

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 1604		Review date: 03/01/2009		
IA/EA Project ID: GF/1020-03	GEF financing:	at endorsement (Million US\$) 0.99	at completion (Million US\$) 0.99	
Project Name: Sustainable Conservation of Globally Important Caribbean Bird Habitats: Strengthening a Regional Network for a Shared Resource	IA/EA own:			
Country: Bahamas, Dominican Republic and Jamaica	Government:			
	Other*:	0.97	2.31	
	Total Cofinancing	0.97	2.31	
Operational Program: OP#1,2,3,4	Total Project Cost:	1.98	3.30	
IA: UNEP	<u>Dates</u>			
Partners involved: BirdLife International, Bahamas National Trust (BNT), Grupo Jaragua (GJ), and BirdLife Jamaica (BLJ)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Oct/2003	
	Closing Date	Proposed: 03/30/07	Actual: 09/30/07	
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 42 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 48 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 6 months
Author of TE:	Dr Nigel Varty	TE completion date: Dec 2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: December 2007	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 0 months

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	S	S	S	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	ML	ML	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	MS	MS	MS	MS
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	S	MS
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	HS	HS

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

Yes. The TE includes analysis of all required issues in a concise but comprehensive manner. Findings and conclusions are supported by convincing evidence, and the evaluator makes good use of his knowledge of similar projects implemented by BirdLife to inform lessons and recommendations.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds,

mismanagement, etc.?
No.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

The project's Global Environmental Objective (described as the Development Objective in the ProDoc) was 'Conservation status of globally important sites for biodiversity in the Caribbean is enhanced through strengthened local and national partnerships and increasingly aware national and international networks of public and private sector stakeholders and decision-makers.'

There were no changes to the Global Environmental Objective during implementation.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

According to the ProDoc, the Development Objectives (Immediate Objectives) of the project were:

- "Enhance cooperation, communication and consensus among biodiversity conservation stakeholders through the coordination of a strengthened network of NGO, government agency and regional institution partnerships
- Increase awareness of Caribbean biodiversity and the issues affecting it amongst local, national and international stakeholders and decision-makers
- Document globally important Caribbean biodiversity sites and establish a framework within which information gaps are evaluated and conservation requirements are assessed, advocated and acted upon for the highest priorities
- Communicate/ exchange site conservation experiences throughout the network of NGOs, government agencies and regional institutions through the establishment (and inclusion) of globally important site action.
- Set in place a strategy and mechanism to ensure sustainability for the conservation and management of globally important biodiversity sites in the Caribbean".

There were no changes to the Development Objectives during implementation.

(describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)		
If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change					
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)	

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or an unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating: S

A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:

(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?

The project has contributed to mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes and sectors, through its awareness-raising and campaigning work to promote more environmentally sustainable approaches to bauxite mining in Cockpit Country in Jamaica and coastal hotel development in the Dominican Republic.

(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?

Project outcomes were relevant to national environmental priorities in the 3 countries where it was implemented:

- Jamaica's priorities for biodiversity conservation have been systematically reviewed in the process of developing the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). This project addressed many of the strategic directions identified by the NBSAP.
- In the Dominican Republic the Sub-ministry of Biodiversity and Protected Areas is committed to developing management plans for many of the protected areas. This project focused on the development of conservation plans and management strategies for globally important biodiversity areas currently outside the existing PA system.
- The project helped the Bahamas National Trust's highest priority to establish and manage an integrated system of parks and protected areas, fully representative of Bahamian biodiversity.

(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?	
The holistic “island ecosystem” approach used in the project was necessary to provide a useable conservation framework and was relevant to 4 operational programs of the Biodiversity Focal Area. In addition, the region is exceptionally important for biodiversity conservation (one of the top six of the 25 global biodiversity conservation “hotspots”) and with high levels of endemism (26-87% according to group), and therefore improving the conservation status of the region constitutes a global environmental benefit.	
(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)	
The project complemented existing government activities in relation to the CBD by making biodiversity information readily accessible, through innovative approaches to the analysis of relative conservation priorities and through the establishment of a sustainable monitoring and action cycle for key sites of biodiversity importance.	
A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership¹	
<p>Being a regional project, there was a strong focus on promoting and strengthening regional cooperation. The Caribbean Regional Advisory Group (CRAG) was established to guide and advise the project. But overall CRAG’s engagement with the project was on a rather loose and informal basis and the group has not been proactive and it did not function well even as an advisory body. The TE considered it one of the less successful aspects of the project. Although the project was a part of the BirdLife global Important Bird Area program, and activities were underway in other Caribbean nations including Cuba (fully funded), Puerto Rico, the Netherlands Antilles and the UK Overseas Territories, there is little mention in the TE of improved regional cooperation.</p> <p>One disappointing partnership has been that between the project and the SCSCB. It was originally hoped before the start of the GEF project that the SCSCB would play a significant role in the project at the regional level. While it has in terms of promoting the CEBF (including administrating a small grants programme to support the Festival), and has aspirations to do more, it is severely constrained by low capacity.</p>	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: MS
<p>The TE concludes that overall, the Immediate Objectives have been largely achieved, although some deliverables were still outstanding but were expected within the next 3 months. Notable project successes include: identification of Important Bird Areas (IBAs) in the Bahamas, Dominican Republic and Jamaica, with associated databases and IBA site accounts; a Regional IBA Directory and IBA database accessible through the BirdLife website; establishment of Site Support Groups (SSGs) at 7 of the 8 project sites; some excellent regional- and national-level publications, including the <i>Birds Caribbean</i> newsletter; very significant raising of co-financing for a MSP (over twice that originally anticipated at project outset), and including significant funding from the corporate sector in the Bahamas; a major contribution to a successful advocacy campaign to halt bauxite mining within the Cockpit Country IBA; small-scale ecotourism ventures around one of the project sites in the Dominican Republic; successful workshops in media communication and strategic and financial planning; some success in promoting the adoption of the IBA programme within government in Jamaica (through the Department of Forestry), the Dominican Republic (Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources) and within the BNT’s strategic plan in the Bahamas; and the bulk of the activities for 6 of the 8 project sites achieved.</p> <p>However, other outputs were not achieved e.g. National IBA Conservation Strategies, partner NGO business plans and operational National Liaison Committees (NLCs) in the Bahamas and Jamaica or Caribbean Regional Advisory Group (CRAG). There have also been delays over delivery of several key outputs, particularly the national IBA lists, which has meant that there has not been sufficient time for significant impact on national policies, and advocacy work has been limited.</p> <p>The number of activities and Outputs set out in the logframe was unrealistic given the GEF resources and the original timescale (42 months). The time required for some project components, particularly the collation of information for the IBA component of the project (populating the database and writing IBA profiles apparently took an order of magnitude longer than anticipated) and the development of technological outputs, such as the web-based IBA database, was significantly under-estimated, and left some project Outputs incomplete or delivered late.</p>	
c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: HS
<p>In Jamaica, the loss of the national executing agency (BLJ) resulted in unexpected delays at the start of the project. However, the project management’s response, although delayed, identified key individuals and groups who could take on responsibility for delivering the national components and to a great extent they performed very well and overcame the loss of BLJ.</p> <p>According to the TE, although the project was extended by 6 months, there was no overspend on project finances and the extension did not affect cost-effectiveness (indeed it ensured that the project delivered on most of its activities). The TE concludes that the project was well designed and cost-effectiveness. First, the project built on a number of previous Caribbean- and national-level projects, particularly a MacArthur Foundation funded project (<i>Biodiversity conservation in the Insular Caribbean – catalyzing site action through local, national and regional partnerships</i>), which had sought to develop the IBA and SSG concepts and establish a communication and information-sharing</p>	

¹ Please consider for regional and global project only

system; the WIWD-WC Project, which already had a well-established network of project sites throughout much of the Caribbean and which had been pioneering the Watchable Wildlife Pond (WWP) approach and high-quality educational materials for teachers and schools on wetland conservation issues.

Second, the SSG model is based on voluntary commitment by local individuals and groups, consequently their involvement in the project required only out-of-pocket expenses to be covered.

Third, much of the information for the IBA site accounts came from previous data-gathering exercises or was provided through a network scientists and technicians who were not paid for their contribution (something which has not been sufficiently recognised in the project reports).

Finally, most project materials have been made available on the web which promotes sustainability in that expensive print runs of many hundreds of copies of project documents are not required.

d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated)

Some of the IBAs are located in areas with high demand from the tourism industry. In the case of the Dominican Republic, Grupo Jaragua has recognised that it needs to offer alternative employment opportunities, so is promoting small-scale ecotourism in the Jaragua National Park area, although there are clearly limits to this and it cannot provide the scale of employment offered by the mining or the proposed hotel developments within the park, or the port facilities bordering it.

4.1.2 Results / Impacts² (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible))

The TE concludes that the long-term impact of the project on biodiversity – for instance, whether the project will lead to improved status for globally threatened species at IBAs and uptake of the biodiversity conservation message - is difficult to judge at this point.

It is also important to mention that the impact of the awareness-raising and education components of the project, in terms of changed attitudes and behaviours is difficult to assess directly and quantitatively. However, one may reasonably conclude that without the GEF project tens of thousands of people in the Caribbean would not have been exposed to bird and site conservation issues.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources	Rating: ML
<p>The project had a strong emphasis on securing grants to continue activities after the end of the project. Funding for continuation of activities in the IBAs have been secured from the MacArthur Foundation, GEF supported Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF), and the BirdLife International Secretariat and the BirdLife Americas Office in Quito, Ecuador.</p> <p>The project has also piloted financial sustainability through the development of small-scale ecotourism. So far ecotourism development is still very small scale involving only a few people and to date has required a great deal of support in terms of staff time. The TE concludes that it is unclear whether ecotourism offers a viable long-term model for local development and sustainable financing for some IBAs in the Caribbean. Some, such as isolated cays with breeding seabird will clearly not benefit from such developments.</p>	
b. Socio-economic / political	Rating: ML
<p>In Bahamas the new administration views environmental matters as a priority. The Prime Minister stated that there will be a new Town Planning Act by the end of the year and that wetlands must stop being built on because of the flooding risk. The situation is less clear in the cases of Jamaica and of Dominican Republic (where Law 202-04, passed in 2004, effectively reduced the national system of protected areas in order to facilitate tourism developments).</p> <p>At the local level, sustainability of some SSGs is questionable. Interviews with members of SSGs in the Dominican Republic and Jamaica (much poorer groups than the SSGs in the Bahamas) indicated that members hoped (and to some extent expected) that membership of an SSG would lead to improvements in their financial and social conditions (particularly among the younger members). In other words, enthusiasm for wildlife and love of their local area may not be enough to sustain membership over the long-term.</p> <p>Given that the SSGs in the Bahamas and Jamaica are still in the very early stages of development and those in the Dominican Republic no more than 2.5 years old, the TE considered it too soon to assess whether the SSG model will be sustainable in the Caribbean (or at least on the three project islands).</p>	

² Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
<p>The project has addressed this issue through the inclusion of project results, e.g. IBA programme, into the strategic and programmatic planning of the project partner organisations, which has been achieved to a large extent.</p> <p>In Bahamass, the IBAs have been integrated into the NBT Strategic Plan and provide a ‘shadow list’ of new protected areas to be submitted to government for protection.</p> <p>In the Dominican Republic, the CEBF and other educational and awareness-raising initiatives are likely to remain with GJ, which has built them into its core activities. However, the IBA programme currently rests with GJ but needs a more permanent institutional home as GJ does not see itself as the long-term host.</p> <p>In Jamaica an MOU is being developed with the Department of Forestry to determine how best to move the IBA framework forward. The Forestry Department sees the value in the SSG approach and they are obvious equivalents to their LFMCS. In addition, the Institute of Jamaica is offering to host the NLC and maintain the IBA database, linked to its role as national host for the CBD’s Clearing House Mechanism.</p> <p>At the regional level, IBAs have become a central part of the SCSCB (2008-2012) strategy, and at the international level, the IBA approach is a central feature of BirdLife’s global (2004-2008) strategy for the conservation of birds and other biodiversity and the IBA database will be maintained and updated by the BirdLife Secretariat and is built into its work programmes and budgets.</p>	
d. Environmental	Rating: ML
<p>Threats to IBAs in the Bahamas include development for tourism infrastructure (including roads), rubbish dumping and infilling, uncontrolled fires, and oil spills.</p> <p>In the Dominican Republic, the JNP has been under threat from mining since its establishment in 1983, when the government also awarded a 100-year licence for mining of limestone within the park. The Ministry of Mining is politically very powerful and the UNDP office in Santo Domingo saw no immediate answer to the problem. Mass-market tourism has also been proposed for the JNP area, particularly at the pristine beach of Bahia de Aguilas, although public campaigns, again led by GJ, have reduced interest among investors (but there is constant pressure to develop the site and foreign tourism features prominently in the Government’s development policy for the Dominican Republic).</p> <p>In Jamaica, bauxite mining has already destroyed much of the Mount Diablo area and been a major threat to Cockpit Country for many years. However, there has been a recent change in government and although it is still in the early days of the administration, the new government has indicated that it is committed to stopping further bauxite mining in Cockpit Country. However, the long campaign to protect Cockpit Country, which has involved input from the project team, notably JET and the WRC, needs to maintain pressure to ensure that there is a final public resolution to the issue, and needs to be a focus for follow-up activities.</p>	
e. Technological	Rating: NA
Not applicable	

4.3 Catalytic role³

a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to catalyze changes in stakeholders
The project has tried to promote ecotourism as an income generating alternative for people living near some of the IBAs. So far this has not produced any significant incentive for stakeholders, and the TE mentions that these activities will need long-term support before they start to do so.
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities changed institutional behaviors
Change in institutional behaviors varied between countries. For example, in Jamaica, where there was no national organization in charge of project implementation (after the downfall of BLJ), and in the Dominican Republic, the IBA program has not been taken by any national institution for follow-up. On the other hand, in the Bahamas the IBA program has already been incorporated to the NBT Strategic Plan.
c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities led to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
In terms of specific national policy and planning frameworks, the project has contributed to the delivery of the NBSAP for the Bahamas and Jamaica (the Dominican Republic has still to produce a NBSAP). The Bahamas NBSAP does not mention IBAs (it predates the GEF project) but it does highlight the need to protect ‘areas important for birds’, and therefore the GEF project outputs, particularly the national IBA list, is a valuable contribution to achieving the NBSAP. However, many of the project’s most important results were achieved near the end of the project, e.g. national IBA lists and database, and another 2-3 years will be needed before it is known how effective the project has been in providing and communicating biodiversity information to decision-makers to improve the conservation and management of each country’s natural resources.
d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project led to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)
The MacArthur Foundation has developed a specific strategy for site conservation that includes funding activities at

³ Please review the ‘Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework’ prior to addressing this section.

IBAs. In the Caribbean, two of their focal areas are Cockpit Country in Jamaica and the Jaragua-Bahoruco-Enriquillo Biosphere Reserve in the Dominican Republic, from which project follow-up is likely to benefit. In addition, significant funding is likely through Conservation International's (CI) Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF), for which the Caribbean is an acknowledged priority (hotspot). An agreement has been reached that IBAs will be an integral focus for the CI grant strategy for the region under this programme. In addition, the BirdLife International Secretariat and the BirdLife Americas Office in Quito, Ecuador, are currently developing a Caribbean regional strategy and there are several proposals in with major donors to fund this. Consequently, funding for follow-up of the regional elements of the project looks optimistic.

e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?

The TE highlights that it should be noted that the delivery of the project was achieved, in part, because of the additional time and resources put into the project by the main groups and individuals – BNT on the Bahamas, GJ and the Jaragua SSG in the Dominican Republic, and the WRC, JET and the Jamaica Project Consultant on Jamaica - especially in the final 18 months, and this 'additional contribution' is not well reflected in the in-kind contributions of the project partners or sufficiently acknowledged in project reports.

The TE also mentions other champions that helped in the achievement of project results:

In Jamaica, the Chair of the Protected Areas Committee is the Conservator of Forests, was a supporter on the IBA approach and helped in the incorporation of the IBA sites within the protected areas master plans.

The Dominican Republic IBA officer's problem solving and people skills were important factors in the achievement of the replication of SSGs.

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? 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?

The project raised 215% more co-financing than expected at project inception.

Up until July 2006, US\$1.8 million had been secured as cash co-financing for the project activities (or expansion of project activities). Funds raised after this date have been classified as follow-up funding, and according to the project's draft TR dated 30 September 2007, an estimated US\$3 million has either been secured or decisions were being waited upon (a €293,000 grant was awarded from the Jensen Foundation in late November 2007).

It is clear that the contribution of in-kind funding, particularly in terms of staff time and travel, provided by the project partners, particularly GJ, the BNT, the WRC and the Jamaica Project Consultant, has been significantly underestimated and needs to be more strongly recognised.

Also, an enormous amount of time was given by many ornithologists, ecologists, government technicians, SSG members, birdwatchers, personnel from other NGOs, and others, who provided data through workshops, reports, correspondence or interviews, or reviewed drafts of site accounts. The Project Manager estimated that around 10%-15% of the GEF project funds were spent on IBA identification and review activities, but the almost exclusively voluntary contribution of those who provided data or undertook reviews is not shown in the co-financing (because it was not quantified), and this would certainly have been very significant.

b. Delays. 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?

In Jamaica, the loss of the national executing agency (BLJ) resulted in unexpected delays at the start of the project. However, the project management's response, although delayed, identified key individuals and groups who could take on responsibility for delivering the national components and to a great extent they performed very well and overcame the loss of BLJ.

In the Bahamas, low capacity (absence of a Director of Parks at the BNT for two years), internal conflict within the BNT (three different Executive Directors in four years), the need to rebuild a lost endowment fund and a very poor level of institutional support during the GEF project had a negatively impact on project results, especially during the first two years.

c. Country Ownership. 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.

According to the TE, the project was designed during a PDF-A workshop with participants from around the region, but mostly from the Bahamas (where the meeting was held) and the Dominican Republic, with only two individuals from Jamaica (one from BirdLife Jamaica and one from Forestry Department), and there were very few government institutions from the three islands represented. Therefore, at the start of the project, institutional ownership varied among participating countries. National project partner ownership was strongest in the Dominican Republic but grew in the Bahamas. Unfortunately, the rapid and catastrophic institutional decline of BLJ shortly after the project began meant that only the IBA identification work was continued (and that was largely concentrated in one individual), so country ownership was very low in Jamaica.

Ownership grew among the national governments as they came to see the usefulness of the IBA process and data, with the Institute of Jamaica likely to house the national IBA database in Jamaica, the Ministry of Environment and Natural

Resources in the Dominican Republic incorporating IBA sites into their maps and field surveys of some IBAs into the work programme of the Wildlife Department, and the BNT completely adopting the Bahamas IBA sites within their own institutional strategy and submitting IBAs for inclusion in the national list of protected areas.

4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

a. M&E design at Entry	Rating (six point scale): U
<p>Some parts of the project problem analysis and logframe were not well articulated, there was no quantified baseline, and the associated indicators were poor with no biological impact or threat reduction indicators, or indicators to measure changes in awareness and or behaviour towards biodiversity.</p> <p>None of the indicators identified to measure achievement of the project Global Environmental Objective can be considered 'SMART' and indeed they are worded more like Outcomes than indicators. The TE noted that there are no quantitative baselines or milestones (mid-term targets) set out in the Project logframe associated with these indicators. In addition, there is no biodiversity status indicator (e.g. to show changes in the population status of selected threatened species occurring at identified sites in the project area within the timeframe of the project), or threat reduction indicators (e.g. to show changes in rate of deforestation, wetland loss or hunting at IBAs during the project's lifetime).</p>	
b. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): MS
<p>Project monitoring and evaluation performance was rather mixed, as the NLCs and CRAG played no or very little role in project monitoring or supervision as envisaged in the Project Document, and the bulk of the project oversight was taken on by the Project Manger supported by other staff at the BirdLife International Secretariat in Cambridge. Daily management of the project by the staff at BirdLife, BNT, GJ, WRC, JET and the Jamaica Project Consultant was excellent. The staff worked in a professional manner, creating a strong, capable project team that showed good adaptive management capacity.</p> <p>The GEF's Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) was added to the project as a proxy impact indicator before implementation began but it was tracked effectively. Consequently, final results were not available for the TE analysis.</p>	
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?	
<p>Due to omission in the original project design, some important M&E activities were not budgeted. For example it was not possible to hold annual meetings of the National Coordinators to review project progress because this had been omitted from the project budget during the design phase. Apart from the value for project monitoring and evaluation, this would have promoted stronger connections between the groups, and given them an increased sense of being part of a bigger network, something which some project staff complained about. Also unfortunately, there was no budget for a final regional meeting with all the partners to discuss the successes, failures and experiences of the four years of the project.</p>	
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?	
<p>Project funds to M&E were increased following a project and budget revision that took place in late 2005 following a supervisory mission to the Caribbean by the UNEP-DGEF TM, prompted by the need to reorganise project activities in Jamaica following the demise of Birdlife Jamaica.</p>	
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system?	
<p>According tot the TE, the project management team demonstrated effective adaptive management. The biannual project progress reports were very detailed and set out the variations in activities and results against the workplan and details of remedial action and how they had been integrated into the logframe. In addition, the PIR presented a risk assessment, which was an integral part of the adaptive management process.</p> <p>In practice monitoring of the project was mostly a dynamic process based on regular communication between the Project Manager and the national project staff, who commented that the Project Manager was very responsive to requests for guidance and made their reporting requirements as easy as possible, allowing them more time to engage in the project activities. For the final 7-9 months of the project, the Project Manager drafted a modified work plan that highlighted activities needed to achieve the key deliverables.</p>	
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.	
<p>No. Although the project managed to implement a working M&E system, the lack of adequate indicators and of established targets</p>	

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MS
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MU
<i>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.</i>

The TE states that the project proposal review process seems to have had little input from GEFSEC or UNEP-DGEF, which should have corrected flaws in the project M&E system. It also found that project deliverables were heavily dependent on the delivery of other products over which the project had no control. Overall, the TE concluded that the project document was much too ambitious with the time and resources available, and the project should have been submitted as a Full-Sized Project.

There was no institutional or capacity assessment of project partners, and it was assumed there was no problem with BLJ, but it closed before the start of the project. However, the project management's response, although delayed, identified key individuals and groups who could take on responsibility for delivering the national components and to a great extent they performed very well and overcame the loss of BLJ.

The TE found that the UNEP-DGEF TM provided relatively little direct guidance to the project partners, as there was an agreement that the Project Manager would act as the central point of contact for the national partners. Consequently, little logistical or project management support was provided by the TM outside of the two field missions apart from brief feedback on project reports sent by the Project Manager.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies⁴ (rating on a 6 point scale) S

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

As mentioned earlier, the executing agency for Jamaica (BLJ) collapsed at the beginning of project implementation. Nevertheless, the TE notes that the groups that took the responsibility of executing activities in Jamaica (JET and a national consultant) performed very well and allowed the project to overcome the loss of BLJ. It concluded that it is a testament to the commitment and professionalism of the project team – in all three countries and at the BirdLife Secretariat in the UK - that the project managed to produce the results and impact it did within four years.

In addition, according to the TE, in some areas, project executants at both the national and international level were instrumental in leveraging actions that went beyond the scope of the project (an example is the successful Cockpit Country advocacy campaign to halt bauxite mining).

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects

- If UNEP-DGEF is looking for well-constructed, realistic and effective projects then it needs to pay attention to the design of the project strategy and the selection of indicators to ensure that objectives and outcomes can be measured, and to ensure that every proposal goes through the whole GEF review process. Particular attention needs to be paid to ensuring biodiversity impact and awareness/behavioural change indicators are included.
- All projects should have a steering committee with decision-making authority. Membership is critical and for regional projects development of a regional advisory group needs to be built from the national partners upwards, with the partners driving the process.
- It is essential to ensure that any NGO involved in a GEF project has sufficient institutional structure and capacity, is self-sustaining, and has a clear strategic plan in place before taking on a role in project implementation.
- NLCs that seek to promote the uptake of an IBA programme in a country are viewed as too specific and therefore of limited value, and will fail if the NLC process is driven by NGOs rather than governments. The system developed in the Dominican Republic – a forum for sharing information and building trust for the IBA programme – might be a more useful model for the Caribbean.
- Influencing corporate sector policy towards more environmentally sensitive practices requires time and specialist capacity. NGOs do not have a comparative advantage in this, and UNEP-DGEF needs to provide concrete guidance on how NGOs can best engage with the corporate sector on GEF projects, and to screen project proponents more carefully on their track record of interaction with this sector if they are proposing major engagement.
- Designers of large, complex, multi-country projects (such as this one) need to ensure that their project deliverables are not heavily dependent on the delivery of other products over which the project has no control, as happened with this project, and this needs to be checked during the project design stage.
- Assessment of the experience of establishing and sustaining SSGs so far in the Caribbean, shows that a great deal of staff time and resources (and therefore organisational commitment) are required, that the investment needs to be particularly intense in the first two years, and greatest benefits occur if there is a dedicated SSG Coordinator appointed by the national partner.

⁴ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

Recommendations for BirdLife and project partners to strengthen project outcomes

- The project's Terminal Report (TR) should include an annex with project follow-up aims and activities, and implementation funding arrangements
- The project should re-examine the objective-level indicators and identify a small number of biodiversity impact and threat-reduction indicators that could be used to quantify impact of the project to strengthen the analysis in the TR
- Information on the SSG experience to date should be collected, synthesized and published by the project
- The role and utility of the NLCs in each country needs to be re-examined
- To further emphasize the value of the project results, a separate analysis should be undertaken of the project's specific contributions to the 2010, MDG1 and MDG7 targets
- Additional surveys should be undertaken in Jamaica to identify IBAs in habitats that were underrepresented in the original national analysis
- A more detailed analysis of the market for bird tourism should be carried out and the economic case for ecotourism development at each of the project sites re-examined to construct adequate business models, before further promotion of these activities in the planned project follow-up
- Given that the delays over the publication of the Regional IBA Directory and IBA site accounts reduced the opportunity for advocacy work, the extent of uptake and success of the IBA programme at the national policy level should be assessed in 2-3 years from the conclusion of the project.

Recommendations for UNEP-DGEF/UNEP/GEF for future projects

- A review of the most effective methods for awareness-raising and behaviour change and how best to measure changes in awareness, attitudes and behaviours (indicators) should be commissioned to guide future project proponents
- GEF OFPs should be kept more informed of project progress and encouraged to become more involved with the monitoring and evaluation of UNEP-DGEF projects
- UNEP-DGEF should consider linkage with UNDP COs where there are strong national elements to projects (as in this case) because of UNDP's on-the-ground presence, capacity to react to immediate events, and linkage to national level policy makers
- More detailed guidance needs to be provided to project proponents on reporting
- A formal capacity assessment of project partners should be undertaken before project implementation begins, particularly for NGO-led projects
- UNEP should suggest to GEFSEC that an explanation of the tracking tools and their utility become a standard part of project documentation and inception meetings.
- UNEP should commission a review of information on the value of the ecosystem services provided by selected biodiversity rich and protected areas (including IBAs) in the region, as such a study would greatly enhance the effectiveness of advocacy associated with these sites
- Given that the SSGs are still in the early stages of development there needs to be a follow-up assessment of the success, impact and sustainability of the SSG experience in four years time

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

-

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? All relevant outcomes and impacts are assessed in the TE, based on project indicators. It also includes a review of the achievement of project objectives.</p>	HS
<p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? The TE was consistent, evidence was very complete or lack of evidence noted. The ratings were well substantiated, and project indicators were used where relevant. There were no major evidence gaps.</p>	HS
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</p>	HS

TE includes a thorough analysis of project sustainability, including all the required criteria.	
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Lessons and recommendations presented in the TE are comprehensive and well supported by evidence included in the TE. In addition, separate recommendations are given for UNEP/GEF and for BirdLife International.	HS
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? TE includes actual project costs (total and per activity) up until July 2007. It also reports on the actual cofinancing used, but does not .	S
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? Assessment of the quality of the M&E system is well presented and includes a lengthy discussion of the inadequacy and poor quality of original project indicators and logframe.	HS

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)

--

9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)

--