1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4454	
GEF Agency project ID		JA-G1001 or GRT/FM-14607-JA	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		Inter-America Development Bank (IDB)	
Project name		Integrated Management of the Yallahs River and Hope River Watersheds	
Country/Countries		Jamaica	
Region		LAC/Small Islands Developing States	
Focal area		Multi-focal: Biodiversity / Land Degradation / Sustainable Forest Management/REDD	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		GEF-5: LD-1, LD-3 BD-2, SFM/REDD-1	
Stand alone or under a programmatic framework		Stand alone	
If applicable, parent program name and GEF ID		-	
Executing agencies involved		National Environment & Planning Agency (NEPA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Forest Conservation Fund (FCF)	
Private sector involvement (including micro, small and medium enterprises)[1]		-	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval (MSP) date		November 20, 2013	
Effectiveness date / project start date		October 1, 2014	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		October 31, 2019	
Actual date of project completion		October 31, 2020	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.151	0.151
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		3.909	3.393
Co-financing	IA own	-	0.284
	Government	8.804	10.076
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	-	-
	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CBOs	-	-
	Other	-	-
Total GEF funding		4.060	3.544
Total Co-financing		8.872	10.360
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		12.933	13.904
Terminal evaluation validation information			
TE completion date		January 21, 2021	

[1] Defined as all micro, small, and medium-scale profit-oriented entities, including individuals and informal entities, that earn income through the sale of goods and services rather than a salary. (GEF IEO 2022)

Author of TE	Alicia A. Hayman, Ph.D.
TER completion date	December 28, 2022
TER prepared by	Mariana Vidal Merino
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Neeraj Kumar Negi

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	MS	MU	-	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes		MU	-	MU
M&E Design		S	-	MS
M&E Implementation		HU	-	HU
Quality of Implementation		MS	-	MS
Quality of Execution		MS	-	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			-	S

3. Project Objectives and theory of change

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project aimed to "contribute to global environmental benefits through climate change mitigation related to Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF), and conservation of biodiversity in the upper watershed buffer area of the Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park" (Request for CEO Endorsement, p.8). The project aimed to generate information on the status of biodiversity for the project area and develop tools to monitor globally important flora and fauna, including endemic and endangered species. It also targeted the maintenance and generation of services from forests and an increase in the area of tropical forests under sustainable management (Request for CEO Endorsement, p.11).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project development objective was to improve the conservation and management of biodiversity and the provision of ecosystem services in the Yallahs and Hope Watersheds (TE, p. xiv)

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or project activities during implementation? What are the reasons given for the change(s)?

There were no reported changes in the Global Environmental Objectives or Development Objectives during project implementation.

The original nine impact and outcome level indicators were reduced to seven, as reflected in the Mid-term Evaluation (MTE, p. x).

The TE notes several changes in the budget distribution and project activities. For example, the target for Component 3 "areas replanted through reforestation and agroforestry," was changed from the reforestation of 400 hectares to the reforestation of 150 hectares and installation of 250 hectares of agroforestry (TE, p.64). Some activities were added during project implementation, such as support for rainwater harvesting and irrigation (PIR 2020, p. 5).

The TE notes inconsistent documentation of changes to the Results Framework and indicator targets from design to entry and during implementation (TE, p. 93).

3.4 Briefly summarize project's theory of change – describe the inputs and causal relationships through which the project will achieve its long-term impacts, key links, and key assumptions.

The Blue and John Crow Mountain ranges in eastern Jamaica cover approximately 52,000 hectares of highly biological diverse tropical broadleaf forests. These mountains provide water for domestic, agricultural and industrial uses to 40% of Jamaica's population. Threats to the integrity of the Blue Mountains include subsistence and commercial agriculture, extraction of timber and fuelwood, mining and quarrying, and the clearing of land for housing. The major effect of human activity in the upper watersheds is deforestation.

Jamaica's government aims to maintain at least 30% of the country's forests and increase forest cover by 2% via watershed and natural resources management actions. Identified constraints include (i) Insufficient planning and data to inform land-use decisions and protected area management; (ii) Lack of sustainable funding to National Park managers and watershed stewards; (iii) Absence of an operational framework among government agencies for effective collaboration; and (iv) few incentives for upper watershed dwellers to maintain forest cover.

This project aimed to improve the conservation and management of biodiversity and the provision of ecosystem services in the Yallahs River and Hope River Watershed Management Units (WMUs). The project objective was to be achieved through the implementation of activities under three components: i) strengthening institutions and building capacity for integrating biodiversity into watershed management, ii) creating economic and financial mechanisms to support sustainable biodiversity and watershed management and iii) implementing sustainable livelihoods, agriculture and forestry in watershed communities (MTR, p. viii).

For the project to achieve its objectives, several assumptions need to hold.These are: (i) Technical Implementing Agencies' have capacities to lead and guide implementation and mainstream project activities to secure long-term sustainability; (ii) There is an ongoing collaboration among agencies; (iii) Farmer's tenure security or land use rights allow them to implement new techniques long enough to recover investment costs; and (iv) Lower watershed users are willing to pay to access improved ecosystem functions such as better (less siltation) and more constant water supply; among others.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

The outcome ratings (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and overall outcome rating) are on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory. The sustainability rating is on a four point scale: Likely to Unlikely.

Please justify the ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance and Coherence**	Rating: Satisfactory

The TE assesses relevance and coherence as **Satisfactory**, and this review concurs.

The project is consistent with the GEF Biodiversity, Land Degradation and Sustainable Forest Management REDD-Plus objectives and well-aligned with the IDB's plans and Country Strategy (CS) for Jamaica. It also aligns with the Vision 2030 Jamaica- National Development Plan and the two Medium Term Socio-Economic Policy Framework (MTF) documents.

There is coherence between the desired impact and the project intervention strategy, including planned outcomes, outputs and activities across the three intervention areas. Planned activities are deemed adequate to produce the desired effects (TE, p. xiv). The project design incorporated lessons learned from previous donor–funded projects related to watershed management initiatives (MTE, p. x).

The project design assumed the engagement of a number of stakeholders that later on were not engaged in implementation. As an example, it was assumed that the Cabinet would support the proposed updates/revisions of PES-type regulations, but during project implementation the Cabinet was not engaged in project activities and the TE assessed the probability of the cabinet not prioritizing the PES scheme for approval as high (TE, p. 80).

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory

The TE assesses the project effectiveness as **Moderately Satisfactory**, while this review assesses it as **Moderately Unsatisfactory**.

The TE (p. 17) notes that the project did not achieve the targets for its two impact level results, which were measured by indicator 1.1, "Sedimentation in waterways", and indicator 2.1, "Tons of carbon sequestered". For indicator 1.1, five of the nine planned stream flow gauges were installed. For indicator 2.1, the estimated increase in mitigation of GHG emissions was 38,517 Mg CO2e per year, 21% of the original target.

The project successfully achieved 60% of its target for its five outcome-level indicators. All outcome-level indicators for Component 1 and Component 3 were met. However, none of the two target indicators for Component 2, which focused on the implementation of a pilot Payment for Environmental Services (PES) system, were achieved (TE, p. 17).

The TE (p.18-19) notes that by the end of the project, 97% of the expected output level results under its three project components were achieved or exceeded. For Component 1, four out of six outputs were successfully completed. These included collecting socio-physical, geomorphological and hydrometeorological data for the watersheds, equipping hydrometeorological stations and developing a Geographic Information (decision support) system (PIR 2020-2021, p. 3). Not all socio-physical datasets were completed. For Component 2, two out of two outputs were successfully completed. These included two studies on the valuation of ecological services and the design of one Payment for Environmental Services (PES) system. However, the target for the indicator on the PES system was initially six and adjusted to one during project implementation. For Component 3, the project met and exceeded three of its four targets. These included completing one of two Knowledge, Attitudes, Practices and Behaviour (KAPB) assessments, delivery and monitoring of an extension program that increased the technical

knowledge of 350 farmers and drove the adoption of eight agricultural practices. A total of hectares were replanted through reforestation and agroforestry activities.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: Unsatisfactory

The TE rates project efficiency as **Unsatisfactory,** and this review concurs. The TE notes that the project achieved 10 out of 11 desired outputs and only three of the seven planned outcomes. The total economic cost was USD 24.5 million, including US$10.2 million of unplanned costs due to significant procurement delays, disbursement variance, and unused fiscal space, among others. At the end of the project, there were incomplete procurements of approximately US$ 0.31 million (TE, p. 51).

The project was completed with a slight delay. The project duration was expected to be 60 months till October 31, 2019. The TE reports that the project implementation was completed in October 31, 2020, with a delay of one year, which is a moderate delay.

The cost-effectiveness analysis through comparative analysis of similar alternatives indicates that the project was comparable to the mean cost of Payment for Environmental Services (PES) projects funded by the GEF. In general a PES design is likely to be more cost-effective than single-focused conservation designs to achieve the desired outcomes in the project area (TE, p. 53). This said, the benefit streams of the project were much lower than expected. The project's ex-post Cost Benefit Analysis shows a negative net benefit of USD 2.2 million. The project's benefits were conservatively estimated at USD 22.3 million, considering a macro policy enhancement capacity of USD 20.9 million and micro level (livelihood improvement) increased profits of USD 1.4 million (TE, p. 92).

Procurement-related issues and challenges were found to be one of the major causes of implementation delays and required several levels of intervention over the project implementation cycle (TE, p. 92).

4.4 **Outcome**	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory

The TE assesses project outcomes as **Moderately Unsatisfactory**, and this review concurs.

The project had a robust design, was well-aligned with GEF and IDB's mandates and plans as well as the country's environmental priorities. The level of outcomes achieved was lower than the targets set at project design, although targets for some outcomes were met. The project was not cost-effective (TE, xix).

Key outcomes related to environment, human well-being, and enabling conditions (Policy, Legal & Institutional Development; Individual & Institutional Capacity-Building; Knowledge Exchange & Learning; Multistakeholder Interactions) are summarized below:

A. Environmental Change. The project's ex-ante direct net mitigation potential was estimated during its design at 196,902 MgCO2e for the first five years of the project. The final mitigation impact of the project five years after establishment ranges between 23,691 and 38,517 MgCO2e, about 21% of the proposed target (TE, Annex 10: Ex-post Carbon Sequestration Assessment Report). Land Management activities

were expected to reduce soil loss and improve the provision of ecosystem services. Through SWAT analysis, the Project Executing Unit demonstrated an 8% reduction in sedimentation attributable to the project activities targeting land use change (TE, p. 78). The analysis of the project impact was limited by the absence of key datasets defined in the project's M&E plan at start-up (TE, p. 75).

B. Socioeconomic change. Improved livelihoods incentivized the adoption of sustainable land management practices by farmers. Farmers applying best practices were found to have a 60% increase in productivity (TE, p. 77).

C. Enabling conditions.

- Policy, Legal & Institutional Development. The Executing Agency, the Environment & Planning Agency, produced the Town and Country Planning Provisional Development Orders for Kingston and Saint Andrew and the Pedro Cays (2017) and the Saint Thomas Parish (2018) that were then used by decision-makers in both Municipal Corporations. Both documents were updated with several policy guidelines to advance sustainable land management and water resource protection for over 80% of the Watershed Management Units. (TE, p. 20).
- Individual & Institutional Capacity-Building. Farmers in the project sites learned and applied sustainable land management practices due to their involvement in the Farmer Field School extension delivery programme. About 62% of farmers in the training programme went on to apply practices learned on their farms (TE, p. 76). Additionally, there is evidence that some farmers that did not participate in the programme replicated the sustainable land management practices (TE, p. 77).
- Knowledge Exchange & Learning. Farmers in the project sites learned and applied sustainable land management practices due to their involvement in the Farmer Field School extension delivery programme (TE, p. 76). Jamaica Fire Brigade delivered forest fire management training sessions to communities within the watershed management units (TE, p. 78).
- Multistakeholder Interactions. The project's multi-agency response to watershed management enhanced the cooperation of stakeholders, who worked together more effectively and better understood their roles – especially regarding monitoring of ecosystem services such as water flow, water quality, and vegetative cover (TE, p. 75).

D. Unintended impacts. Early in project implementation, the project benefited from the Forestry Department's partnership with the Jamaica Fire Brigade to support the delivery of forest fire management training sessions to communities within the watershed management units. The trainees were able to use the knowledge and skills gained in fire management to save hectares of forest and property when a fire threatened the area subsequently (TE, p. 78).

4.5 **Sustainability**	Rating: Moderately Unlikely

The TE assesses the likelihood of sustainability of project benefits as **Moderately Unlikely.** This review concurs. At the time of the TE, the Project Executing Unit had drafted a sustainability plan, reflecting some activities that will transition from the project to longer-term programmatic actions. Nevertheless, the Plan lacked defined commitments to sustain action and scale up results, which increases the risk to the continuation of project benefits and outcomes (TE, p. 78).

The risk assessment conducted as part of the TE identified 18 risks (see pp. 80-83). From these, 16 were rated as High and are summarized below:

Financial resources. (i) Competing opportunities, e.g., for farmers to earn income; (ii) Country-wide economic/fiscal constraints due to COVID-19 or similar phenomena; (iii) Appropriate framework for implementation of payment or incentive scheme for the project not agreed upon; (iv) Lack or insufficient funds to transition into an integrated sustainable environmental and financial solution for the watershed management units.

Sociopolitical. (i) Cabinet does not prioritize the Payment for Environmental Service (PES) scheme; (ii) Longstanding unresolved land tenure issues impacting further work in the watershed management units, particularly concerning the PES scheme; (iii) Inadequate buy-in from the Political directorate and Kingston Metropolitan Area residents; (iv) Adoption of sustainable land management practices reduced or discontinued due to factors such as age, gender, cost of innovations, farmer apathy, absence of continued support from relevant entities, insufficient incentives for adoption.

Institutional framework and governance. (i) Weakened interagency collaboration and inadequate buy-in from Technical Implementing Agencies. (ii) Technical risks: Data sharing discontinued or not occurring as frequently as required to support Integrated Water Resource Management decision-making; Decision-support function not adequately utilized; Inadequacy of data sharing protocols.

Environmental. Natural and anthropogenic disasters and hazards such as enhanced droughts, hurricanes, heavy rainfalls, and forest fires - that damage the work done (e.g., trees planted, hydromet equipment installed); (ii) Pressures and threats to forests (encroachment, deforestation, pests and diseases, use of chemicals.

Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. The TE notes evidence that some farmers that did not participate in the Farmer Field School extension delivery programme replicated the sustainable land management practices. Best practice adoption was reported to be incentivized by a farmers' increase in productivity of over 60% (TE, p. 77).

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The TE (p. 47) reports that at the end of the project, co-financing was USD 10.4 million, 17% higher than the committed co-financing at GEF CEO endorsement. Such an increase is explained by delayed implementation of some activities, which caused higher costs than planned. Most of the additional co-financing was a grant from the Forestry Department. The Rural Agricultural Development Authority, National Environment and Planning Agency, Planning Institute of Jamaica, and Forest Conservation Fund had higher in-kind contributions than planned at GEF CEO endorsement.

5.2 Project extensions and/or 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project duration was expected to be 60 months, till October 31, 2019, but was extended to October 31, 2020. Although the total delay in project implementation completion was cumulatively about a year, the delays in project activities affected project results.

The TE (p. 37) notes that the project encountered several challenges, many of which led to delays and impacted project outcomes and sustainability. Main reasons for project delays included (i) an absence of a structured process to identify workarounds that address project constraints and minimize implementation delays; (ii) inadequate stakeholder understanding of intervention logic and proper sequencing of activities; and (iii) procurement delays.

There are several illustrative examples of the effect of delays on project results. Delay hindered the full implementation of the Payment for Environmental Services (PES) scheme and related outputs (TE, p. 21). Related PES sensitization and awareness were not implemented to the extent needed (TE, p. 23). Another example is the hydro-met assessment conducted during the design phase – the assessment had several deficiencies and had to be redone. This affected multiple activities and delayed their implementation (TE, p. 20). Several administrative and procurement bottlenecks were caused by "poor sequencing of inter-related activities, re-advertisement of procurements due to inadequate responses, inadequate budget projections for external consultancies, delays in producing TORs and finalizing technical aspects of activities" (TE, p. 27).

5.3 Stakeholder ownership. Assess the extent to which stakeholder ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE notes a well-defined and structured governance framework. The project utilized a multi-level institutional framework, with arrangements that integrated multiple stakeholders at the strategic, technical and operational levels. Coordination mechanisms were successfully established for project

implementation, but their utilization varied over time and with stakeholders involved. The Project Executing Unit played a critical role in coordinating these partnerships, many of which were instrumental in building the capacity of the partner agencies in integrated water resource management (TE, p. 40).

Partner agencies' willingness to participate was high, and the extent of engagement and support provided through various mechanisms indicated their commitment to the project activities. This commitment provided an opportunity for sustaining coordination among watershed agencies and other stakeholders in the long term. However, it is not clear how these mechanisms will be maintained beyond project completion (TE, p. 40)

5.4 Other factors: In case the terminal evaluation discusses other key factors that affected project outcomes, discuss those factors and outline how they affected outcomes, whether positively or negatively.

The TE highlights the following factors as positively affecting project outcomes: (i) iterative planning process, with adaptive actions; and (ii) alignment and complementarity with partners' mandates, programmes and plans (TE, p. 25).The following factors negatively affected project outcomes: (i) Insufficient utilization of the design guidelines, especially considering the limited capacity (human and technical) at entry; (ii) Inadequate technical capacity around Payment for Ecosystem Services implementation, leading to delays in the implementation; (iii) Limited state of readiness for implementation that was reflected in varying levels of ownership of activities by implementing partners; (iv) Gaps in the Project Executing Unit and partner agencies' capacity and constant staff turnover that resulted in a loss of institutional memory and impacted the project management and coordination; (v) Inadequate focus on the enabling environment (legal, regulatory and policy) for the Payment for Environmental Services and other policy results; (vi) Absence of a trigger mechanism for taking timely action on poor project performance; (vii) Limited change control that made it challenging to track modifications to the project.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE rates the M&E design at entry as Satisfactory, whereas this review assesses it as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

The initial design of the project M&E system is assessed to be adequate. The M&E system is coordinated by the Project Executing Unit, with input from the relevant Technical Implementing Agencies. The M&E plan guided the Project Executing Unit on the measures to evaluate progress in achieving outputs, outcomes, and the Project Development Objective defined in the Results Framework. In addition, the M&E plan included a budget to cover the baseline data collection and analysis and installation of

equipment and training in support of data analysis and long-term monitoring of key parameters across the range of technical agencies (TE, p. 58).

At project inception several changes were made in the Results Framework in project's expected impacts, outcomes, and outputs and related indicators. Justifications for the changes made at inception could not be examined by terminal evaluation as the rationale was not documented and due to changes in project staff that were involved in these changes (TE, p. 58).

At the impact level, indicators "I1.1 - Sedimentation in waterways" and "I2.1 - Tons of carbon sequestered" were found to be inadequate measures of the expected results. At the outcome level, indicators were assessed as relevant at project design. Nevertheless, indicators for outcome 2 became irrelevant following approved changes at the output level of the Results Framework. These indicators could not be replaced due to the donor restrictions on modifying the Results Matrix above the output level (TE, pp. 59-60).

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: Highly Unsatisfactory

The TE rates the M&E implementation as **Highly Unsatisfactory**, and this review concurs. The M&E implementation had numerous shortcomings linked to its complex implementation arrangements and a multi-layered reporting system that did not sufficiently build off the M&E plan provided at entry.

The TE notes the following deficiencies identified at the end of the project: (i) Absence of an updated M&E plan that would align with activity or partner M&E plans; (ii) Absence of a defined data collection strategy; (iii) Inadequate documentation of multi-year changes to the Results Framework; (iv) Absence of a performance indicator tracking system; (v) Baselines conducted well after the start of associated activities; (vi) Limited M&E capacity building provided to the project staff and partners; (v) A reporting with limited to no assessment of progress at the outcome and impact levels; and (vi) Insufficient budget to meet the M&E requirements (TE, p. 62).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation rating is based on the assessment of the performance of GEF Agency(s). Quality of Execution rating is based on performance of the executing agency(s). In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six-point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for the quality of project implementation. This review concurs.

Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) is the implementing Agency of the project. The TE indicates that the IDB "supported the Government of Jamaica in project design by providing technical expertise to design a complex, multi-faceted project that incorporated the innovative PES mechanism to address local challenges with sustainable financing for IWRM" (TE, p. xvii). The IDB supervised project management, procurement, and technical and financial input over the project's life and was responsive to emerging project implementation issues. Throughout the project, the IDB had changes in Task Team Leaders and Operational Analysts that caused communication issues with the Project Executing Unit. Changes in corporate archival systems also contributed to gaps in project institutional memory (TE, p. xvii). The IDB's efforts to improve project focus on outcomes and impacts were not well articulated and did not result in improvements in Results Framework monitoring (TE, p. 21).

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory

The TE provides a rating of Moderately Satisfactory for the quality of project execution, whereas this review rates project execution as **Moderately Unsatisfactory**.

The Executing Agency for this project was the National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA). The TE notes that the Executing Agency and Project Executing Unit had a strong commitment in areas for which partner agencies had clear mandates and plans. Fiduciary management was fully compliant with the Financing Agreement (2014) while adhering to the procurement protocols of both the Government of Jamaica and the IDB. However, there were discrepancies between the project design, the financial agreement and the implementation requirements. There were also inconsistencies in backstopping and limitations in the coordination support provided to the Project Executing Unit by the Executing Agency. Overall, there was limited tracking of the project's progress, which hindered the timely implementation of adaptive management measures (TE, p. 94).

8. Lessons and recommendations

8.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report, including how they could have application for other GEF projects. Lessons must be based on project experience.

The TE provides the following key lessons learned (TE, pp. 84-85):

1. [DESIGN] For the design of Integrated Water Resources Management projects, particularly those that are complex and testing novel approaches, it is important to balance project complexity and the host country's absorptive capacity.
2. [DESIGN] A strong participatory process is required for project design that (i) involves key partners (ii) obtains consensus on final design elements for the project, and (iii) leads to agreement on identified stakeholders' roles and responsibilities.
3. [PRE-IMPLEMENTATION] A targeted pre-implementation phase is essential for successfully delivering Integrated Water Resources Management projects, particularly for multi-year and multi-partner projects.

4. [PRE-IMPLEMENTATION] The Executing Agency, Project Executing Unit and project partners must be aware of the (relevant) terms, conditions and requirements of the project/financing agreement to adequately structure and align project plans.

5. [PRE-IMPLEMENTATION] To minimize administrative challenges during project implementation, inter and intra-agency process flows must be well-established.

6. [PRE-IMPLEMENTATION] Where there is a significant time lag between project design and implementation, it is important that all design elements (operational and technical) transition into and are used to inform implementation. Planned activities, timelines and costs should be reassessed at start-up.

7. [IMPLEMENTATION] . The Project Executing Unit and Executing Agency should have a good understanding of the project's intervention logic to ensure the logical sequencing of project activities to achieve the project objectives.

8. [IMPLEMENTATION] Tracking of project performance and the use of a control/trigger system will allow oversight units, structures and entities, internal and external to the Executing Agency, to quickly determine the state of project execution and identify and implement remedial actions as needed.

9. [IMPLEMENTATION] Any delays in establishing baselines for project interventions can limit the project's ability to establish attribution to outcomes. M&E capacity gaps should be identified early and addressed.

10. [WATERSHED MANAGEMENT] Watershed management cannot be addressed via isolated projects but needs to have a long-term programmatic approach.

11. [WATERSHED MANAGEMENT] The project experience, in its attempt to establish a sustainable financing mechanism for Integrated Water Resources Management using Payment for Environmental Services, underscores the need for continued investment in sustainable financing mechanisms that create incentives for the range of stakeholders.

The TE provides fifteen good practices (TE, pp. 85-86), some of which are summarized below:

- A multi-agency project needs to be identified in the structures and processes utilized. MOUs/PAs serve as a visible commitment by stakeholders, but for execution, the use of contracts is more effective and allows for flexibility in the use of partner-established processes for execution.
- Direct alignment of project activities with agencies' mandate builds ownership and commitment and increases the likelihood of smooth implementation.
- The use of structures such as the Project Steering Committee and Technical Working Group to provide oversight, technical support and coordination of key implementing agencies to the project.
- Obtaining commitment letters from partners during design is useful for establishing and providing a basis for re-engagement once the project is approved.
- A multi-stakeholder approach to watershed management allows for more effective project implementation. It also provides opportunities for joint planning, implementation, data and information sharing and leveraging limited resources.

- Flexibility in activity scheduling to meet participants' needs allow for greater participation (e.g., scheduling sessions to accommodate competing activities).
- Learner-centred practical application methodologies are essential to knowledge transfer and behaviour change for Integrated Water Resources Management.
- An integrated approach to watershed management that incorporates environmental, social, institutional and financial elements can over time secure the desired environmental benefits.
- The use of farmer-to-farmer assistance ("Day-for-Day" or "Field Days") facilitates adoption of innovations by individual farmers and ensures accuracy in their replication of innovations.
- Use of community persons to conduct surveys/collect data. This was an especially useful measure in response to restrictions linked to the COVID-19 pandemic.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pp. 94-97):

R1. To the Project Executing Unit [Close-out action]. Develop in collaboration with key partners a closeout plan, for handover to the Executing Agency, that defines critical "next steps" for incomplete activities in order to secure the project's investments.
R2. To the Project Executing Unit [Close-out action]. Establish a shared knowledge management archival system between the project partner agencies that captures documents, other materials and project management records.
R3. To the National Environment and Planning Agency [Post Closure]. Lead a multi-agency response to develop and implement a strategy to move the PES output from design to implementation.
R4. To the National Environment and Planning Agency [Post Closure]. Transition the project to a long-term programmatic intervention that supports the sustainable financing mechanism (PES) and other Integrated Water Resource Management activities.
R5. To the National Environment and Planning Agency / Planning Institute of Jamaica [Post Closure]. Develop a concept note and plan to secure funding for an Integrated Water Resource Management bridge project that will facilitate the transition from this project to a long-term programme.
R6. To the National Environment and Planning Agency / Government of Jamaica [Post Closure]. Utilize the lessons learned from the project and related initiatives to define an updated framework for watershed governance designed to move towards a long-term cross-agency approach to addressing issues in the Watershed Management Units.
R7. To the Government of Jamaica [Post Closure]. Build a cross-agency cadre of project management specialists within core government agencies to support the mobilization and implementation requirements of donor-funded projects.

9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six-point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria/indicators of terminal evaluation quality	GEF IEO COMMENTS	Rating
1. Timeliness: terminal evaluation report was carried out and submitted on time?		HS
2. General information: Provides general information on the project and evaluation as per the requirement?		HS
3. Stakeholder involvement: the report was prepared in consultation with – and with feedback from - key stakeholders?		S
4. Theory of change: provides solid account of the project's theory of change?		MS
5. Methodology: Provides an informative and transparent account of the methodology?		S
6. Outcome: Provides a clear and candid account of the achievement of project outcomes?		HS
7. Sustainability: Presents realistic assessment of sustainability?		S
8. M&E: Presents sound assessment of the quality of the M&E system?		HS
9. Finance: Reports on utilization of GEF funding and materialization of co-financing?		S

10. Implementation: Presents a candid account of project implementation and Agency performance?		S
11. Safeguards: Provides information on application of environmental and social safeguards, and conduct and use of gender analysis?		HS
12. Lessons and recommendations are supported by the project experience and are relevant to future programming?		HS
13. Ratings: Ratings are well-substantiated by evidence, realistic and convincing?		S
14. Report presentation: The report was well-written, logically organized, and consistent?		S
Overall quality of the report		S

10. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

- Request for CEO Endorsement (2013)
- Mid-Term Evaluation, Final Report (2018)