this activity and resultant dissemination of information is anticipated to support more sustainable agriculture biodiversity and SFM.	successful application of skills thought to community members. Participation in this activity is wide ranging having included student from the Happy Hill Secondary School as well as famers from NEFO (which includes women and elderly). Prior to COVID-19 restrictions the Project also supported farm visits by extension officers in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands. This supports further dissemination on critical skills and training to reduce pesticide use and promote suitable rangeland management, agroforestry and agriculture biodiversity.	
Impact of Soil erosion/stability on household incomes of famers within the Beauséjour watershed	No existing estimates of soil loss or land soil accumulation levels available. TBD within first 6 months of project No statistics on farmer income available . Initial survey to establish baseline to be conducted during Year 1	*(not set or not applicable)*	15% reduction of soil loss 25% increase in weekly income per farmer.	Activities related to impact of soil erosion/stability on household income of farmers within the Beauséjour watershed has been moderately unsatisfactory for most of the period and the status of monitoring this impact in partially completed. Although monitoring activities have been initiated within the 2018 period, monitoring has not been consistently conducted. Thus only ad hoc information is available . Other recently initiated interventions to support reduction in soil erosion include use of bamboo and cross contours following removal at private farmlands. There have also been tours and training by extension services to support reduction in soil loss. No consistently measured information on agricultural productivity (to replace increase in	Partially Met - Activities related to impact of soil erosion/stability on household income of farmers within the Beauséjour watershed has been moderately satisfactory for the reporting period. Significant work has been undertaken by the recruitment of a climate smart agriculture specialist who has supported community engagement in rainwater harvesting and irrigation management. These activities have contributed physical infrastructure and equipment to farmers who are actively	

				weekly income) nor baseline soil erosion rate has been (regularly) available. However, proxy measurements suggest reduction in soil erosion. It is anticipated that more consistent measurement through support to government counterparts (recently acquired equipment) will better facilitate this monitoring	engaged in enhance soil management . Further to physical equipment, capacity building activities have supported knowledge transfer to maintain improved practices for managing soil erosion with the anticipation that these activities will lead to improvements in household incomes; however, this has not yet been possible to measure given the early stages of the activity. Further, given reduced household incomes due to COVID-19 challenges, it is difficult to utilize any correlations to soil stability or other land management activities undertaken by the Project during the Reporting Period.	
Education and awareness levels	- No education and awareness program	*(not set or not applicable)*	- Public awareness campaign developed and implemented	Public awareness campaign has been satisfactory. To date this initiative has been highly successful with targets for training and public outreach being exceeded annually. Likewise, annual targets have been successfully achieved and planned activities completed for the period under consideration. Outreach has included the implementation of the Ridge to Reef Education Outreach Campaign. The Campaign targeted students within the age range of 7-9 years (grade 3) using appropriate visual and audio aids along with interactive games and activities during targeted engagements of 45 minutes duration at 7 schools. A total of 216 students were engaged as becoming “Ridge to Reef Student Ambassadors” Public Education is also enhanced though increased public engagement through public display boards and outdoor educational	Partially Met - Public awareness campaigns have made highly satisfactory progress. The Public awareness Campaign developed and implemented by the Project has been satisfactory and remains a very successfully implemented activity. In keeping with the public awareness strategy, the Project has had an active school engagement campaign. “Ridge to Reef Student Ambassadors” initiative in collaboration with the Ministry of Education continues to be successfully implemented with Grade 3 students (7-9 years) using appropriate visual and audio	

				materials/signage strategically located to raise awareness and provide information on INRM.	aids along with interactive games and activities during targeted engagements of 45 minutes duration at 9 schools. Over 250 students have participated in the reporting period. The initiative had to be halted in 2020 due to schools closure in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Given the overall success and intended long-term benefits of the initiative, the Project is exploring the option of developing a recorded /web hosted version of the initiative to further support the sustainability of the education component. There has also been ongoing collaboration with Private Sector, Academia and Civil Society Organizations to enhance public awareness and education. This includes public displays at events and Ministries in commemoration of environmental themed activities. There was also wide participation in the Grenada Sailing Week and Grenada Dive Association – Dive Week which both included international media/ guests. Further to engagement in the education sector the Project has a strong public service announcement track record inclusive of public awareness videos, interviews and press releases. These are also hosted on the dedicated Project website and UNDP Barbados & EC to extend the regional reach/ information dissemination	

The progress of the objective can be described as:	**Off track**	

3) ITINERARY AND SUMMARY OF VISITS

4) LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Meetings - R2R Terminal Evaluation		
Name	**Organization**	**Date**
Ms. Rudo Udika	Project Coordinator, R2R/UNDP	April 9, 2021
Ms. Claudia Ortiz	Regional Technical Director - UNDP	April 15, 2021
Mr. Titus Antoine	Former Director R2R/UNDP Focal Point	April 19, 2021
Ms. Claudette Pitt	Director, St. Patrick's Environmental and Community Tourism Organization (SPECTO)	April 20, 2021
Ms. Marion Geiss	Technical Advisor, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	April 20, 2021
Mr. Aden Forteau	Former Technical Director, Climate Smart Agriculture and Rural Enterprise Programme (SAEP)	April 21, 2021
Mr. Tobias Calliste	Senior Fisheries Officer, Ministry of Sports, Culture and the Arts, Fisheries and Co-operatives	April 21, 2021

Mr. Ian Noel	Marine Pilot, Grenada Ports Authority	April 23, 2021
Mr. Arley Gill	Legal Consultant	April 23, 2021
Mr. Trevor Thompson	Land Use Officer, Ministry of Agriculture, Lands and Forestry	April 26, 2021
Hon. Peter David	Minister of Agriculture Lands and Forestry – Government of Grenada	April 30, 2021
Mr. Mohammad Nagdee	SSECC Cluster Head/Project Manager – UNDP	May 2, 2021

5) LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. Priority – Status matrix for the report effectiveness section -The status of the GEF project results against the agreed GEF indicator framework.
2. The original Project Document ProDoc in word format
3. The MTE in word format.
4. List of current national and regional priorities (the international and national policies and laws, frameworks this project is contributing) - i.e., relevance –
5. List of all laws and policies the GEF support has contributed to and or developed by the project with a summary of institutional results. (also Mainstreaming results)
6. GEF project 'final' inception report (if it exists)
7. Priority - GEF project Steering Committee (Project Board Meeting Minutes). Include a cover page with all major decisions for adaptation of project, dates and who participated, and any major decisions
8. Priority - All the GEF Annual Project Reviews APRs and Project Implementation Report (PIRs)
9. Priority - GEF Mid-Term Evaluation Report
10. Priority -All GEF project supported Technical and Research Reports (Please provide a cover list with the dates and work costs)
11. Priority - Matrix for report or annex -All project-supported knowledge products and communications i.e., project brochures and public awareness materials.

12. Priority Annex- Final GEF tracking tools – FINAL METTs post MTR -Capacity Development Scorecard and Financial Scorecard
13. Priority -List with a description of all the GEF-supported capacity building and learning activities disaggregated by gender and conducted by the project since the beginning. This should be in a matrix with a breakdown of venues, dates, participant's gender, and results, etc.
14. Evaluation TOR in word format
15. Priority –Matrix or List of synergistic ongoing and in the pipeline GEF projects i.e., linked to this project and a short explanation of all synergistic donor activities.
16. Matrix or List of the project supported research scientific and or policy-related studies (enabling activities)
17. Priority – List of actual stakeholder involvement. Develop a matrix with the role and actual involvement of Stakeholders – Delineate the list – to include project implementing partners and other stakeholders that have been active (describe how and how this differed from what was planned in the Project document. Including Government, Donors, Private Sector and NGOs supported by the project –Sustainability
18. Priority - List of all GEF funded and or supported staff attached to the project from inception – position and reason for leaving.
19. Priority- Table explaining the gender-related disaggregated results
20. Priority –Co-financing table making up the total and all donors? Prepared in the format in the inception report below.

1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP-GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual or annual, with associated workplans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and of other meetings (i.e., Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages) Completed

13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, midterm and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data, including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or recurring expenditures
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants
20	Any relevant socioeconomic monitoring data, such as average incomes/employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over ~US$5,000 (i.e., organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e., any leveraged or "catalytic" results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g., number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
	Additional documents, as required

6) 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, regional and national levels?			
• Does the project relate to the GEF Biodiversity and or Climate Change focal areas and has it been designed to deliver global environmental benefits in line with relevant international objectives?	• The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators • The project makes explicit links with global biodiversity and or climate action goals	• Project Document • GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies • PIF	• Desk Review of Documents
• Is the project aligned to National development objectives, broadly, and to national energy transition priorities specifically?	• The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national energy policies.	• Project Document • National development strategies, energy policies, Nationally Determined Contributions, etc. • PIF	• Desk Review of Documents
• Is the project relevant to stated regional development objectives as defined by CARICOM, OECS and other regional frameworks?	• Explicit links are made within the project to regional development policies, action plans and associated initiatives	• Project Document • PIF	• Desk Review of Documents
• Is the project's Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified?	• The Theory of Change clearly indicates how project interventions and projected results would contribute to the reduction of the three major barriers to low carbon development (Policy, institutional/technical capacity and financial)	• Project Document • PIF	• Desk Review of Documents
• Does the project directly and adequately address the needs of beneficiaries at local and regional levels?	• The Theory of Change clearly identifies beneficiary groups and defines how their capabilities would be enhanced by the project.	• Project Document • PIF	• Desk Review of Documents
• Is the project's results framework relevant to the development challenges and are results at the appropriate level?	• The project results framework adequately measures impact • The project indicators are SMART • Indicator baselines are clearly defined and populated, and milestones and targets are • The results framework is comprehensive and demonstrates systematic links to the theory of change	• Project Document • PIF	• Desk Review of Documents
• Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant UN system priorities, including thematic objectives at the national/regional and international levels?	• The project's results framework includes relevant thematic outcomes and indicators from the UNDP Strategic Plan, the UNDAF, UNDP CPD and other relevant corporate objectives	• Project Document • UNDP CPD, UNDAF, SP	• Desk Review of Documents

• Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs and rights been considered during design and implementation?	• The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement. • Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive	• Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder Consultation Reports	• Desk Review of Documents • Stakeholder Interviews
• Have the interventions of the project been adequately considered in the context of other development activities being undertaken in the same or related thematic area?	• A Partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities	• Project Document • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting	• Desk Review of Documents • Stakeholder Interviews
• Have relevant lessons learned from previous projects informed the design, implementation, risk management and monitoring of the project?	• Lessons learned are explicitly identified and integrated into all aspects of the Project Document	• Project Document • PIF	• Desk Review of Documents
• Did the project design adequately identify, assess and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions?	• The SES checklist was completed appropriately, and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified	• Project Document • SES Annex	• Desk Review of Documents
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
• Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives?	• The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets	• Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Monitoring Reports • Beneficiary testimony • Site visit/field reports • Pilot Data Analysis/Reports	• Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries • Site visits
• Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making?	• Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at project end	• Steering Committee Meeting Minutes • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR)	• Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
• How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions and impact drivers being managed?	• A clearly defined risk identification, categorization and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS)	• ATLAS Risk Log • M&E Reports	• Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
• How were risks related to COVID-19 managed?	• COVID-19 related risks were defined against project activities with mitigating actions proposed	• PME COVID-19 updated	• Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries

• Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?	• The steering committee participation included representatives from key institutions in Government	• Steering Committee Meeting Minutes	• Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
• Has the project contributed directly to any changes in legislation or policy in line with the project's objectives?	• Draft legislation has been developed or enacted to catalyze the reduction of barriers to the increased penetration of renewable energy/energy-efficient technologies	• Draft legislation • Policy Documents • Action/Implementation Plans	• Desk Review of Documents
• Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters?	• The project has directly contributed to reductions in one or more vulnerabilities associated with natural disasters	• Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony	• Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
• Has the project carefully considered the thematic issues related to human rights? Has the project sought to and actively pursued equality of access to clean energy services and opportunities for women and men (i.e., project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc.)	• A gender mainstreaming plan was completed • The project results framework has incorporated gender equality considerations, as relevant. • Multi-dimensional poverty reduction is an explicit objective • The project prioritized the most vulnerable as key beneficiaries	• Gender Mainstreaming Plan • Project Document • Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan	• Desk Review of Documents
• Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
• Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant?	• The project demonstrated adaptive management and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets and activities • Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation • Any changes to the project's planned activities were approved by the Steering Committee • Any substantive changes (outcome-level changes) approved by the Steering Committee and donor, as required	• Annual Work Plans • Steering Committee Meeting Reports • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony • Revised Project Results Framework	• Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries
• To what extent were the Project results delivered with the greatest value for money?	• Value for money analyses, requests for information, market surveys and other market intelligence were undertaken for key procurements. • Procurement is done on a competitive basis, where relevant.	• VFM, RFI, Market Surveys • Procurement Evaluation Documents	• Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
• Was co-financing adequately estimated during project design (sources, type, value, relevance), tracked during implementation and what were the reasons for any differences between expected and realized co-financing?	• Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates • Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations identified and alternative sources identified	• Annual Work Plans • Steering Committee Meeting Reports • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR)	• Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries

	• Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation		
• Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements (i.e., LOA)?	• Technical support to the Executing Agency and project team were timely and of acceptable quality. • Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate	• LOA (s)/Cooperation Agreement(s) • UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/recruitment documents) • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR)	• Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel
• Have the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts been properly considered when the project was designed?	• An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of the internal control framework and internal capacities of the IP • An ex-ante capacity analysis was undertaken of key partners with explicit responsibilities for implementation of project funds • The cash transfer modality and implementation modality appropriately reflected the findings of any ex-ante analyses	• HACT Assessment(s) • Capacity Assessments	• Desk Review of Documents
• Has the M&E plan been well-formulated, and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation?	• The M&E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded • The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&E tool • There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality) • Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels	• Project Document • M&E Plan • AWPs • FACE forms • Quarterly Narrative Reports • Site visit reports	• Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
• Has the project adequately used relevant national systems (procurement, recruitment, payments) for project implementation where possible?	• Use of national systems was in keeping with relevant national requirements and internal control frameworks • Management of financial resources has been in line with accounting best practice • Management of project assets has been in line with accounting best practice	• Procurement/Recruitment reports • FACE forms • CDRs	• Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
• Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management?	• Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings. • Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices	• Project Audit Reports •	• Desk Review of Documents
• Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
• Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?	• The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure financial sustainability of relevant activities	• Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log	• Desk Review of Documents

• Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?	• The exit strategy identifies relevant socio-political risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same	• Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log	• Desk Review of Documents
• Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow?	• Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed roles and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy • MOU(s) exist for on-going monitoring, maintenance and oversight of phased down or phased over activities	• Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log • MOU(s)	• Desk Review of Documents
• Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?	• The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate same	• Project Exit Strategy • Risk Log	• Desk Review of Documents
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
• Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status, or reductions in ecological stress that can be linked directly to project interventions?	• The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation and transportation	• Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Monitoring Reports • Pilot Data Analysis/Reports	• Desk Review of Documents • Site visits

7) QUESTIONNAIRE USED AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS

QUESTIONNAIRE OR INTERVIEW GUIDE USED FOR DATA COLLECTION

Questionnaire for Project Management

Please answer according to the main heading and use the sub-questions as guides. Please provide concrete examples to illustrate your answers and main points with evidence i.e., statistics, date, actual events, consultancies, policies, etc.

Due:

Send to shodge1@gmail.com

1. PROJECT DESIGN, LOGIC AND STRATEGIES

Formulation/ Priorities

- How did the project contribute to the national, regional, and international priorities?
- What national, regional, and international directives and policy/laws are (include any since project signing) did this project contribute to?
- Have any of the stated priorities changed because of or in the background of this project?
- Describe details about the relevance to international national policy and enabling context: SDGs, CC, DRR (2015), Biodiversity, etc.

Design Process

- Were you involved in the project design? What was the process? Has the policy context changed? What are your thoughts on the project design in relation to the political operating context? How might the design have been more relevant?
- What were the main national drivers for developing this project?

Strategy/ Logic

- Is the project's rationale and logical framework smart, and as the theory of change in line with the actual problems at the national level and subregional level?
- Did the project have a clear theory of change? Did the project document provide you with a strong monitoring framework for results? Did you understand the strategies in the document and how these would lead to results? Why or why not? Was the results framework logical and smart? Was there a good baseline?
- Were the expected results logical and clear to all stakeholders? How?
- Do you think the outputs link to the expected outcomes? Why or why not?
- Has the casual pathway to results been clear and concise?
- Any lessons learned?

2. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT:

- What was the overall approach to capacity-building approach?
- How did you use the mechanism for adaptive management? What was the role of the PSC in guiding this project to results? Was it useful for deciding on work plans and implementation strategies? Why or why not?? How were the work plans developed and

rolled out? Who was there? Who was not there that should have been?
- Did you have a technical committee? How did that work out?
- What was the capacity building approach taken nationally? Please provide details of the approaches for training, learning, knowledge sharing, and policy advocacy. Did you have a CB strategies and strong stakeholder analysis?
- How many CB workshops did the project have? List them. Were they useful? Why?
- How many consultancies have been implemented? What were they? If you could do the project over, what would you drop? And add?

Management and Oversight Arrangements
- Describe the project management and implementation and oversight arrangements, i.e., where is the PMU situated in gov and is it the right place?
- How many staff was hired since the start? Any challenges to report concerning staffing and procurement? Any lesson learned?
- How did UNDP support the NIM work? What was UNDPs role in oversight and in implementation? How did UNDP support your do your work? Any challenges? Describe how the project was coordinated daily at the national level? Any lessons learned? Did the UNDP knowledge platform support the project implementation and results? How? Why or why not?
- How often did the UNDP RTA visit or interact? What were the results of those visits?
- How did UNDP Barbados help monitor this project? Was the support effective and or useful?
- Did you have a partnership strategy?
- Did the project management, oversight, and work planning arrangements work out? Why or why not?
- What was human resources and organizational set-up?
- How did you do work planning at the national level? Describe the process.
- What were the day-to-day coordination, reporting, and monitoring mechanisms? To whom did you report? When? How? Did this system work? Why or why not?
- What was the role of the project secretariat in results monitoring, oversight, and management?

Work Planning and Procurement Processes
- What was the process for work planning and budgeting?
- Did UNDP support work planning – how? Did the UNDP CO and or RTA support work planning? How?
- How did you facilitate intersectoral national work planning?
- How did you present the ongoing implementation of this project to PSC meetings and policy level persons? Was this effective? Why or why not?
- Did you have a procurement plan?
- How did the government procurement process work?

Finance and Co –Finance
- How were the project finances monitored? What was UNDPs role in this? Provide all details of expenditure per year and final?
- Did you track co-financing why or why not? Provide the table in the format requested.
- Please provide the overall expenditure per outcome per year in chart and tables for the report?

- Provide a breakdown of expenditure by the outcome and by year until the end of the project.

Monitoring and Evaluation systems

- Describe the project monitoring and evaluation system? What are the main lessons learned?
- How were the technical aspects monitored and facilitated by the project? Describe.

Gender Mainstreaming

- Did you have gender results and monitoring plan? What was it? How would you do this if you could do it again?
- What are the gender related results?
- Did you have a gender mainstreaming and or safeguards plan?

Other factors influencing Results

- Were there any unintended consequences and unexpected results of the project's work?
- What were any key factors influencing this project implementation?
- How did management employ adaptive management at the national and subregional levels? Can you provide a few examples?
- Any lesson learned?

Governance and oversight

- What were the main mechanisms for project oversight? i.e., UNDP, RTA, meetings with the director of the department, project boards, and national workshops?
- How many steering committee meetings have there been? Who attended and when? Were these meetings useful? Why or Why not?
- Any lesson learned?

Synergies

- Did the project support any synergies with ongoing related regional or national projects and initiatives? How? Why or why not?
- What were the related projects?
- Any lesson learned?

Technical inputs

- What were the main technical consultancies and inputs?
- Did the project, project management, GEF support and monitor the implementation of technical consultancies, and provide you with sufficient technical support to enable the implementation of new approaches and tools? How? Why or why not? Any lesson learned?
- What was the CTA role? Was the CTA input useful for monitoring support? How? How can it be improved? Any Lessons?

Partnerships

- Who were the main partners to implementation?
- Who were your regional and national implementing partners? List them?
- Did the original partnership strategy play out? Why or why not?
- What might be improved?

Financial management and co-financing results

- Did the government commit all expected co-financing? Why or why not? Please provide this number and include all the in-kind and cash resources.
- Provide the final national project expenditure by the outcome and by year.

Communication and KM

- How did you employ knowledge management and use communication in this project as an enabler for results? Did you have a plan and supportive staff managing these aspects? Did this contribute to policy and learning results? How?
- Provide a highlight list of knowledge products developed by the project?
- Provide comments: communications, knowledge management, and capacity building approach, how communications supported the policy level expected results.

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Describe the monitoring and evaluation systems at the national level?
- How did you monitor and report your results- weekly, monthly, yearly and to whom?
- What were the internal project results reporting mechanisms? How often did you discuss national-level results internally and where?
- How did you monitor the capacity development work? (i.e., evidence of program-level assessments)
- Any lessons learned?

Other factors influencing implementation

3. PROJECT RESULTS

- Did the project reach its goal, expected outcomes? Why or why not. Were certain areas easy to do than others –why?
- What has been the policy level results of this project?
- Which national and regional outcomes and targets were most difficult to meet? Why?
- Which national and regional outcomes and targets were the easiest to achieve? Why?
- Are any of the national project targets outstanding? Why?
- What might have been done differently to meet all targets and goals? Why
- What do you think are the project's greatest results? At the subregional level, at the national level?
- How did you facilitate collaboration between sectors in project activities, Give examples?
- What is the value added of inter-project level collaboration?
- Any lessons learned?

Sustainability

- What is the overall likelihood of this project's sustainability? Why?
  - Economic sustainability
  - Political sustainability
  - Environmental sustainability

- Social sustainability

Impact Level Results

- What do you think were the main achievement and the impact level results?

4. LESSON LEARNED AND NEXT STEPS

- What are the main lessons learned based on the following?
  - Design
  - Management and Implementation Approach
  - Finance
  - Results

5. NEXT STEPS

- What are the next steps? What are your key recommendations to share?

Draft questions for other stakeholders and implementing partners

Stakeholder Interview Questions and Templates

a. National Focal Point Questionnaire

Country:		**Date/time:**	
Name of Respondent:		**Interviewer:**	

National Focal Point Questionnaire	
Project Benefits and Results	
1. Was the project design in line with national sector development priorities and plans of participating countries?	•
2. Were you consulted during the design of the project?	•
3. What benefits have already been seen from the project activities implemented in <COUNTRY> to date?	•
4. How has the project helped to develop the capacity of <COUNTRY> to continue the project activities after the close of the project?	•

Project Achievability	
5. How successful do you think the project has been at delivering results to date?	•
6. Were any unforeseen delays experienced during project start up?	•
7. How achievable do you think the project results are in <COUNTRY> within the time remaining for the project?	•
8. Could improvements be made to make delivery more effective?	•
9. What barriers have you identified to achieving the outcomes and objectives of the project?	•
10. To what extent has the involvement of local partners contributed to the success of the site-specific projects?	

Project Management Arrangements	
11. Has communication between PIU and <COUNTRY> been clear, effective and on time?	•
12. Do you provide feedback to PIU when you receive communications from them?	•
13. Are you aware of who at PIU you should be communicating with regarding project management?	•

14. Does PIU share the annual Project Implementation Reviews with you and do you have an opportunity to provide feedback?	•
15. How well do you think Piu has communicated the project to countries and local project partners? Can you suggest any ways to improve this communication?	•

Sustainability	
16. What does <COUNTRY> expect to happen at the end of the current project to sustain the project results?	•
17. How important is it to <COUNTRY> that the programme continues after September 2019?	•
18. How relevant is PIU to the continuation of project results after September 2019?	•
19. What could <COUNTRY> do to make to ensure that results continue after September 2019?	•
20. What could <COUNTRY> do to make to ensure that PIU continues after September 2019?	•

8) EVALUATION CONSULTANT AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[11]

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant)**:** _____

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

[11] www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

9) REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: ___

10) ANNEXED IN A SEPARATE FILE: TE AUDIT TRAIL
11) ANNEXED IN A SEPARATE FILE: TERMINAL GEF TRACKING TOOLS, IF APPLICABLE

ENDNOTES

[i]

Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution:	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings:
6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)
Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

[ii] The project area includes the whole island territory of Grenada (344 sq.km. of landscape) sitting on a volcanic-coralline island shelf raised from the depths of the Atlantic Ocean to the East and the Caribbean Sea to the West. The island is divided into small districts called parishes that include St. George, St. Andrew, St. Patrick, St. John, St. David, St. Mark and Carriacou/ Petite Martinique. It is important to note, however, that there is no local Government in parishes. The Pilot project area in Outcome 2 includes a land space of about 1547 ha. within the Annandale/Grenville Vale/Beauséjour watershed where special attention would be given for demonstrating Ridge to Reef natural resource management.

[iii] Focus communities for Ridge to Reef Project ♣ Happy Hill ♣ Beauséjour ♣ New Hampshire ♣ Vendome ♣ Annadale ♣ Granville Vale

[iv] (Soil 1 Source: *World Factbook*, 20175, Water Conservation acts)

[v] **Outcome 1. Establishment and effective management of new and existing Protected Areas:**
This Outcome is designed to support the implementation of key elements of the ***Grenada System Plan for Parks and Protected Areas (2011)*** aimed at establishing new, and improving management of existing, terrestrial and marine protected areas, and to help Grenada meet its commitments under the Caribbean Challenge to protect 25% of its near-shore habitat and 25% of its terrestrial habitat by the year 2020. This Outcome would allow for the enhancement (where capacity already exists) and development (where gaps exist) of a legal planning and institutional (Strategic and operational management) framework for integrating SFM/REDD+ and SLM principles and practices within the national environmental and development policies. This refers to an integrated approach to managing forest ecosystems, landscapes and coastal seascapes, adaptation and prevention of LD, as well as the integration of peoples' livelihoods objectives within the programs for management of BD and ecosystems functions.

Output 1.1. An Institutional Framework for Protected Area System Management
At the *systemic level*, the project would strengthen the policy framework for PAs by formally establishing bodies to oversee terrestrial and marine protected areas and develop strategic plans for these bodies. PA system finances, the project would establish a visitor fee system at PAs (building on information from a

recent willingness-to-pay survey[v] for Grenada's PAs),) and would create a PA System Business Plan to plan for long-term revenue and spending.

Output 1.2. A Legal and Regulatory Framework for Management of Protected Areas

The current legal and regulatory framework concerning Protected Areas in Grenada has several law-based gaps that prevent effective PA management. While Forestry management is currently administered through legislation such as: *National Heritage Protection Act* (1990), the *National Parks and Protected Areas Act* (1991) and the *Forest, Soil and Water Conservation Act* (1947) as well as a few Standing Rules and Orders (regulations), there is a need for more adaptive legislation to accommodate better conservation of Biodiversity, better SLM, SFM/REDD+, LD and CC adaption principles and practices in TPAs. A draft bill: "*Protected Areas, Forestry and Wildlife*" as yet remains un-enacted, likely due to limited capacity to satisfy institutional requirements, among other reasons. Through this Output, the project would facilitate the thorough review, adaptation and enactment of this bill, taking into account current requirements.

Output 1.3. Expanded Protected Areas System – Management Support to 5 TPAs

As a small island of about 133sq. miles/344 square kilometers, Grenada is able to accommodate a limited number of TPAs between 1544 ha1544ha. and 8ha;.; where island landscapes consist of micro-watersheds that directly impact island shelf seascapes; potable water sources are shared with farmers growing food crops scattered among several residential housing areas; and tree crops such as agro-forests on middle altitude landscapes are often threatened by agricultural expansion and forest fire and hurricane damage. Within this context, a PA network is being expanded where there are only 8 TPAs of more than 25 hectares; only three of these are legally established and have management plans; five others, although legally established, have no management plans.

Output 1.4. Management of Protected Area Units Institutionalized –Mainstreaming Biodiversity through PAs in regular budget processes.

This Output is designed to gradually mainstream PAs as a key instrument in a programmatic approach to the management and conservation of the BD and ecosystems function in Grenada. The small island character of the country, with its Ridge to Reef environmental impacts and contested use of landscapes and seascapes, calls for a unique programmatic response. Through this Output, the project accommodates the **space-based approach** to PAs where representations of the biodiversity would be protected using various tactics, such as area closures, season closures, resource use restrictions with regards to extraction and with full consideration for both traditional and 'more-recent' livelihood opportunities.

Output 1.5 Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources as a Means for Community Involvement in PA co-management - Demonstration Projects

Through this Output, the project would use the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources as a means for community involvement in PA co-management. Using lessons learned in the project "OECS Protected Areas and Associated Livelihood (OPAAL)" (2005 -2011), which implemented sustainable livelihood activities in communities around the Annandale and Grand Etang Forest Reserves, the project would empower community groups and stakeholders from villages adjacent to or within PAs to participate in the protection of biodiversity and ecosystem, functions.

Outcome 2: Climate resilient SLM practices applied in the Beauséjour watershed to reduce threats adjacent to and upstream of PAs

This Outcome focuses on reduced LD, improved Carbon stocks and enhancement of BD in the Beauséjour watershed. Climate resilient technologies would be developed and implemented by local area communities (villages) on 1547 ha of the Beauséjour Watershed leading to improved habitat integrity in the Annandale Forest Reserve within the watershed and surrounding landscape as well as nearby MPAs. Figures 2.A-D depict the area to be covered, as well as its characteristics.

It is anticipated that the initiative would reduce threats to ecosystems functions from encroachments, pollution, sedimentation and mining[v]. Additionally, there would be direct carbon benefits due to reduced deforestation on at least 50% of private lands (337.3 ha) through enforcement of regulations on clearing steep slopes and riparian zones, thereby conserving total carbon stock estimated at 9,613tC,;, as well as benefits expected from the enrichment of forest cover through enrichment planting (150 ha).) and removal of bamboo (40 ha),.), thereby increasing carbon stock by 4320tC. Furthermore, the indirect benefits through avoided deforestation of total carbon stock in all forests in the Beauséjour Watershed by watershed-level planning and management would result in an estimated 26,066tC. The project expects an impact that would also reduce sediment load and fertilizer/pesticide carriage by about 15%.

In terms of human impacts, the project is expected to promote the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices within 6 village level communities for preserving and conserving ecosystems and livelihood opportunities demonstrated by: (1) reduced levels of soil erosion on steep landscapes and (2) increased net household incomes.

***Output 2.1. Strengthened planning and management framework, capacities and awareness for participatory sustainable resource management*.**

This Output would focus on strengthening the planning and management framework to implement SLM and SFM interventions in the Beauséjour Watershed, an area important for agricultural production, biodiversity conservation, the provision of drinking water, and rural livelihoods. An intersectoral committee would be set up as the first step in the co-management engagement process and would serve not only to guide in planning project interventions, but is also expected to carry over for responses in the post project period. This **Inter-sectoral Committee for the Beauséjour Watershed**, including local community representatives, would be established to integrate planning and oversight of BD and SLM approaches in both the productive landscape and within PA units (this activity would be carried out in collaboration with ongoing efforts to establish a National Lands Agency in Grenada for coordination of land management). A plan of action for the Beauséjour Watershed planning and management would be elaborated and presented in order to acquire consensus on the existing needs and determine how each stakeholder group might contribute and what enabling resources are available to support the plan's implementation.

Output 2.2.

[vi] Key finding: Overly ambitious- Validated by MTR

The project's concept originates from a 2006 gap analysis 2 on protected areas following up the 2004 Hurricane Ivan disaster that emphasized the need for more protection of Grenada's ecosystems (i) with

at-the-time existing interventions that were supporting SFM and sustainable livelihoods (e.g. OPAAL3) and (ii) the need to comply with the Grenada Declaration (25% of area classified as TPAs and MPAs) and to meet the Caribbean Challenge Initiative (conserve and manage at least 20% of the marine and coastal environment by 2020)(ProDOC and MTR). The TE found that the project was overly comprehensive in scope given the time frame and resources available, especially the limited staffing of the key Government partners. The coverage is as MTR stetted " essentially two different projects "presented as one with two Outcomes under a title "Ridge to Reef" which suggests an integrated approach which was not reflected so far in actual project implementation (also see finding on interpretation of inception concept –one marine and one land) . The fist Outcome relates to expanding and strengthening Protected Areas (both marine and terrestrial), while the other relates to SLM and SFM, mostly outside of PAs. Although the two Outcomes are in theory and complementary to each other, it may have been more appropriate to focus on either one or the other given the time frame and resources available. The design of Outcome 2 activities is well structured and at least in theory complementary to those of Outcome 1 with a combination of support to (i) PAs such as Grand Étan & Annandale, Molière Beauséjour, (ii) SFM including the removal of invasive species and replanting of indigenous agroforestry species, (iii) SLM including agriculture, livestock support and (iv) the monitoring of land degradation, watercourses and marine area pollution and sedimentation. While there are clearly strong biophysical linkages between the two, as TPAs can positively impact the quality of soils, waters and the biota in surrounding watersheds and MPAs can clearly be impacted either positively or negatively by watershed management practices, this integrated design has not yet been translated into actual project implementation, with the two Outcomes still basically operating as two different projects. The design of the Project as it relates to co-management is not clear.

Key Finding – interpretation of the project document during inception work weak and in need of UNDP supported GEF technical inputs. For instance the inception meeting (PB meeting) recorded the interpretation of the two components as component one – terrestrial and complement two Marine. When in fact these should not have been separated as the intention was to achieve integrated natural resource planning for biodiversity mainstreaming and a system approach to PAs including conversation of the legal arrange for establishing a national body to oversee PA management and an approach to biodiversity valuation in the budgeting process .

Key finding – weak performance monitoring results framework

As also stated by the MTR, the Results Framework (RF) was poorly elaborated and was not useful l as an effective impact monitoring tool. There was no effort to date to revise the RF to make it more relevant and user friendly. And while the MTR also confirmed this, did not provide the alternative option on prescriptive recommendations, this is a lesson learned many indicators in the RF are not S.M.A.R.T. and there are problems with the description of the baseline and of the targets associated with many of these. A few illustrative examples follow. For instance, the first objective-level indicator "PA management in Grenada is mainstreamed" has little meaning. According to the baseline and target, it means that "PA planning & management instruments and guidelines formally incorporated into the Government's Administration". Even this target is unclear. Greater specificity would be helpful. Likewise, the indicator "Financial sustainability to increase viability and resilience of the PA system in Grenada" is vague and is

translated in the target as “budgetary restructuring to foster strategic collaboration between fisheries, forestry and tourism to increase (double) budgetary allocations to 8 PAs as eco-sites”.

[vii] Evaluator learned over the period of implementation, government Ministries, departments and related priorities have been changed in keeping with national and international dynamics. The Government Ministries and IP and associated Permanent Secretaries have changed over the years. More recently COVID-19COVID1919 has caused Government focus to safeguard public health to shift priorities from previously tabled legislative amendments to protected areas legislation.

During 2020, the project’s implementation was delayed as a direct result of COVID-19. Infrastructural projects namely the construction of an interpretation centre at Carriacou was significantly delayed by halts to construction activities and other government restrictions. Planned travel and in person training workshops were also cancelled to adhere to COVID-19COVID1919COVID-19 public health restrictions. With subsequent reopening of activities within the limitations of physical distancing protocols, some virtual and limited (number restricted) activities have been able to resume. In several instances, technical capacity and limited IT resources for beneficiaries (fisherfolk and farming stakeholders in particular) also posed a challenge to implementation via virtual modalities.
From MTR the project continued to deal with limited Government engagement, partly due to staff capacity issues, as well as delays, most of which are due to COVID-19. UNDP CO staff rotation also complicated procurement related processes. The delivery was off-track at MTR and continued to be so. To-date there is no measurement of progress in indicators such as: METT scores, national monitoring system, # of Ha of bio-diverse landscapes/ seascapes formally recognized and managed effectively; # of Ha of forested area increased, direct or indirect carbon benefits, increase in benefits from resource- based livelihoods, the Cabinet approval of LUP, LUP regulations, NFP including carbon sequestration, water quality/ quantity protocol, tons of Carbon sequestered (only anecdotal), and turbidity reduction (only anecdotal), % increase in weekly income per farmer, and % reduction of soil loss.
Capacity-building and awareness activities show progress, however the impact of these in increased capacity to manage PAs and their institutional sustainability was difficult to assess.