

## 1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	1254
IA/EA Project ID	UNDP 858; UNEP GFL/6030-04
Focal Area	International Waters
Project Name	Integrating Watershed and Coastal Areas Management in the Caribbean Small Island Developing States (IWCAM)
Country/Countries	13 Small Island Developing States of the Caribbean: Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Barbados, Cuba, Grenada, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago.
Geographic Scope	Regional
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNEP (Lead IA) and UNDP
Executing Agencies involved	Lead EA: the Secretariat of the Cartagena Convention, the UNEP Caribbean Regional Coordinating Unit (CAR RCU); The Caribbean Environment Health Institute (CEHI); UNOPS
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Among the executing agencies
Involvement of Private Sector	Yes- Beneficiary
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	International Waters 3 - Undertake Innovative Demonstrations for Reducing Contaminants and Addressing Water Scarcity; OP 9 - Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area
TER Prepared by	Joshua Schneck
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	Andrea Merla and David Simmons
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	3/23/3005 UNEP; 7/25/2006 UNDP
Project Implementation Start Date	5/23/2006
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	7/1/2010
Actual Date of Project Completion	6/1/2012
TE Completion Date	5/1/2012
IA Review Date	
TE Submission Date	8/30/2012

## 2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	0.61	0.61
Co-financing for Project Preparation	0.50	0.50
Total Project Prep Financing	1.11	1.11
GEF Financing	13.78	13.78
IA/EA own	6.87	
Government	82.90	5.20
Other*	8.50	
Total Project Financing	112.05	18.98
Total Financing including Prep	113.16	20.09

\*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

### 3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes	S	HS	HS	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	L	L	L
Monitoring and Evaluation	N/A	S	S	MS
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	HS	HS	S
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS

### 4. Project Objectives

#### 4.1. Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the Proposal Document submitted for CEO approval (ProDoc), the overall objective of this project is "to strengthen the commitment and capacity of the participating countries to implement an integrated approach to the management of watersheds and coastal areas, with a long-term goal of enhancement of the capacity of the countries to plan and manage their aquatic resources and ecosystems on a sustainable basis."

The Global Environmental Objectives of the project are further described in the Incremental Cost Analysis provided in the Project Brief (Project Brief, Annex A, pg vii):

- "This project will create the necessary conditions and framework for concerted actions to protect globally important environmental resources," and
- "By implementing the project activities the countries of the region will significantly contribute to the protection of globally-significant biodiversity within the Caribbean region through the long-term sustainable management of biological resources and ecosystems, while mitigating or eliminating regional transboundary threats to those resources and ecosystems."

The terminal evaluation for the project does not note any change in the Global Environmental Objectives of the project.

#### 4.2. Development Objectives of the project:

The project logframe included in the ProDoc has the following expected overall outcome for the project: "An overall national and regional reform in support of the IWCAM approach as a necessary and vital strategy for sustainable management and protection of coastal and watershed resources."

Four objectively verifiable indicators provided in the logframe further articulate the expected overall outcome of the project:

- (1) "Reforms in policy, legislation and institutional arrangements in support of IWCAM";
- (2) "Effective regional cooperation and sharing of information and lessons on IWCAM";
- (3) "Development and transfer of more appropriate technologies and IWCAM-related techniques";
- (4) "Overall improvements in coastal and watershed status and related community welfare."

The terminal evaluation and final PIR for the project do not note any change in the Development Objectives of the project.

#### 4.3. *Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:*

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives	No	
Development Objectives	No	
Project Components	No	
Other activities	Yes	The scope of the project activities were reduced due to a lack of progress *

\*A few of the demonstration project activities were reduced due to delays in the implementation and over-ambitious targets. Unrealized demonstration project goals often included monitoring of the project's impact on the local environment, in addition to setting up a payment-for-ecosystem services program in St. Lucia.

## 5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

### 5.1. *Relevance – Satisfactory*

Project outcomes focused on assisting the 13 participating Small Island Developing States (SIDS) in improving their watershed and coastal zone management practices in support of sustainable development, through an integrated approach that recognizes the interdependency of human activity throughout these ecosystems. As such it is highly relevant to GEF-3 priorities, in particular, Operational Program 9: Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area, which specifically calls for projects that "stress integrated freshwater basin-coastal management as key elements to ensure a sustainable future for these island states (SIDS)." A number of new policies and plans that are in-line with the IWCAM approach have been, or are in the process of being adopted, and can be clearly traced back to the project (TE, pg 6).

In addition to the IWCAM-aligned policies and plans adopted by countries, relevance of project outcomes to country priorities can be seen in: (1) successful replication of best practices across a number of project countries, led by country agencies/organizations; and (2) alignment of project outcomes with the objectives set out in the Cartagena Convention providing for environmental protection in the Caribbean. The Cartagena Convention was ratified by all of the participating countries at the time of project completion. The Convention's protocol addressing

pollution from land-based sources and activities, the LBS Protocol, was ratified by 3 participating countries over the course of the project (Antigua/Barbuda, the Bahamas, and Saint Lucia), and 4 other participants are "close" (TE, pg 23) to ratification. The IWCAM project is seen by participating countries as a tool for meeting country commitments to the environmental and developmental goals set out in the Convention, and articulated in other national and regional forums (TE, pg 6 & 23-25).

## 5.2. *Effectiveness* – **Moderately Satisfactory**

According to the terminal evaluation, the project was successful in catalyzing the beginning of a policy and institutional reform process in participating countries, as well as a high level of regional and national commitment to continue what the project has started. The project was also successful in setting up an effective information sharing platform and transferring knowledge of the IWCAM approach and best practices to stakeholders throughout the region, via numerous workshops; meetings that included high-level government representatives, business and community members; a website; and many publications, reports, and newsletters (TE, pg 6 & 19). Moreover, as a result of project activities and communications, the project was able to foster the replication of best practices across three of the participant countries: Jamaica, where a IWCAM-based Watershed Area Management Model is being applied country-wide; Grenada, which is adopting an Integrated Water Resources Management approach tested in St. Lucia; and the Dominican Republic, where a watershed management scheme piloted in Lower Haina Basin is being extended to other watersheds in the country (TE, pg 19).

The TE estimates that around 80% of the logframe indicators of achievement can be considered as "largely met" (TE, pg 31). What is not clear to the reviewer of the TE is to what extent project demonstration activities, which constituted a primary component of project outcomes (some 40% of total GEF funding), have contributed to reductions in environmental stress and improvements in local and regional environmental health. No quantitative description of reductions in environmental stressors and improvements in environmental health - which are called for in the project logframe - are given in the TE, and they're nearly absent in project documents surveyed in this TE review, which include IWCAM project case studies, IWCAM newsletters, and IWCAM Results Notes (on [www.iwlearn.net/results](http://www.iwlearn.net/results)). The Case Study of the St. Kitts and Nevis Demonstration project is a partial exception (stress reduction is alluded to, post-project environmental monitoring is absent). Shortcomings include:

- \* Antigua - the project experienced substantial delays in execution, the project location shifted from original design, and the project is still not operational.
- \* Bahamas, Exuma - the project experienced substantial delays in execution with wastewater facilities only recently in operation. No assessment of environmental impacts provided in the TE or Project Case study.

\* Dominican Republic - the project experienced substantial delays in project execution, and no sampling of groundwater occurred following management reforms.

\* St. Lucia - the project's intended scope was reduced (the watershed-wide payment-for-ecosystem program that was to be a principle focus of the project was never established, nor was a planned soil conservation project executed), and again no quantitative measures of improvements in water quality, changes in land-use practice, and improvements in waste reduction/leakage as called for in the ProDoc logframe are provided in the TE or the Project Case Study.

Because of the above noted shortcomings in the execution of project demonstrations, which limits to some degree the ability to attribute policy reforms to project outputs, the fact that a great majority of co-financing expected for this project did not materialize, which impacted the performance of two demonstration projects, the assessment of project effectiveness is Moderately Satisfactory, with moderate shortcomings.

### 5.3. *Efficiency* – **Moderately Satisfactory**

This project was completed after a delay of about two years. According to the TE, some of this delay is attributable to the large number of participating countries where demonstration projects were to be executed, and associated challenges with starting the project. These included challenges in onboarding project managers (TE, pg 18). Delays in project execution and changes in on-the-ground conditions necessitated readjustments in project design in some cases. As noted above, delays limited the effectiveness of some of the demonstration projects, where actual project impacts on the environment could not yet be assessed.

TE conclusions that the execution of demonstration projects deserve praise for their overall cost-effectiveness (TE, pg 32), and that the overall goals of the project were largely met are somewhat contradicted by the evidence provided in the TE. TE states that some 20% of logframe indicators were not met, and the effectiveness of demonstration projects was never assessed in any systematic way, as called for in the ProDoc. The PCU does appear to have exhibited a capacity for adaptive management, and the TE describes several instances where efforts by the PCU were instrumental in steering demonstration projects back on target after delays threatened to derail the demonstration projects entirely.

Efficiency was facilitated by effective regional project management and coordination, with a reportedly highly competent team staffing the Project Coordinating Unit - all of whom remained with the project throughout its duration (TE, pg 28-29). The project's emphasis on data and information management systems, including establishment of a regional GIS database network (GeoNetwork Opensource system), a Water Information System in Barbados and Grenada, and the project's dedicated web platform appear to have been effective in bringing the results of the project to a wider audience cost-effectively.

### 5.4. *Sustainability* – **Low-Moderate Risks**

According to the TE, sustainability of project outcomes - that is, continuing the process of policy reform facilitated by the project, maintaining commitment by country stakeholders to the IWCAM approach, and securing widespread adoption of actions that contribute to sustainable watershed and coastal management - is contingent upon continued national-level interest in the IWCAM approach, and also upon the ability of regional coordinating entities to take over many of the roles and responsibilities assumed by the project's Project Coordinating Unit in facilitating IWCAM reforms. It is the assessment of the TE that country-commitment to the IWCAM approach is strong, and likely to be sustained, as countries have already committed themselves to action through the Cartagena Convention and its Protocol on Land Based Pollution (most country participants have ratified the LBS Protocol, or are in process of doing so), and the IWCAM approach is seen as the best way to fulfill those obligations (TE, pg 6). What is more in question is the ability of the two Executing Agencies, CEHI and UNEP CAR RCU, to take over the regional facilitation responsibilities of the project, and whether adequate financial resources will materialize to support this. Without dedicated financial resources and coordination between the two entities, "regional momentum toward reforms might be at least in part lost after project completion" (TE, pg 34).

Sustainability can be further assessed along 4 lines:

- \* Financial resources - According to the TE, this constitutes the greatest risk to project sustainability. Resources are needed to cover an expanded roles for CEHI and UNEP CAR RCU in continuing to facilitate reforms and ensure that effective communication of IWCAM best practices continues.

- \* Soci-political sustainability - countries appear to have a strong commitment to the integrated watershed management approach, as demonstrated by commitments to regional environmental treaties and ownership and replication of IWCAM practices.

Institutional framework - the project established several new schemes and in some cases NGOs to facilitate adoption and execution of IWCAM approaches. According to the TE, overall these institutional arrangements appear adequate and robust to continue over time.

- \* Environmental sustainability - threats from extreme climate-related events, such as storm surges, constitute a persistent challenge to continued sustainability.

## **6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes**

### **6.1. Co-financing**

6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

TE reports that tracking of co-financing was not done systematically nor continuously. Data was not available to the evaluation team. Two cancelled IADB loans that were intended to comprise the bulk of co-financing did not materialize. Reported co-

financing, from the final PIR (2011), reveals that \$5.2 million out of \$98.3 million expected co-financing- a little over 5% - was realized. Considering that the co-financing was directed primarily to two demonstration projects, one of which were rated overall as satisfactory (Tobago) and the other rated as highly satisfactory (St. Kitts), it can be inferred that the co-financing was not essential to the achievement of GEF objectives. No assessment on how well integrated the limited amount of co-financing realized is reported in the TE.

- 6.1.2. If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

No information on why the two IADB loans intended to comprise the bulk of anticipated co-financing for this project is provided in the TE, except to note that costs for a wastewater treatment plant in Tobago, which was to be financed in part by the IADB, kept escalating, and the project was cancelled by the Government of Tobago (TE, pg 88). As noted above, the cancelled co-financing was to be directed towards two demonstration projects, one of which were rated overall as satisfactory (Tobago) and the other rated as highly satisfactory (St. Kitts).

## 6.2. Delays

- 6.2.1. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

This project was completed after a delay of about two years. According to the TE, some of this delay is attributable to the large number of participating countries where demonstration projects were to be executed, and associated challenges with starting the project. These included challenges in onboarding project managers (TE, pg 18). Delays in project execution and changes in on-the-ground conditions necessitated readjustments in project design in some cases. As noted above, delays limited the effectiveness of some of the demonstration projects, where actual project impacts on the environment could not yet be assessed. Delays do not appear to have affected overall outcomes or sustainability to any significant degree however.

## 6.3. Country ownership

- 6.3.1. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

As reported in the TE, country-ownership for this project was high, and was brought about in-part by the intensive consultation which preceded the implementation of the project. Country priorities, articulated in this process, were incorporated into the

IWCAM program. Many of the country partners are also reported to have provided in-kind support for the project, although not all pledged contributions to the project were realized.

One limitation noted in the TE is that the project could have benefitted from the participation and direct involvement of higher level governmental officials. The highest reported level of governmental representation on any of the project committees was at the level of Permanent Secretary, and very few countries sent the same person on a continuous basis. Additionally, the National Intersectoral Committees (NIC) that were intended to provide oversight of the project and ensure the integration of IWCAM principles into national policy frameworks were a "major weakness," in terms of their actual involvement in the project (TE, pg 29 & 39). It appears that more progress could have been realized in the demonstration projects and in achieving more widespread reforms had the project secured commitments for higher level governmental participation throughout.

## **7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system**

### **7.1. M&E design at entry – Moderately Unsatisfactory**

It is the assessment of the TE and the reviewer of the TE that the project's M&E design at entry suffers from several shortcomings. The most significant ones are:

- \* The ProDoc Logframe, which provides the basis for monitoring of project success, fails to distinguish clearly between factors that are well within the control of project actors, and those (such as political decisions) which are clearly outside of the control of the project. For example, the overall objective of the project looks at creating the conditions under which policy reforms are more likely to occur, whereas the overall project Outcome, as stated in the ProDoc's Logframe is the "implementation" of national and regional reforms. A clearer delineation of what is possible in the timeframe of the project would greatly benefit the ability to clearly measure the effectiveness of the project;
- \* There is no attempt to systematically assess baseline conditions;
- \* There is no attempt to provide a timeframe for the monitoring of conditions, other than the project's PIRs and TE. Monitoring of environmental and socio-economic conditions, which are called for in some project components, is not set out in any systematic way;
- \* Budgeting for M&E is unclear. In the UNDP ProDoc submitted for GEF CEO endorsement (separate ones were submitted from UNEP and UNDP), there is a line for "F&A" which I assume is M&A. No M&E is budgeted other than for a TE in the UNEP ProDoc.

### **7.2. M&E implementation – Moderately Unsatisfactory**

M&E implementation had significant shortcomings:



\* Financial information, including realized co-financing was not provided in the TE, nor consolidated in the PIRs.

\* Monitoring of environmental stress indicators and environmental status, as called for in the ProDoc Logframe was not done in any quantitative and consistent way, and only provided through a few anecdotal descriptions in the case studies, and never for the project as a whole;

Other requested information, including annual work plans, quarterly operation reports, and PIRs were submitted as called for and are of good quality (TE, pg 41).

## **8. Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution**

### **8.1. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution – Satisfactory**

#### **8.2. Overall Quality of Implementation- Satisfactory**

According to the TE, the level of supervision provided by UNEP and UNDP was adequate, and critical in the early phases of the project in guiding the Project Coordinating Unit staff and initiating the work. The quality of the PIRs is also good, although the final PIR in the PMIS systems appears incomplete. IA decision to abandon the purchase of a marine vessel was a good one (TE, pg 40).

Shortcomings are present in the design of the project's M&E program, as noted above. IAs should have provided more oversight of the EAs to ensure consistent and comprehensive M&E, in particular, monitoring and reporting on environmental stress and status indicators. Complete records of financial expenditures are also lacking, to which IAs must share some responsibility. Finally, as the TE notes, the project could have benefited from the production of a comprehensive summary report at the close of the project. Such a report should have been called for in the project's design (TE, pg 7).

#### **8.3. Overall Quality of Execution – Satisfactory**

This project was a complex undertaking, involving two implementing agencies, and three executing agencies, and with work spanning across 13 different countries. The EA's did a good job in managing the project and deserve a good deal of the credit for the project's overall success in achieving desired outcomes (TE, pg. 36-37). As noted in the TE, the project benefited from the experience of the UNEP South China Sea project, and set up a management structure similar to that. This included a strong core Project Coordinating Unit, assisted by various support structures and executing agencies, with the two implementing agencies operating in the background. As noted in the TE, EAs demonstrated a high capacity for adaptive management, which included adjusting the project to the loss of the great majority of expected co-financing, responding to specific requests for capacity building from countries, and the decision to proceed with small pilots in hot spots identified through the course of the project.

Shortcomings of the EAs, which have been described above, include:

\* Failure to carry out comprehensive and consistent quantitative monitoring of environmental stress and status indicators;

\* Poor financial accounting of expenditures - still not provided to the TE at the time of evaluation.

## 9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	<b>Satisfactory</b>	TE provides a clear accounting of the projects activities, and the many outcomes linked to this project. More attention should have been paid to assessing the impacts of the project, particularly on natural resources and communities.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>	The TE is internally consistent, and provides a fair amount of information about the project's overall success. However, more information should have been provided demonstrating the clear links from project outputs to project outcomes. It's not clear for example how - despite significant delays in all project demonstrations, and limited reporting on whether those projects were able to yield improvements in environmental resources and livelihoods - how the project can claim to have had such an impact on the environmental policies and practices of the 13 participating countries. The reviewer of the TE is left with the impression that the project's impacts are less than what is described. Moreover, the failure of the TE to review project activities in Cuba and Union Island, Saint Vincent should have been addressed at a higher level (through the IAs). Finally, a clearer assessment of project financing should have been provided (there was none provided in the TE).
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	<b>Satisfactory</b>	More information could have been provided on the willingness of CEHI and UNEP CAR RCU to continue the work of the PCU. TE notes that the IWCAM approach has become "part of the mandates" of the two regional Executing Agencies, however it's unclear what this means in practice. Also, additional information could have been provided on funding to ensure continued operation (and in some cases implementation) of demonstration projects, as well as the project's website.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	<b>Satisfactory</b>	Lessons learned are well supported by the evidence provide and fairly comprehensive. More information could have been provided on why projects experienced such lengthy delays in startup, and more information on why systematic monitoring of environmental stressors and status was not undertaken.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	<b>Highly Unsatisfactory</b>	No information provided in the TE.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>	TE does a good job explaining the shortcomings in the design of the project's M&E. More information should have been provided on why environmental and socioeconomic monitoring that was called for in the ProDoc logframe was never undertaken.

## **10. Other issues to follow up on - YES**

There are several items in need of follow up:

- \* a final and comprehensive accounting of project expenditures was never provided to the TE;
- \* the TE evaluators were unable to visit project sites in Cuba or Union Island, Saint Vincent. It is unclear why this was the case, and what actually occurred in these sites, where GEF funds were expended;
- \* the mid-term evaluation referenced in the TE is not in PMIS system.
- \* it's not clear if the final PIR in PMIS is the final draft (it's in spreadsheet form and appears incomplete).

## **11. Sources of information**

## Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

The project produced a copious amount of reports, case studies, newsletters that contributed to knowledge about integrated watershed management techniques, best practices, and relevant policy developments. Highlights include:

- \* The Toolkit for Institutional, Policy and Legislative Improvements;
- \* GEF-IWCAM Indicators Assessment (assessing the state of environmental monitoring in participating countries) and Indicators Template (suggesting an approach for developing indicators for assessing environmental health of watersheds and coastal systems);
- \* Environmental Impact Assessment Review Training Workshop Manual;
- \* Policy Makers Briefing Sheets;
- \* Report on the Implementation of the IWCAM Pilot Projects in the communities of Greggs, Chateaubelair, Spring Village, and Buccament/Vermont;
- \* A series of IWCAM Brochures for the general public, the agricultural sector, the industrial sector and the tourism sector.
- \* 8 Experience notes providing overviews of the experiences of the project's demonstration sites;
- \* Case studies detailing the experiences of the project's demonstration sites;
- \* The Community Based Resource Assessment Tool and Facilitation Manual;

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance?

Yes

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

According to the TE, the GEF-IWCAM Indicators Capacity Assessment and Indicators Template reports was useful in providing a baseline for future monitoring activities being developed (TE, pg 20). The indicators are being piloted in Barbados. According to the TE, the Toolkit for Institutional, Policy, and Legislative Improvements, which is focused on promoting the IWCAM approach in the Caribbean, has been "instrumental in achieving some of the policy and institutional reforms enacted in the demo countries" (TE, pg 23). No further evidence is provided in the TE to support this assessment however.

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

Outputs that contributed to information being compiled and made accessible to many include:

- \* A dedicated website for the project ([www.iwcam.org](http://www.iwcam.org)) where project documents and other related information can be accessed;
- \* A still-unfinished GeoNetwork Opensource system, where many of the project's GIS outputs can be assessed. The TE reports that much of the spatial data that has been generated from the demonstration projects has been stored in information systems at both the national and regional levels.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?

UA

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?

WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

No system was put into place to monitor the number of visitors to the project's information platforms or downloading of materials, according to the TE.

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised?

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

Project activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised include:  
\* Numerous national- and regional-level workshops where information about the IWCAM approach and best practices were shared (TE, pg 25).  
\* Trainings provided to demonstration project personnel and laboratory technicians from the water agencies in participating countries to enhance the skills of these individuals.  
\* The project was featured prominently at the GEF biannual International Water Conferences (TE, pg 20).  
\* Meetings of the project management team with stakeholders throughout the course of the project.

Was any **positive** change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmental management skills?

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO **TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS** BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

TE reports that demonstration project personnel and laboratory technicians from the water agencies in the participating countries were provided with training aimed at improving their technical capacities. Member countries were also provided training in proposal writing, communications, project management and environmental impact assessment review. Project work on indicators also reported to have been successful at improving the capacity of participating countries to monitor the environmental health and status of their watershed and coastal systems (TE, pg 20).

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained?

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

None provided in the TE.

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks?

Were these adopted?

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

As reported in the TE (TE, pg 6), policies related to the IWCAM approach that can be clearly traced back to project action and which have been, or are in the process of being adopted by countries include:

- \* The Land and Sea Use Plan in Andros, Bahamas;
- \* IWCAM-Watershed Area Management Model (WAMM) policy adopted country-wide in Jamaica;
- \* a new Water Act in Saint Kitts;
- \* Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Road Maps and policy statements adopted by various countries (Antigua, Dominica, Barbados, Grenada, St. Lucia, Union Island).

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures?

Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?

**WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?**

As reported in the TE, the following institutional and administrative systems were created as a result of the project:

- \* an NGO was created for the management of the Font d'Or basin in Saint Lucia;
- \* a public-private partnership was created in the Dominica Republic to continue remediation efforts in the Haina Basin;
- \* UNEP CAR RCU will become the repository of environmental and activity monitoring data going forward, with a dedicated IT Assistant who will provide long-term continued support for this role (described as a Clearing House Mechanism in the TE). According to the TE, these institutions/arrangements are intended as long-term, ongoing systems.

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

**WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?**

As reported in the TE, the NGO created for the management of the Font d'Or basin in Saint Lucia will provide increased opportunities for stakeholder participation in environmental governance: *"The project has facilitated the establishment of TMR as a legitimate community-based NGO dedicated to continuing the work of the Project Management Unit. Through this group, not only is it anticipated that the work will be sustained, but that they will engage in community-community dialogue to share experience, generate awareness of the issues and eventually assist in improving water quality and watershed management in those communities"* (TE, pg 82).

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

**WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION?  
WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?**

Did the project contribute to any of the following:

Please specify what was contributed:

Technologies & Approaches	Yes
Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	Yes
Financial Mechanisms	No

Increased awareness, support, and implementation of IWCAM integrated watershed management approach in the Caribbean region.
UNEP CAR RCU will become the repository of environmental and activity monitoring data going forward

Did **replication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place?

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.

WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

According to the TE, the IWCAM approach was replicated in the following areas:  
 \* the IWCAM-based Watershed Area Management Model piloted in Portland Jamaica is now being applied country-wide;  
 \* the Integrated Water Resources Management approach tested in St. Lucia is being applied in Grenada;  
 \* in the Dominican Republic, the watershed management scheme piloted in Lower Haina Basin is being extended to other watersheds in the country.

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.

HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

According to the TE:  
 \* the IWCAM-based Watershed Area Management Model piloted in Portland Jamaica is now being applied country-wide;  
 \* in the Dominican Republic, the watershed management scheme piloted in Lower Haina Basin is being extended to other watersheds in the country.  
 No further information on the effects of this scaling up, or any modifications required to facilitate this are provided in the TE.

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

According to the TE, the project was successful at creating increased awareness and widespread buy-in of the IWCAM integrated watershed management approach in stakeholders throughout the region, from the government level to local communities (TE, pg 46). This was achieved through the projects extensive and effective communications campaign and the numerous demonstration projects in the participating countries. As noted above, there is very little information provided in the TE or case studies about how this approach has impacted the environmental resources of interest to the project, or the livelihoods of community members dependent upon these resources.



Did **removal of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place?

**SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.**

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

 <--dropdown menu

If "combination", then of which types?

 &  <--dropdown menu

**QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS HAS CHANGED AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.**

Was stress reduction achieved?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

<input type="checkbox"/> Local	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (local)
<input type="checkbox"/> Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (systemic)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

 Measured  Anecdotal

Was there a change in environmental status?

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

<input type="checkbox"/> Local	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (local)
<input type="checkbox"/> Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (systemic)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

 Measured  Anecdotal

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

Anecdotal information on stress reduction provided in an International Waters Results Notes 18-08-2011 (available at [www.iwlearn.net.results](http://www.iwlearn.net.results)) states:

\* Transformation in the Basseterre Valley of Saint Kitts & Nevis of a threatened and exploited aquifer/well-field into a model water resource management area. This area is now officially designated as a National Park under the National conservation and Environmental Protection Act as a result of the project.

\* Effective transfer and replication of lessons and best practices to other hotspots/countries - projects are copying successes from others, e.g. Genada and Tobago regarding wetland filtration, and a some mainstreaming is taking place at the national level, e.g. Jamaica's Watershed Area Management Mechanism (WAMM) and rainwater harvesting in St. Lucia.

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental

No

Socioeconomic

No

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

ProDoc logframe calls for quantitative monitoring of stress reduction as a result of demonstration project activities. No information is provided in the TE or Case Studies, aside for limited anecdotal information on the results of any post-project monitoring. This is a significant failure that limits the ability to assess the project's impact on resources of interest.

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

Yes

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

According to the TE, indicators for environmental monitoring are being piloted in Barbados. The UNCEP CAR RCU is expected to function as a data repository and clearing house for monitoring information going forward.

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

Has the monitoring data been used for management?

UA

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

Yes

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

Limited anecdotal information is available in Case Studies that are publically available on project's website. It is unclear from the TE to what degree monitoring information collected by the UNEP CAR RCU will be publically available.

*“SOCIOECONOMIC” REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE “BEFORE” AND “AFTER” NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.*

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts?

UA

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local  Intended (local)  Unintended (local)

Systemic  Intended (systemic)  Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?  Measured  Anecdotal

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts?

No

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local       Intended (local)       Unintended (local)  
 Systemic       Intended (systemic)       Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?     Measured     Anecdotal

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at **systemic level**

Evidence on unintended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

Evidence on unintended socio-economic impacts at **systemic level**

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

The following is a summary of the lessons learned presented in the TE:

- \* The success of the this project highlights the need for a dedicated environmental management agency in the Caribbean, with responsibilities for implementing projects. This is a possible role for CEHI;
- \* New IWCAM related initiatives in the region should consider developing a set of "rediness criteria" for future projects. These could include defining the enabling environment required for the project to be successful, and insisting on the need for countries to have some policy in place to support the IWCAM approach;
- \* Adaptive and flexible management should be encouraged;
- \* Greater effort should be made in promoting private sector initiatives that support and complement the IWCAM approach;
- \* More investment in IT should be made with the aim of achieving savings from reduced travel expenditures that can be directed towards other project components;
- \* This project benefited from an extensive communications campaign including many activities that were not, but should have, been included in the project's design. Adequate resources need to be budgeted for website maintenance and updates;
- \* Political legitimacy for the project would have been enhanced if greater connections and involvement of CARICOM in the project;
- \* More effort should be made to involve the scientific community in IWCAM projects, on a continuous basis;
- \* GEF, UNDP, and UNEP should consider providing continued support for implementation of IWCAM-friendly policies that have arisen or are in the process of being drafted as a result of this project.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The TE makes two primary recommendations:

- (1) Project experiences should be fully captured in a consolidated final project report;
- (2) Executing Agencies, which have now committed to working on the IWCAM approach going forward, organize and facilitate consultations with development banks and donors, including the GEF, where countries could present their progress on IWCAM, issues with the approach, and plans going forward, thereby initiating an important dialogue with potential development partners.