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# A. Basic Project and Finance Data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Implementing Partner: | National Environment and Planning Agency |
| GEF Focal Area: | Biodiversity |
| Country(ies) | (JAM) Jamaica |
| Project Start Date: | 12-Jul-2010 |
| Planned Project Closing Date: | 31-Aug-2016 |
| Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board meetings during reporting period: | December 2014 October 2014 March 2015 July 2015 |
| Total GEF Grant (U$S) | $ 2,890,585 |
| GEF Grant Disbursed as of 30 June (U$S): | $ 949,902.67 |
| Total Co-financing (as planned in CEO endorsement request): | $ 7,489,500.00 |
| Overall Risk Rating | High |
| Overall DO Rating | Moderately Satisfactory |
| Overall IP Rating | Moderately Satisfactory |

# B. Project Contacts and Links

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Partner | Contact Name | Email Address |
| Project Coordinator / Manager | Ngozi Christian | ngozi.christian@nepa.gov.jm |
| UNDP Country Office Programme Officer | Richard Kelly | richard.kelly@undp.org |
| Project Implementing Partner | National Environment and Planning Agency | ndouglas@nepa.gov.jm |
| GEF Operational Focal Point | Gillian Guthrie | emdmohe@yahoo.com |
| Other Partners | Forest Department; Fisheries Division; JNHT & PAC |  |
| UNDP Technical Adviser | Lyes Ferroukhi | lyes.ferroukhi@undp.org |
| UNDP Programme Associate | Edwin Chipsen | edwin.chipsen@undp.org |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project website, etc. | http://www.jm.undp.org/content/jamaica/en/home/operations/projects/environment\_and\_energy/national-protected-areas-project.html https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.944573365567129.1073741845.519385968085873&amp;type=3 https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.944041835620282.1073741843.519385968085873&type=3 https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.940605122630620.1073741842.519385968085873&type=3 https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.937521329605666.1073741841.519385968085873&type=3 https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.936482573042875.1073741840.519385968085873&type=3 |
| Links to media coverage |  |

# C. Project Summary

Long-term solution to the ongoing loss of biodiversity (BD) in PAs in Jamaica by the consolidation of the NSPA in line with the recommendations of the PASMP. This would involve: a) making provision for policy and institutional frameworks and coordination; b) ensuring financial sustainability; c) increasing capacities among PA stakeholders at local and national levels; and d) improving targeting of investments in line with identified priorities for ecological coverage. The PASMP initiative will lay the bases for this.

# D. Progress toward Development Objective

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective/Outcome** | **Description** | **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Target Level at end of project** | **Level at 30 June 2013** | **Level at 30 June 2014** | **Level at 30 June 2015** |
| Objective | To consolidate the operational and financial sustainability of JamaicaÃ¢s National System of Protected Areas | Increase in NSPA operational sustainability measured by average METT score for all PAs based on the following definitions: High (75-100), Medium (55-74), Low (&lt;55). | High: number of PAs - 0 Medium: number of PAs - 4 Low: number of PAs - 28 | High: number of PAs - 2 Medium: number of PAs - 6 Low: number of PAs - 24 | High: number of PAs - 0 Medium: number of PAs - 6 Low: number of PAs - 26 ( Verification of baseline for METT Scores was conducted during the reporitng period. On verification of baseline for the METT scores, the total number of PAs that were of Medium rating was five (5) and not four (4) as reported) | High: number of PAs - 1 Medium: number of PAs - 9 Low: number of PAs - 22 | High: number of PAs - 1 Medium: number of PAs - 13 Low: number of PAs - 18 |
|  |  | Increase in NSPA financial capacity measured by Financial Sustainability Scorecard | Financial Score (Part 2): 53 | Financial Score (Part 2): 122 (The highest score possible is 225) |  | The financial score was assessed for some protected areas but not. The PMU has indicated that efforts will be made to complete the task during the year Ã¢ 2014. | The revised target includes that the highest score possible is 225. The Financial Sustainability scorecard will be applied to the project's mid term evaluation. |
|  |  | Area of Closed Broad-leaf Forest within NPAS sustained | Broad-leaf: 88,000 hectares | No change in area of Closed Broad-leaf Forest: 88,000 hectares | Area of Closed Broad-leaf Forest: 88,000 hectares This report represents the status as of 2010. It must be noted that the source of verification is the Global Forest Resources Assessment Country Report submitted to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. This report is published every 10 years. | Broad-leaf: 88,000 hectares | The most current data is unavailable, however there is data for the 2012-2013 period which reflects a decrease of approximately 4,000 hectares. |
|  |  | Area of living reef within 10 NPAS monitoring sites sustained | Area of Reef: 3% - 30% living | No change in Area of Reef: 3% - 30% living | Area of living reef - 6% - 30% living Please note that this figure represents 7 monitoring sites within the NPAS from 2008-2011 that has been consistently monitored. The number of common sites monitored within protected areas have not been consistent over the years and this indicator may need to be revised. It is also important to note that it was expressed that this indicator may not be the best to monitor health of the marine environment as it is impacted by natural occcurences not in the control of the management entities - these include impacts resulting from from climate change. Also, it must be noted that NEPA produces the annual reports entitled: \"Coral Reefs Jamaica, Reef Status & Trends\" | No change in Area of Reef: 6% - 30% living since June 2013 | The most current data is unavailable, however there is data for the 2012-2013 period which reflects no change in the area of living reef. There was 3%- 30% living reef. |
|  |  | Population of 4 indicator species sustained in PAs proposed to be monitored: 1. Endemic Giant Swallowtail Butterfly (Pterouus humerus) 2. Queen Conch (Strombus gigas) 3. Black Bill Parrot (Amazona agilis) 4.Yellow Bill Parrot (Amazona collaria) | Number of individuals of: endemic Giant Swallowtail Butterfly (Pterouus humerus), endemic Jamaican BlackBird (Nesopsar niggerrimus), Hawksbill Turtle (Eretmochelys imbricate), and Queen Conch (Strombus gigas) (exact figures to be determined at project inception) | Distribution and Density of endemic Swallowtail Butterfly same as baseline data No change in Queen Conch: Depth Strata (metres) 0 -10 243 conch/hectare 10-20 - 145 conch/hectare 20-30 165 conch/hectare Biomass estimate 12,214 metric tonne | Population of Queen Conch (Strombus gigas): Depth Strata (metres) 0 -10 Ã¢ 243 conch/hectare 10-20 - 145 conch/hectare 20-30 Ã¢ 165 conch/hectare This information was obtained from the Fisheries Division, Jamaica. | 1. Abundance of endemic ticki ticki fish (Gambusia melapleura) - Data unavailable 2.Population of Queen Conch (Strombus gigas): Queen Conch: Depth Strata (metres) 0 -10 Ã¢ 243 conch/hectare 10-20 - 145 conch/hectare 20-30 Ã¢ 165 conch/hectare 3.Extent of swamp forest patches and number of associated indicator species (e.g. Symphonia globulifera, Hibiscus elatus, Roystonea princeps): Swamp Forest patches: 18; Number of indicators species: data unavailable Biomass estimate Ã¢ 12,214 metric tonnes | Current data is unavailable, however a survey is to be done for the biomass of Queen Conch and the report should be available by early 2016. |
| Outcome 1 | Strengthening of financial planning and revenue generation | Increase in Protected Area Trust Fund principal and annual disbursement to NPAS | Trust Fund Principle: 0 Annual Disbursement to NPAS: 0 | Caribbean Biodiversity Fund (CBF) Principal: US$ 3.35 million Disbursement to NPAS: US$ 100,000 - US$ 250,000 | Trust Fund Principal: US$ 4,478,554.00 The German Development Bank has transferred their portion to the CBF. The remaining donors are to transfer the sum once the NPATF has been established. Annual Disbursement to NPAS: 0 Trust Fund Principal baseline has increased to US$ 5,728,554 | Trust Fund Principle: 0 Annual Disbursement to NPAS: 0 Trust fund not yet established | CBF Principal: US$ 3.4 million Still awaiting transfer of US$ 750,000 from UNDP to the CBF. Disbursement to NPAS (from CBF): $0. Processes leading to the signing of the Vertical Agreement with the CBF are underway |
|  |  | Amount of funds generated locally by the Local PA Trust Fund. % of the Trust Fund principal generated locally | $0 | US$ 600,000- 1,000,000 | N/A. The National Protected Area Trust Fund has not been established - this is expected to be done by the first quarter of 2014. | $0 | $0 Mechanism to capitalize Trust Fund is being developed. Tourism Enhancement Fund (TEF) Proposal being developed. Preliminary discussions have been positive. |
|  |  | Increase in annual government funding for PAs | US$ 4,097,000 | US$ 4,500,000- $4,900,00 (12% - 20% increase) | Annual government funding for PAs: US$5,197,748.06 | US$4,155,288 | No data collected |
|  |  | Increase in annual non-government resources | US$1,575,987 | US$ 1,650,000 - $1,891,184 (15% - 20% increase) |  | No data collected | No data collected |
|  |  | Number of PAs with business plans that reflect NPAS standards | 0 PAs with business plans that reflect NPAS standards | 8 PAs with business plans that reflect NPAS standards (25% increase) | 1 PA with draft business plan that reflect NPAS standards | 2 PAs with business plans that reflect NPAS standards | Four business plans have been completed, but require revisions based on the recommendations of the Project Steering Committee. The development of four additional business plans is underway. |
|  |  | Local Protected Area Trust Fund 100% established and fully operational by 2016. | 0 Protected Areas Trust Fund existing locally | Establishment of the Local Trust Fund by 2014. Operationalization of the Local Trust Fund by 2016. |  |  | Local Trust Fund was established in December 2014. The operationalization process is underway. The National Conservation Trust Fund of Jamaica Board established and endorsed by the relevant Government Minister. Draft By-laws have been completed and will be finalized shortly. |
|  |  | Number of Protected Areas with mechanisms to generate revenue at the site level | 1 PAs with mechanisms to generate revenue (BJCMNP) | Revenue generation in 5 PAs |  |  | 1 PA with mechanisms to generate revenue (BJCMNP). However, plans are underway to facilitate the development of revenue generation mechanisms in additional PAs. |
|  |  | Extent to which operational plan for the PA system financial strategy developed. | No such strategy available. | Operational Plan for the PA system financial strategy developed. |  |  | The NPAS Project has procured the services of Global Parks volunteers to facilitate the development of the operational plan for the PA system financial strategy. Completion expected by December 2016. |
| Outcome 2 | Rationalizing and integrating the NSPA | Status of developing drafting instructions for umbrella PA legislation and supporting legal framework. | 0 Umbrella legislation for NPAS | Drafting instructions for umbrella PA legislation and supporting legal framework developed | N/A. Progress on the targets are expected by the last quarter of 2013. | Review of existing PA legislations (gap analysis) is completed. Review of co-management agreements is currently ongoing | Drafting instructions partially completed (draft should be ready by September 2015). Draft policy near completion (should be ready by mid-August 2015) |
|  |  | Number of new PA landscapes declared and implementing management plans that reflect integrated landscape/seascape wide approaches to combating PA threats | Zero (0) new coastal and marine PA landscapes declared and implementing management plans that reflect integrated landscape/seascape wide approaches to combating PA threats | One (1) new coastal and one (1) new marine PA landscape declared and implementing management plans that reflect integrated landscape/seascape wide approaches to combating PA threats. | One (1) new marine protected area with draft management plan | Zero (0) new coastal and marine PA landscapes gazetted. Draft management Plan for Pedro Cays and Surrounding Waters updated | No new PA landscapes declared and implementing management plans. |
|  |  | Number of PAs with clearly designated lead and support entity. | One (1) PA within NSPA legal agreement designation PA management authority. | 6 Protected Areas within the NPAS with legal agreements designating PA Management Authority. |  |  | Four (4) agreements are in place for the system. |
| Outcome 3 | Increasing PA management effectiveness | Increase in PA management effectiveness measured by METT scores | METT Scores for 28 PAs and 4 Forest Regions: Ã¢Â¢ Montego Bay Marine Park - 44 Ã¢Â¢ Blue and John Crow Mtn National Park Ã¢ 72 Ã¢Â¢ Negril EPA - 32 Ã¢Â¢ Negril Marine Park Ã¢ 39 Ã¢Â¢ Palisadoes-Port Royal Protected Area Ã¢ 27 Ã¢Â¢ Coral Spring-Mountain Spring Ã¢ 19 Ã¢Â¢ Portland Bight Protected Area Ã¢ 36 Ã¢Â¢ Ocho Rios Protected Area Ã¢ 19 Ã¢Â¢ Mason River protected Area - 54 Ã¢Â¢ Bogue Islands Fish Sanctuary - 14 Ã¢Â¢ Bowden Fish Sanctuary - 13 Ã¢Â¢ Airport Point Fish Sanctuary - 46 Ã¢Â¢ Discovery Bay Fish Sanctuary - 34 Ã¢Â¢ Bluefields Bay Fish Sanctuary - 33 Ã¢Â¢ Orange Bay Fish Sanctuary - 36 Ã¢Â¢ Galeon Bay Fish Sanctuary - 30 Ã¢Â¢ Salt Harbour Fish Sanctuary - 36 Ã¢Â¢ Galleon Harbour Fish Sanctuary - 32 Ã¢Â¢ Three Bays Fish Sanctuary - 32 Ã¢Â¢Forestry Northeast - 58 Ã¢Â¢ Forestry Southeast - 56 Ã¢Â¢ Forestry Northwest - 40 Ã¢Â¢ Forestry Southwest - 45 Ã¢Â¢ Port Royal and Palisadoes - 52 Ã¢Â¢ Black River - 21 Ã¢Â¢ Spanish Town - 41 Ã¢Â¢ Titchfield Hill - 43 Ã¢Â¢ Falmouth - 35 Ã¢Â¢ Seville - 74 Ã¢Â¢ Rio Nuevo - 17 Ã¢Â¢ Mountain River Cave - 44 Ã¢Â¢ Mason River Reserve - 54 (Note that there are 102 Forest Reserves found within the four (4) Forest Regions listed as individual PAs) | 25% overall increase in METT scores for 50% of the 28 PAs and 4 Forest Regions of NPAS. | Blue and John Crow Mtn National Park Ã¢?? 67 Bluefields Bay Special Fishery Conservation Area formerly Bluefields Bay Fish Sanctuary: 69 Montego Point Special Fishery Conservation Area formerly Montego Bay Marine Park Fish SanctuaryAirport Point Fish Sanctuary: 67 Seville Heritage Park: 68 Coral Spring-Mountain Spring Protected Area: 28 Palisadoes-Port Royal Protected Area: 31 Mason River Protected Area: 54 All the METT scorecards will be completed by the end of 2013 | Ã¢?Â¢Montego Bay Marine Park - 51 Ã¢?Â¢Blue and John Crow Mtn National Park Ã¢?? 75 Ã¢?Â¢Negril EPA - 32 Ã¢?Â¢Negril Marine Park Ã¢?? 37 Ã¢?Â¢Palisadoes-Port Royal Protected Area Ã¢?? 29 Ã¢?Â¢Coral Spring-Mountain Spring Ã¢?? 20 Ã¢?Â¢Portland Bight Protected Area Ã¢?? 42 Ã¢?Â¢Ocho Rios Protected Areas Ã¢?? 22 Ã¢?Â¢Mason River protected Area - 54 Ã¢?Â¢Bogue Islands Fish Sanctuary - 44 Ã¢?Â¢Port Morant Harbour Lagoon Special Fishery Conservation Area (formerly Bowden Fish Sanctuary) - 35 Ã¢?Â¢Montego Bay Point Special Fishery Conservation Area (formerly Airport Point Fish Sanctuary)- 46 Ã¢?Â¢Discovery Bay Special Fishery Conservation Area (formerly Discovery Bay Fish Sanctuary) - 35 Ã¢?Â¢Bluefields Bay Special Fishery Conservation Area (formerly Bluefields Bay Fish Sanctuary) - 33 Ã¢?Â¢Orange Bay Special Fishery Conservation Area (formerly Orange Bay Fish Sanctuary) - 52 Ã¢?Â¢Galleon St. Elizabeth Special Fishery Conservation Area (formerly Galeon Fish Sanctuary) Ã¢?? 48 Ã¢?Â¢Salt Harbour Special Fishery Conservation Area (formerly Salt Harbour Fish Sanctuary) - 37 Ã¢?Â¢Galleon Harbour Special Fishery Conservation Area formerly (Galleon Harbour Fish Sanctuary) - 55 Ã¢?Â¢Three Bays Special Fishery Conservation Area (formerly Three Bays Fish Sanctuary) - 55 Ã¢?Â¢Forestry Northeast - 62 Ã¢?Â¢Forestry Southeast - 58 Ã¢?Â¢Forestry Northwest - 42 Ã¢?Â¢Forestry Southwest - 49 Ã¢?Â¢Port Royal and Palisadoes Ã¢?? 67 Ã¢?Â¢Black River - 52 Ã¢?Â¢Spanish Town - 60 Ã¢?Â¢Titchfield Hill - 55 Ã¢?Â¢Falmouth - 57 Ã¢?Â¢Seville - 74 Ã¢?Â¢Rio Nuevo - 30 Ã¢?Â¢Mountain River Cave Ã¢?? 51 Ã¢?Â¢Mason River Reserve - 64 | METT Scores for 28 PAs and 4 Forest Regions at Mid-Project (2012-2013): Ã¢?Â¢ Montego Bay Marine Park - 66 Ã¢?Â¢ Blue and John Crow Mtn National Park Ã¢?? 75 Ã¢?Â¢ Negril EPA - 36 Ã¢?Â¢ Negril Marine Park Ã¢?? 36 Ã¢?Â¢ Palisadoes-Port Royal Protected Area Ã¢?? 29 Ã¢?Â¢ Coral Spring-Mountain Spring Ã¢?? 19 Ã¢?Â¢ Portland Bight Protected Area Ã¢?? 50 Ã¢?Â¢ Ocho Rios Protected Area Ã¢?? 22 Ã¢?Â¢ Mason River protected Area - 54 Ã¢?Â¢ Bogue Islands Special Fishery Conservation Area - 53 Ã¢?Â¢ Port Morant Special Fishery Conservation Area (formerly Bowden Fish Sanctuary) - 13 Ã¢?Â¢Montego Bay Point Special Fishery Conservation Area (formerly Airport Point Fish Sanctuary) - 50 Ã¢?Â¢ Discovery Bay Special Fishery Conservation Area - 60 Ã¢?Â¢ Bluefields Bay Special Fishery Conservation Area- 66 Ã¢?Â¢ Orange Bay Special Fishery Conservation Area - 52 Ã¢?Â¢ Galleon Bay Special Fishery Conservation Area - 49 Ã¢?Â¢ Salt Harbour Special Fishery Conservation Area - 62 Ã¢?Â¢ Galleon Harbour Special Fishery Conservation Area - 63 Ã¢?Â¢ Three Bays Special Fishery Conservation Area- 61 Ã¢?Â¢Forestry Northeast - 62 Ã¢?Â¢ Forestry Southeast - 58 Ã¢?Â¢ Forestry Northwest - 43 Ã¢?Â¢ Forestry Southwest - 49 Ã¢?Â¢ Port Royal and Palisadoes - 67 Ã¢?Â¢ Black River - 52 Ã¢?Â¢ Spanish Town - 60 Ã¢?Â¢ Titchfield Peninsula - 55 Ã¢?Â¢ Falmouth Historic District - 57 Ã¢?Â¢ Seville Great House - 72 Ã¢?Â¢ Rio Nuevo - 29 Ã¢?Â¢ Mountain River Cave - 50 Ã¢?Â¢ Mason River Reserve - 54 (Note that there are 102 Forest Reserves found within the four (4) Forest Regions listed as individual PAs) |
|  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | . |  |  |  |
|  |  | Number of PAs that contribute to and/or access biological information through CBD Jamaica Clearing House Mechanism (JaCHM). | One (1) PA contributing to and accessing the CBD JaCHM. | 28 PAs and 4 Forest Regions contributing to the JaCHM. Accessing of database and website by end users to include PA Managers (100% of PAs) | Three (3) Protected Areas (Mason River Protected Area, Negril Marine Park, Portland Bight Protected Area) and two (2) Forest Regions (Forestry North East and Forestry South East) have accessed and contributed to the Jamaica Clearing House Mechanism (JaCHM). Information on the remaining PAs will be uploaded by the end of 2013 | Same as in June 2013. | Same as in June 2014. Currently the NPAS Project Management Unit is liaising with the JaCHM to ascertain the process for increasing access and/or contributions to the JaCHM on the part of Protected Areas |
|  |  | Number of PAs with management plans that reflect NPAS management guideline standards | Zero (0) PAs with management plans that reflect NPAS management guideline standards | 8 PAs with management plans that reflect NPAS management guideline standards (25%) | 1 PA with draft management plan (PBPA). It is expected to have 6 additional PA management plans by end of the first quarter of 2014. | 4 Management Plans NPAS management guideline standards not yet developed | Five (5) PAs with management plans. NPAS guidelines are near completion. |
|  |  | Extent to which the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E) System for NPA management developed. | 0 M&amp;E system for NPA Management | Monitoring and Evaluation sytem for protected area management developed. |  |  | Research is being conducted by the NPAS Biodiversity Conservation Specialist (University of the West Indies, Mona) towards the devlopment of the Monitoring and Evaluation System for Protected Area Management. |
|  |  | Number of PAS with conservation-based economic activities | 0 PAs with conservation-based economic activities | 3 PAs with conservation-based economic activities implemented. |  |  | Proposals have been requested from the following protected areas: Pedro Bank, Black River, Gourie Forest Reserve, Port Royal Heritage District and Mason RIver Protected Area. A proposal was received from the Gourie Forest Reserve. |
|  |  | Status of implementation of Communication Strategy for NPAS |  | Communication Strategy for NPAS implemented in 20 key PAs |  |  | Communication Strategy for NPAS implemented in 7 key PAs. Plans are being finalized to implement the Communication Strategy for NPAS in PAs through various means including Public Service Announcements. |

# E. Progress in Implementation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Project Outcomes | Description | Outputs Reported as of 30 June 2015 |
| Outcome 1 | Strengthening of financial planning and revenue generation | Progress: 1. Trust fund established 2. Consultant engaged to complete business plans 3. Consultant engaged to complete revenue generation mechanisms 4. Consultant engaged to complete operational plan for financial strategy |
| Outcome 2 | Rationalizing and integrating the NSPA | Progress: 1. Stakeholder consultations towards preparing drafting instructions for overarching PA legislation completed. Draft legislation is being prepared for submission 2. Marine Spatial plan for Pedro Bank 90% completed. Declaration of the Black River Upper/Lower Morass 10% completed |
| Outcome 3 | Increasing PA management effectiveness | Progress: 1. 5 management plans completed; management plan guidelines drafted 2. Monitoring and evaluation framework drafted 3. Conservation based economic development commenced, that is, 2 proposals received for consideration by the project 4. Implementation of the communication strategy continued |

General Comments:

Generally, the project has made great strides in 2014/15. Progress was made towards the trust fund and the legislation. During the year the project not only established the trust fund but also gave oversight and support to the establishment of the board. The project recruited to new Local Legal Advisor who has been making real progress in preparing the legislation for the protected areas. With respect to all the other outputs, all activities are scheduled to be finished by March 2016 and therefore it is expected that with the additional Interns and Graduate Trainees to be engaged by the project, all targets will be met by end of project in July 2016.

# F. Ratings and Comments on Project Progress

**Project Progress toward Development Objective**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Role | 2015 Rating | 2015 Comments |
| Project Manager/Coordinator | Moderately Satisfactory | Explain why you gave a specific rating. Overall, outcome 1 has had some successes and a lot of setbacks. Basically, the project is behind in achieving this outcome. (A) The project should have (i) established the trust fund, (ii) revised the Articles of Association to include all 11 members of the board, (iii) set up a bank account and (iv) hired the Executive Director. The trust fund was established in December 2014 and since the decisions on items (ii) to (iv) above have not yet been made. This is satisfactory given that the CBF only completed the final version of the vertical agreement in July 2015. (B) The work towards preparing business plans based on NPAS standards has been delayed. A total of four (4) business plans were drafted however none of the 4 is based on the NPAS standards. This is expected to be completed by March 2016. Overall this is unsatisfactory, however, a consultant was engaged in early 2015 who will complete all the remaining business plans and revise/update the existing ones. (C) The design and implementation of the revenue generation mechanisms has just begun and should be completed by March 3016. This too is unsatisfactory, however the ground work will begin in July 2015 and is slated to be completed by December 2015. (D) Work on the operational plan for the PA system financial strategy has only just begun. However the operational plan is slated to be completed by December 2015. This is marginally satisfactory. Outcome 2: Overall, achieving this outcome has improved over 2014. However, the project is still behind. (A) Work towards preparing the drafting instructions for the legislation is advanced. In that stakeholder consultations were carried out and the draft of these deliverables will be made available within the next 6 months. This is satisfactory. (B) In terms of the work being done on declaring two (2) areas protected (Pedro Bank and Black River), this is marginally unsatisfactory. The project is advanced in completing the Marine Spatial Plan for Pedro bank however, in the case of Black River, the steps towards declaring the area have only just begun and will be completed by project end. Outcome 3: This outcome has also had grave challenges and as a result, the project has been experiencing delays. (A) In terms of the management plans, five management plans have been completed however, all 5 need to be revised so that they conform to the NPAS standards. Given that this output is 50% complete, the achievement is marginally satisfactory. (B) The monitoring and evaluation framework has been drafted but not yet finalized. It is expected that it will be finalized by December 2015. Therefore this is marginally satisfactory. (C) The output, conservation based economic development, to be implemented under the project, has not started. However, this is scheduled to begin in August 2015 and completed March 2016. This is marginally unsatisfactory, however the target will be realised before the projected end date of the project. (D) The final output under the project is the implementation of a communication strategy. The communication strategy has been developed since 2012, however, the implementation only begun in 2014 and is not yet completed. This achievement is therefore unsatisfactory but every effort is being made the project to implement the strategy starting July 2015. Critical risks: The project has a number of risks, these are largely financial, organisational and operational. 1. Accounting/Financial Reporting: There is difficulty completing financial and the narrative report with great accuracy as the project does not always have access to up to date financial information. This will affect reporting timelines if this is not addressed. 2.Lengthy decision-making and bureaucratic processes undermine achievement of expected results in lifetime of project 3a. Human Resources Processes and Procedures: The Human Resource Branch of the IP must follow certain guidelines and processes. This affects the projectâs ability to complete activities and outputs within the timeframe expected. If this is not addressed then the project will experience up to 3 months delay when procuring or recruiting new consultants or staff. 3b. Human Resource processes: The process of procuring, contracting or changing terms of a contract is lengthy 4. Delivery: The project is unable to deliver as per the timelines mentioned in the consultantsâ contract as the project main beneficiaries are many times unable to provide the information in a timely fashion. This does not only affect the timeliness of deliverables but also the review of deliverables. If this continues, it will affect the projectâs completion date and delivery rate. 5. New unexpected regulations. policies: The GOJ has indicated that all projects are expected to pay Government Consumption Tax (GCT) on all goods and services procured. This will affect the projectâs available budget, consultantâs contract and the donorâs who are usually tax exempt. If this is not addressed at the highest level, it will affect Consultantsâ ability to acquire tax compliance certificates and reduce the available budget of the project by 16.5%. 6. Partnerships failing to deliver: The main beneficiaries of the project are often times unable to attend consultations or provide critical information required to assist the project in achieving its targets. If this continues, the project will be implemented without the necessary buy-in required for its success. 7. Project Management: The Project Manager has limited authority as all decisions affecting the project must be approved by the Implementing Partner before they can be implemented or actioned. Action Plan 1. The project will continue to broker and foster good working relationships with the stakeholders 2. Conduct monthly review and assessment of the project accounting/finances 3. Use more direct contracting method to secure consultants and/or staff 4. Recruit consultants to assist us to review deliverables 5. Keep tighter timelines in order to get the project back on track |
| UNDP Country Office Programme Officer | Moderately Satisfactory | Momentum for project implementation has significantly increased over the reporting period compared to last year. The establishment of the National Trust Fund and Board and movement towards completion of the drafting instructions for overarching legislation and draft policy are good achievements. While other outputs are yet to be achieved, progress is being made towards achieving them. Also, there has been progress towards establishing mechanisms for local capitalization of the Trust Fund. The M and E aspects of the project has also improved with frequent bilateral meetings with the IP and more effective PSC meetings. The Strategic Results Framework was revised to make it more realistic. The PMU along with UNDP has also sought creative ways to achieve outputs such as the use of Global Park Volunteers. While the project is making positive progress there remain implementation challenges and slow pace in which some deliverables are being achieved. It is taking a long time for some outputs to be finalized by the relevant stakeholders and the PSC. Measures are being put in place to address this situation. There are also some targets and indicators that recent data is absent for. Accessing data will be important to achieve project targets in this regard. The project spend is also lagging although this is expected to improve. There are also some challenges in the IP's financial monitoring of the project. This issue is being addressed through enhanced monitoring of financial activities. Given the momentum, the outputs should be achieved during the life of the project. UNDP has also increased its oversight for the project which should have a positive impact going forward. UNDP has also provided technical input where required and has assisted the Project Management Unit in procuring relevant consultants to improve the procurement efficiency of the project. The improved oversight from UNDP, the active support from the RTA in RBLAC, the interest and focus of the IP and the achievements of the project to date warrants my rating of moderately satisfactory. During the year the Project Steering Committee was also revamped and re-energized to provide more project oversight and guidance for the project. The CEO of National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA) assumed Chair of the PSC to provide greater support for the project. Once the finalization of key outputs are achieved such as the drafting instructions for the legislation, the business and management plans then the rating for the project should be improved. |
| Project Implementing Partner | Moderately Satisfactory | Within the last year, work continued towards the operationalization of the National Conservation Trust Fund of Jamaica. The PMU acted as Secretariat for the Trust Fund Board and facilitated 3 Board meetings and a Board Training Session since its establishment. The Board continued to work on completion of the By-Laws which will eventually be aligned to the vertical agreement with the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund (CBF). CEO of NEPA is integrally involved with overseeing the operationalization of the NCTFJ in order to commence receiving funds from the CBF. Note that the CBF has indicated that they will not be ready to disburse until January 2016. During the year, 3 major Consultancies were discontinued due to poor quality of work. Between Jan and March 2015, 4 Consultants were engaged to complete the Business Planning Process, Revenue Generation Process, Overarching NPAS Policy Process and Overarching Legal Process. Key stakeholder consultations, focus group and coordination meetings were held towards the preparation of the overarching protected areas system legislation and an overarching protected areas policy. Business planning process resumed after a 3 month hiatus (due to change of Consultants) with feasibility meetings, site visits and a review of the Draft Business Plans to determine the realistic business implementation needs for BJCMNP, Seville Heritage site and the Gourie/Clydesdale Forest Reserves. NEPA commenced the management plan preparation for the Ocho Rios and Palisadoes Protected Areas, while work continued on the Black River management plan. Additionally, TNC continued work on completion of the Marine Spatial Plan for Pedro Bank and completed the Draft Management Plan for Pedro Cays and Surrounding Waters. As the Agency continues the work to getting the Black River and Pedro Cays declared as Protected Areas, UWI continued work on data gathering of the biodiversity of the two areas. Discussions commenced on Revenue Generation, Alternative Livelihood and Conservation-Based Economic Development programmes in selected Protected Areas. Public Education and sensitization activities continued through the completion of Billboard designs, holding of a Media Sensitization Workshop, design of a Project Web Page, completion of a media KAP survey and community meetings/workshops. Although many of the project activities are in advanced stages of completion, the project spend rate is not yet reflective of all the work being done. Based on the projected results, the implementation rate is expected to increase significantly in the third quarter. |
| GEF Operational Focal point | Satisfactory | Over the reporting period, several elements of the Project outputs have been achieved or are being finalized. Of note is the establishment of the National Conservation Trust Fund of Jamaica (NCTFJ) and the convening of its Board. Several activities related to the effective operationalization of the Fund are being finalized, including the sustainable funding mechanism. In addition, significant work has been done on the preparation of the draft Protected Areas Policy and the drafting instructions for protected areas legislation. Also, there has been increased monitoring and evaluation of the Project by the UNDP and the Project Steering Committee to ensure that the Project deliverables are achieved. There is also increased momentum within the Project Management Unit (PMU) in coordinating the Project activities in support of the achievement of the Project objectives. While progress has been made in finalizing the Project deliverables, there are still some challenges. These include finalization of some outputs, for example (i) Management and Business Plans for protected areas, (ii) lack of data for assessing target endemic species under the Project, and (iii) the declaration of two new protected areas. Another challenge is that expenditure under the Project has been less than anticipated, however measures are being put in place to increase expenditure. |
| Other Partners |  |  |
| UNDP Technical Advisor | Moderately Satisfactory | The PRODOC of this project established that one of the most viable and urgent long-term solution to counterbalance the ongoing loss of ecosystem functionality and biodiversity (BD) in Jamaica is the consolidation of the National Protected Area System . The project was therefore designed to lift the following barriers which were identified during the design phase: ( 1): Inadequate funding sources and financial management mechanisms. The financial sustainability of the NSPA is hindered by its limited income sources and the inadequate mechanisms for the effective management of financial resources. Existing financial mechanisms such as the Environmental Foundation of Jamaica (EFJ), the Jamaica National Parks Trust Fund (JNPTF) and the Forest Conservation Fund are not capable of providing the sustained financial support required by the NSPA, given that they were not designed to do so. (2) Limited consolidation of the NSPA at programmatic level. The effectiveness of the NSPA in protecting BD, and the corresponding cost-effectiveness of the use of PA budgets, has also been constrained by the limited integration of its constituent PAs. There is also a geographical overlap between different types of protected areas and consequently an overlap in jurisdiction, resulting in limited management efficiency and duplication of efforts (3): Inadequate capacities and tools for effective PA management. The operational effectiveness of individual PAs is constrained by the inadequate technical, managerial and financial capacities of PA managers. Advantage is not taken of the potential for stakeholders near protected areas to contribute to the effectiveness of PA management, thereby increasing the burdens placed on Government resources. The limited availability of data on the location of endangered and endemic species has also recently become more of an issue of concern as pressure to develop the ecologically sensitive and economically valuable coastal zones has increased dramatically recently. Based on this, 3 key ( and pretty straightforward) outcomes were defined for this project: (i) Strengthening planning and revenue generation for PAs (ii) Rationalizing and integrating the NSAP while improving the national policy and regulatory framework (iii) Increasing PA management effectiveness Beyond complying with the GEF BD focal area eligibility criteria, this initiative is also clearly responding to strategic national priorities related to water and food security, climate resilience and tourism development. Also, Jamaica is part of the Caribbean Challenge Initiative. As such the country has committed to increase its efforts to conserve and manage its coastal ecosystems and to seek ways to increase resilience to CC of the island based on more efficient management practices of its ecosystems. The project is also in line with overall regional efforts to strengthen PA management in countries such as Cuba, Haiti, Dominican Republic, St Kitts and Nevis, Dominica, Grenada where similar initiatives are running in parallel. The project is rated as Moderately Satisfactory. Considering that this project was off-track for a long period of time and rated as unsatisfactory for several consecutive years, this qualification is actually very positive and the RTA wishes to commend the project team, NEPA, project partners and the UNDP CO for their outstanding efforts to pull back the project on track. The RTA has witnessed in the past two years how the project proponents and all the partners involved have tried very hard to apply adaptive management and how this triggered a new positive momentum. Several elements contributed to this positive development and some are further detailed under the IP rating. The most noticeable milestone achieved during this reporting period is undoubtedly the establishment of the National Trust Fund Mechanism which will allow Jamaica to draw upon regional resources and generate national revenue flows to the PAs. Having witnessed all the complexities involved in the process, the RTA can confirm that this is an achievement of major proportions. In parallel to this, the project with strong support from UNDP, also continued to work on the architecture of a national revenue generation strategy. This strategy should result in the establishment of innovative financial mechanisms which will tap into revenues generated by the tourism sector but also from other sources including government contributions and private sector investments. Promising discussions are currently being held with the Ministry of Tourism to explore ways to derive revenues based on the Tourism Enhancement Act. This is all good but this activity has experienced a lot of delays and the RTA has been clear with the CO that while the current efforts are good the project needs to accelerate the pace at which it is moving. The national revenue generation mechanism is a key element of the project. The Country has committed to put it in place and it is a necessary condition for the country to access external revenues generated by the CBF. The GEF contribution through this project is also conditioned to the development of a clear and operational national revenue mechanism. Therefore the project must increase the efforts in this field and focus very strongly on this before project closure. The consultancy conducted by Glenn Haas provides the project team and the UNDP CO with important ideas to pursue with the Government including a new system of gate fees. Other areas to explore include airport taxes, fuel taxes, PSA schemes etc. By the end of next reporting period the RTA would like to see major progress on this particular issue reflected by clear Government Commitment. The establishment of new tax systems or PSA schemes takes time. This also requires high- level government clearance as well as supportive legislation. The time left to go through these processes is scarce and yet the success of this project will be to a large extent measured on the results achieved on this particular point. The project has also managed to make substantial progress under component 2 . The drafting instructions for the overarching PA legislation and the draft policy are very good achievements. Again the next reporting period will be crucial to take this work to the next level and ensure that the project will consolidate the adequate legal and policy environment for more efficient PA management in the future. It would be good if the project could take this activity to the next level and ensure that all the conditions are met for these policy and legal frameworks to become enforced and operational. The RTA considers that this particular target and the development of the financial revenue mechanism that will generate local capitalization of the national trust fund are by far the two most important elements to focus on hereafter and until the end of the project. All measures, including acquiring external expertise if that is necessary, must be taken to achieve 100% completion rate on these two crucial activities. If by July 2016, the project manages to achieve these two targets then it will be remembered as a fantastic success story and Jamaica will be an example to follow for many other countries. Recommendation: 1) Based on the revised project framework (see IP tab), prepare the project exit strategy already now. It should be articulated around two main deliverables: (i) the development of an operational and efficient national revenue mechanism that will capitalize the Jamaica national PA trust fund (revolving fund) and (ii) the development and hopefully enforcement of a new legal, institutional and policy framework on PAs 2) As recommended several times previously, UNDP, the project team and key partners should lead discussions with strategic actors with the aim to secure more efficient planning and investments on PA management as well as buy in for the deliverables that the project will leave to the country. These actors include : the office of the prime minister, ministry of tourism, ministry of agriculture, tour operators, water authorities, civil protection services, coffee producers, ministry of local development, ministry of finance, PIOJ, the Forestry Department and the Fisheries Department, other actors from the private sector. As already signaled last year, public âprivate partnerships in support to PA management, the enforcement of new environmental taxes, tourism derived fees, water fees , government and international contributions to PA management etc. will not happen over one night and will require policy and legal support . |

**Project Progress in Project Implementation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Role | 2014 Rating | 2015 Rating | 2015 Comments |
| Project Manager/Coordinator | Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | 1. Please rate the efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, in this reporting period, is project delivery on target with the Annual Work Plan? Is cumulative project delivery on track? Based on the annual work plan submitted in the 1st quarter of the year, the project is significantly behind for the year. The actions outlined previous sections will be employed to help get the project back on track. 2 Please rate the progress and efficiency in delivery of outputs. For example, if the institutional environment in which the project operates has changed significantly during the reporting period, have the outputs and activities been revised in such a way to ensure the project achieves the stated end-of-project targets? The strategic results framework was revised during the year and this will ensure that the project meets and exceeds its targets. Therefore with the changes made, the project will achieve all its targets. 3 Please rate the quality of risk management. For example, in this reporting period were project risks, including any social and environmental safeguard risks, managed effectively? Risks have been managed satisfactorily, in that, they are first identified then escalated where the project unit is unable to successfully cause a change in the right direction. 4 Please rate the quality of adaptive management. For example, in this reporting period were actions taken to address implementation issues identified in the PIR last year? During the year, the project implemented several measures to cause movement in the project, such as, the use of grants to carryout outputs relating to revenue generation and conservation based economic development. 5 Please rate the quality of monitoring and evaluation. For example, in this reporting period were sufficient financial resources allocated to project monitoring and evaluation? The resources allocated for monitoring has proven to be adequate. |
| UNDP Country Office Programme Officer | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | The project has made significant progress over the reporting period in the achievement of some outputs such as the establishment of the National Trust Fund and preparatory activities for the operationalization and capitalization of the fund. Progress has also been made in the development of the overarching policy and legislation for the protected areas system. Slow progress is being made in the formulation of management plans. Overall the project is making slow progress in the achievement of the outputs leading towards the outputs. However, overall implementation has been less than expected an issue that has been inherited due to significant delays in project implementation in the years before this reporting period. It is evident that the IP and the PMU had shortcomings in its capacity to implement the project as expected. Implementation rate has been slowed also due to slow finalization of deliverables or outputs and earlier in the year there were problems with the quality of work by some consultants. Getting the support of the agencies involved in the project has also been challenging. The less than expected implementation rate has also affected the expenditure of the project which has caused revisions of the AWPs for 2014 and 2015. Despite the challenges, significant achievements have occurred over the reporting period. The PSC was revamped with the CEO of the IP being Chair. This has improved project oversight and guidance provided by the PSC. It has also improved accountability from the PMU. The IP has also stepped up its management and oversight of the project and the project has benefitted from the technical guidance and input provided by the Technical Advisor to the project. This has enhanced the progress of reviewing consultants' outputs. UNDP has significantly improved quality assurance, oversight and technical support for the project with support provided for procurement of consultants, workshops and training sessions to improve the capacity of the PMU, Bilateral Meetings with the IP and PMU and assistance in addressing implementation issues. UNDP has assisted in procuring Global Parks Volunteers who are assisting in the development of the operational and financing mechanisms for the PAs. The adaptive measures being executed by the IP and UNDP should lead to greater progress in implementation and address project risks. Key outputs such as the draft policy and the drafting instructions for the PA legislation should be completed before the end of 2015. The operationalization of the National Trust Fund will continue with progress made in establishing the Revolving Fund. The significant progress made during the reporting period compared to previous years is positive and should continue in the last year of the project. The mechanisms for sustainable financing for PAs being developed by the project and the products to improve the policy and legislative framework for the effective management of the PAs should improve the sustainability of project outputs and achievement of project outcomes. Given the improved efforts of all the partners involved in the project and the current progress, the outputs of the project should be achieved during the remaining life of the project which ends in July 2016. Efforts to improve M&E are underway. This has been less than expected for the project. The project has suffered due to inadequate monitoring and address of project risks. Also, not enough financing has been allocated for M&E. However, the UNDP has stepped up its M&E for the project and has employed the services of a UN Volunteer (UNV) who is an M&E expert to provide M&E support for the project. The UNV has provided technical input in the review of the Strategic Results Framework (SRF); review of AWPs; Quarterly and Annual Reports and provide overall M&E guidance for the project. Hence, the improved project oversight, quality assurance, adaptive measures being executed for the project, achievements during the reporting period and increased efforts by the IP to improve project implementation has warranted a moderately satisfactory rating for the project. |
| Project Implementing Partner | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | The Project was stalled late 2014 after NEPA ended the contracts 3 major Consultants, who were completing the Overarching Legal Framework and the Business Plans for the Protected Areas, due to non-performance. A major target was achieved as the Trust Fund was established and 11 members named. The Trust Fund at the CBF level was also capitalized with the targeted funds, by TNC and KFw, on Jamaica's behalf. Based on increased focus on protected areas management specifically by GOJ and the NGO's, many of the targeted Protected Areas were able to improve their METT Scores. At the end of 2014, the annual implementation rate was 86%, representative of the effectiveness of the adaptive management strategies being employed. The UNDP assisted this process by facilitating more Direct Payments through AtLas which assisted in better financial control. Additionally, UNDP assisted engagement processes by directly engaging a few Consultants on our behalf. The work of the International Technical Adviser impacted positively on the speedy review of the Technical Deliverables. Due to the number of Consultants and the number of technical deliverables that were being reviewed, the PSC suggested that a Technical Working Group be established to focus solely on reviews. When the review time continued to be a challenge, the PSC suggested that non-technical Deliverables could be reviewed solely by the Intl Technical Adviser, the PMU and the Project Directorate to speed up the review process and encourage a quick turn around of payments for Consultants. As part of the adaptive management strategy, the PSC was reconstituted and so was able to play a more structured role in monitoring and managing the Scope, Time and Costs of the project, and assisted with mitigating against risks through constant guidance. Additionally, the CEO of NEPA assuming the role of Chairman to the PSC. Additionally, when NEPA recognized the delays in the preparation of Management Plans and in the roll-out of the Communication Strategy, the CEO of the agency mandated that components be done explicitly via the relevant Branch's/Unit's Operations Plans. This strategy resulted in more of the project targets coming back on track. With the continued efforts, and with the improvement of internal controls and managing of external risks, the project will achieve the main targets by February 2016. |
| GEF Operational Focal point | Moderately Satisfactory |  |  |
| Other Partners |  |  |  |
| UNDP Technical Advisor | Unsatisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | In terms of progress towards implementation, the project is rated as Moderately Satisfactory (MS). Delivery has been slow in 2015 with a realization rate of 20% out of the annual operational plan budget of 1,031,167.11 USD. This figure may increase slightly towards the end of the year. The cumulative delivery rate of the project is 40% (Prodoc amount: 2,770,585 USD, Disbursements: 1,671,836.92 USD) The RTA wishes to commend all the actors involved including NEPA staff, UNDP CO staff and the steering committee for outstanding efforts to try to bring the project back on track as reflected in the DO Tab. There is still a long way to go to ensure long term sustainability of the NPAS but the project has now made a strong contribution towards that goal. Good job and donât give up! |

# G. Project Planning

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Key project milestone** | **Status** | **Original Planned Date (Month/Year)** | **Actual or Expected Date (Month/Year)** | **Comments** |
| **Inception Workshop** |  | **-** | **-** |  |
| Mid-term Review |  | - | - |  |
| Terminal Evaluation |  | - | - |  |

# H. Critical Risk Management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Critical Risks Type(s) | Critical Risk Management Measures Undertaken in 2015 |
| Organizational | Weak management and technical capacity undermines project outcomes. Project Management Unit in IP has inadequate capacity to manage this complex project: Management measures taken: To address the issue of lengthy procurement, UNDP assisted the PMU is recruiting the consultant for the revenue generation, operational plan for the financial strategy and management plan related outputs. To assist with the issue of poor quality deliverables, the PMU, with assistance from UNDP contracted a Technical Advisor. To address the issue of slow turn around time to submit feedback to consultants and other technical challenges, the PMU engaged a Project Assistant. To assist with the weak administrative support provided to the PMU, an Intern was contracted to provide support to the PMU. To address the issue of financial management, the PMU engaged a full time (as opposed to a part time) Accountant to the project. In addition, the CEO of NEPA now chairs the PSC. This has assisted in moving outputs forward |
| Financial | Capitalization of the National Protected Area Trust Fund â This action may be delayed as the additional funding is yet to be identified for the Endowment aspect of the Fund and the revenue generation portion that will feed into the NPATF may be delayed. Mechanisms for the local capitalization of the Trust Fund is underway. A funding proposal is being formulated for submission to the Tourism Enhancement Fund (TEF). |
| Operational | The procurement process for recruitment of consultants is lengthy and will result in difficulty completing outputs within the agreed timeline. Over the reporting period, UNDP assisted in the recruiting of consultants for the project. The IP has also improved its processes for recruitment given the urgency of project completion. |
| Political | Critical legal and institutional framework necessary to improve management efficiency â including adoption of protected areas law and consolidation of NSPA management regime - will not occur during project cycle. The project has no power to get legislation passed. The PSC recommended the revision of the Strategic Results Framework (SRF) to include changes in the target to Drafting Instructions for the PA legislation and Draft Policy for PAs. These can be achieved during the project cycle. Approval was given for the SRF revision by the RTA and the CO. |
| Environmental | Climate change, natural disasters, and other environmental impacts beyond national borders exceed current expectations. No significant risk in this area was posed to the project during the reporting period. |

# I. Environmental and Social Grievances

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Related environmental or social issue |  |
| Status |  |
| Significance |  |
| Detailed description |  |

# J. Communicating Impact

|  |
| --- |
| Tell us the story of the project focusing on how the project has helped to improve peoples lives. |
| This project is about safeguarding Jamaica\'s biodiversity. It aims to improve Jamaica\'s protected areas financially and operationally while also making it more integrated or cohesive through laws and legislations. It is intended to harmonise the NSPA, build the capacity of the NSPA, create new PAs, and generate income for the NSPA. The beneficiaries of this project are the government, non-government entities, persons living or working within PAs and Jamaica in general through improvement in the economy, reduction of poverty, improved livelihoods that this project is aiming to achieve. So far based on what has been achieved, there is little impact on people\'s livelihoods. However once the business plans are implemented that will be achieved. |
| What is the most significant change that has resulted from the project this reporting period? |
| The most significant change is the establishment of the trust fund, that is, the National Conservation Trust Fund of Jamaica (NCTFJ). |
| Describe how the project supported South-South Cooperation and Triangular Cooperation efforts in the reporting year. |
| Not applicable |

# K. Partnerships

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Partners | Innovation and Work with Partners |
| Civil Society Organisations/NGOs | NGOs are members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC), they are also co-managers of some of Jamaica\'s protected areas. They are part of the pool of people with whom the project consult on issues relating to quality of deliverables and information/data gathering to better improve Consultants reports. Additionally, they are being invited to be part of the trust fund board. |
| Indigenous Peoples | Indigenous peoples/locals are part of the group we engage on matters to do with management plans and business plan preparations. We have also engaged them during our implementation of the public awareness strategy, the Knowledge and Attitude Survey and during site visits to various PAs. |
| Private Sector | The private sector is on the project's working groups and are invited to have discussions on various deliverables having to do with the trust fund and conservation easement. |
| GEF Small Grants Programme |  |
| Other Partners |  |

# L. Progress toward Gender Equality

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Has a gender or social assessment been carried out this reporting period? | No |
| If a gender or social assessment has been carried out what where the findings? |  |
| Does this project specifically target woman or girls as direct beneficiaries? | No |
| Please specify results achieved this reporting period that focus on increasing gender equality and improving the empowerment of women. |  |

# M. Annex 1 - Ratings Definitions

**Development Objective Progress Ratings Definitions**

*Highly Satisfactory (HS):*  Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as 'good practice'.

*Satisfactory (S):* Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.

*Moderately Satisfactory (MS):* Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.

*Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):* Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.

*Unsatisfactory (U):* Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.

*Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):* The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

**Implementation Progress Ratings Definitions**

*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 few that are subject to remedial action.

*Moderately Satisfactory (MS):* Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.

*Moderately 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.