

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

**1. Basic Project Data**

Official Project Title: Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Jamaica

**Project Summary (as in PIMS and Project Document)**

The integrity of ecosystem functions and services, on which biodiversity, agricultural production and income-generating opportunities in rural Jamaica depend, are seriously affected by land degradation. The objective of the project is to enhance sustainable land management (SLM) by building capacities for SLM in appropriate government and civil society institutions and user groups and mainstreaming SLM into government planning and strategy development. Outcomes are: 1) SLM is mainstreamed into national institutions, policies, strategies, and plans; 2) Capacity for management, application and adaptation of SLM is enhanced; and 3) Effective management and adaptive learning is achieved.

The project aims to minimize and prevent land degradation by mainstreaming SLM through strengthening the institutional framework, developing a coherent policy and legal framework, mainstreaming SLM into the country's development planning and medium-term economic framework, and improving the technical capabilities and know how within government institutions as well as within key stakeholder groups. The project will also build technical capacity on SLM through training and demonstration activities. The latter will demonstrate improved methods of land rehabilitation and soil conservation, as well as small-scale irrigation systems and agro-forestry. The project will therefore help establish priorities and strategies that address the underlying causes of land degradation in rural communities by strengthening relevant institutions and will assist Jamaica in meeting its environmental obligations to the CCD in keeping with national priorities. The project will support the development of tools that enhance expertise within resource user groups, farmers' groups and government organizations and NGOs concerned with agro-forestry, small-scale irrigation systems, soil conservation, and land rehabilitation.

The Government of Jamaica will execute this project over a period of three years, starting in 2007 through the Forestry Department, working closely with a Project Steering Committee (PSC) that will provide high-level policy guidance and oversight. A project management unit will execute the project. The total budget of the project is US\$ 986,000 of which US\$ 500,000 is from the GEF. The UNDP is the GEF Implementing Agency.

Country Jamaica	PIMS Number	3468
	Atlas Project Number	ID 00044037

**Project Timeframe:**

Date of Delegation of Authority Letter	October 9, 2007	Planned Project Duration	3 years
Project Document Signature Date	January 8, 2008	Original Planned Operational Closure Date	December 31, 2010
Date of First Disbursement	June 2008	Revised Planned <sup>1</sup> Operational Closure Date	June 30, 2012

<sup>1</sup> Please explain any entry here in Section 3

Is this the Terminal APR/PIR?	YES		NO	√	Date Operationally Closed (if applicable)	N/A
-------------------------------	-----	--	----	---	--	-----

**Project documentation and information:**

List documents/ reports/ prepared about the project.	Minutes of PSC Meetings, First Quarterly report, AWP, Report of the Inception Workshop and First Stakeholder Consultation
List the Website address (URL) of project	<a href="http://www.jm.undp.org/Energy-and-Environment-Current-Projects">http://www.jm.undp.org/Energy-and-Environment-Current-Projects</a>

**Project contacts:**

Title	Name	E-mail	Date	Signature
Project Manger	Clarence Parkes	clarencepks@yahoo.com		<i>Clarence Parkes</i> 21/7/10
UNDP CO Programme Officer	Margaret Jones Williams	Margaret.jones.williams@undp.org	July 22, 2010	<i>Margaret Williams</i>
Regional Technical Advisor	Paula Caballero	Paula.caballero@undp.org	15-07-2010	

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

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

### Rating of Project Progress:

Level/Position	2010 Rating	Comments (Please comment on the rating for 2010 and also on any observable trends from the project commencement)
National Project Manager/Coordinator	S	Satisfactory according to the revised AWP, however it should be noted that the project activities only started January 2010 with the hiring of the Lead Land Degradation Expert. Since January 2010 we were able to accomplish the following project activities: an office space identified for the project, frequent meetings of PSC members to get the project started and finalizing the AWP, the planning and hosting of the Inception workshop and stakeholder consultation, and hiring of Land management Consultants (LMCs). It is anticipated that with the hiring of LMCs and the support shown by the Stakeholders at the Inception Workshop we will be able to meet the timeline set out in the AWP. Also the capacity assessment of the Implementing Agency needs to be resolved
UNDP Country Office/ Programme Officer	S	After a lengthy recruitment process the Lead Land Degradation Expert/Project Manager was hired in January 2010. The PSC with a wide cross-sectoral representation has met consistently each month since January 2010, to ensure timely project implementation going forward, and had significant input into finalization of the AWP. Two Local Land Management Consultants were contracted in June 2010. The Inception Workshop and First Stakeholder Consultation was held on June 17, World Day to Combat Desertification. UNDP CO Deputy Res Rep brought Greetings at the Opening Ceremony and the E and E Programme Specialist chaired the session. The Report of the Workshop has been completed and incorporates recommendations from stakeholders. Demonstration projects are scheduled to come on stream in the third quarter of 2010 and the CO is expected to participate in field visits to the Demo Project sites. <i>Additional:</i> <i>Number of field visits by the CO staff:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more
UNDP Regional Centre/ Technical Advisor	S	The project experienced considerable delays in start-up given difficulties in identifying and contracting a professional with the required expertise and track record. However, since the start of the project in 2010, very clear commitment by Government authorities and competent project execution by the PMU indicate that the initiative is back on track. The UNDP CO is, moreover, closely following the project and providing such support as necessary. It is expected that the project will fully deliver on its outcome by the revised closure date of June 2012 if delivery (at 4% at end June) picks up. <i>Additional:</i> <i>Inception workshop attended by RTA:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <i>Number of visits to the project by RTA:</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more

Please rate the project progress as per the following nomenclature:

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

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

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

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

**3. Adjustments to Project Timeframe**

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

Change	Reason for Change	Scope of delay (in months)
Project end date extended from December 31, 2010 to September 30, 2012	There were difficulties in finding a suitable candidate for the Lead Land Degradation expert. The person was contracted in January 2010 and thus project activities started at that time.	21 months

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

Name of Contributor	Type of Contributions In-kind/cash-UNDP managed only	Amount Carried Over from PDF-A into Project US\$	Amount Committed in Project Document US\$	Amount Committed After Project Approval US\$	Estimated Total Disbursement to 30 June 2010 US\$	Expected Total Disbursement by end of project US\$
<b>GEF</b>		943	475,000	475,000	15,662	475,000
<b>Co-financing /Nature (Gov, Multilateral, etc.)</b>						
UNDP	Cash		45,000	45,000	996	45,000
JCDT	Cash		316,000			316,000
GOJ	In-kind		125,000	125,000	1188	125,000

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

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

Challenges	Constraints	Mitigation Measures	Lessons Leant	Required Assistance
<b>Administrative</b>				
Capacity Assessment of Forestry Department not yet completed	The Forestry Department was not able to receive funds from UNDP.	UNDP will make direct payment to suppliers until capacity assessment is completed	Capacity assessment should be done prior to start of the project	
Greater level collaboration needed , since the project document made reference to a PMU having overall responsibility for project management , administrative, technical,& financial reporting	Persons designated as part of the PMU should be more involved to make them aware of the project outputs, and their role in the planning , execution, and reporting of project activities	There should be regular meetings with project team	Project unit should be aware of their role from the start of the project	
<b>Technical</b>				
<b>Other</b>				

## 6. Good Practice in this reporting period

### Key Achievements in this reporting period:

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Finalized 2010 AWP</li> <li>2. Inception Workshop and first Stakeholder Consultation held</li> <li>3. Land Management Consultants (LMCs) positions were advertised. 18 applications were received for this position. Five applicants were short listed, interviewed and two candidates were selected.</li> <li>4. Contracts and ToR prepared and signed by LMCs</li> </ol>
--

### Best Problem Solving Practices Demonstrated:

Problem	Solution
UNDP is required to complete a capacity and financial risk assessment prior to disbursing funds to an Implementing Agency. UNDP attempted to complete this in 2009, however there was some difficulty as the Implementing Partner, the Forestry Department (FD) was unable to release documents that were required for reason of confidentiality. In particular, minutes of Executive Meetings and financial reporting. The UNDP has been working with the FD to resolve these issues.	UNDP CO then requested alternative documentation that fulfilled the requirements, ie proof that Executive Meetings were held, the frequency of the meetings and that minute are routinely taken. Since 2010 the availability of persons at FD and UNDP to conduct the site visit and assessment became an issue. The FD and UNDP have set a date of July 7, 2010 to complete the visit and the assessment report is to be completed by July 31, 2010.
Until the Capacity Assessment is completed the Forestry Department cannot receive disbursements from the CO.	UNDP CO will make direct payments to all suppliers until the Capacity Assessment is completed. The PMU will adhere to UNDP Procurement Guidelines and submit supporting documentation to the CO.

**General Comments:**

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

Capacity Assessment of Implementing Agency should be done before the start up of the project and the recruiting of Project Manager. This will ensure timely disbursement of project funds when project is initiated. Reviewing of the policies started but this was not completed because of administrative duties which took up most of the time.

**Annex I: Project Implementation Status Questionnaire**

PIMS Number, Project Title and Country		PIMS: Title:		Country: Jamaica
Implementation Status		Monitoring & Evaluation		
<input type="checkbox"/> Before Inception <input type="checkbox"/> At Inception <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1 <sup>st</sup> Year <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		<input type="checkbox"/> 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <sup>th</sup> Year <input type="checkbox"/> Completion		<input type="checkbox"/> Mid-Term Review Completed When: <input type="checkbox"/> Final Evaluation Completed When:
SLM Capacity Development	NAP Elaboration	SLM Mainstreaming		
<b>1. Project Developed?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> National Policy Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> National Institutional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Local Policy Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Local Institutional Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Individuals Capacity (farmers, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> NGO Capacity Others:	<b>4. NAP Elaboration Done?</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NAP Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> NAP Adopted When: <b>5. Government Support on NAP elaboration?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Not Sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> More than Sufficient <b>6. Linkages with other Global Environmental Conventions/Plans Made?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> NBSAP <input type="checkbox"/> NAPA <input type="checkbox"/> Nat'l Comm. to UNFCCC	<b>7. Attended DIFS Workshop?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <b>8. IFS Elaboration Done?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> IFS Drafted <input type="checkbox"/> IFS Adopted When: <b>9. SLM Mainstreamed?</b> Line-Ministries/Sectors <input type="checkbox"/> Finance <input type="checkbox"/> Planning <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture/Forestry <input type="checkbox"/> Water Resources <input type="checkbox"/> Economic Development <input type="checkbox"/> Transport/Infrastructure <input type="checkbox"/> Social Development <input type="checkbox"/> Public Health <input type="checkbox"/> Local Government Others: <input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector <input type="checkbox"/> International Donor <b>10. Government Support on SLM mainstreaming?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Not Sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> Sufficient <input type="checkbox"/> More than Sufficient		
<b>2. Capacity on SLM at Project Start?</b> National Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Weak <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Average <input type="checkbox"/> Strong Local Capacity <input type="checkbox"/> Weak <input type="checkbox"/> Average <input type="checkbox"/> Strong	<b>11. Stakeholder Interest Increased?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <b>12. Financial Flow to SLM Increased?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 1~5% <input type="checkbox"/> 6~15% <input type="checkbox"/> 16~30% <input type="checkbox"/> Over 30% Mostly from: <input type="checkbox"/> Internal Sources <input type="checkbox"/> External Sources <input type="checkbox"/> Innovative Sources <b>13. Climate change mitigation or/and adaptation options considered in SLM</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, circle one or both ( <i>Mitigation/adaptation</i> ) <b>14. Indigenous SLM Knowledge Mainstreamed?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, into which sector(s): <b>15. Gender Mainstreamed?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, into which sector(s):			<b>16. Project Contributed to Policy Reform on SLM?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Which policy: <b>17. SLM field-Tested?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If no, planned when: <b>18. SLM Land Coverage Increased?</b> Before Project _____ ha. / _____ % of total land area After Project Intervention _____ ha. / _____ % of total land area <b>19. Land Productivity Increased?</b> Average Yield Increase due to Project Intervention <input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> 1~5% <input type="checkbox"/> 6~15% <input type="checkbox"/> 16~30% <input type="checkbox"/> Over 30%