TERMINAL EVALUATION

"Piloting Natural Resource Valuation within Environmental Impact Assessments"

Jamaica

UNDP Project ID: 00070518 GEF Project ID: 3619

Evaluation Time Frame: 22 work days (March – April, 2013)
Date of Submission of TE Report: Draft submitted 5/1/13; Final on 5/20/13
GEF Focal Area/Operational Program: Multi-Focal Area/Capacity Building
GEF Implementing Agency: United Nations Development Programme
Project Executing Agency: National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA)

Evaluator: Ms. Virginia Ravndal, International Consultant (vravndal@mindspring.com)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Terminal Evaluation Consultant (TEC) would like to express her sincere gratitude and appreciation to all those who patiently took part in interviews and provided helpful information, and without whose participation, this Terminal Evaluation (TE) would not be meaningful. Their contributions are greatly appreciated, and the perspectives and information they generously shared with the TEC were crucial to the conduct of this evaluation.

ACRONYMS

APR	Annual Progress Report
AOP	Annual Operating Plan
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ENACT	Environmental Action Programme
EVPA	Economic Valuation of Protected Areas
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GOJ	Government of Jamaica
ISD	Institute of Sustainable Development
JBI	Jamaica Bauxite Institute
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MSP	Medium-Size Project
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
MIND	Management Institute for National Development
NCSA	National Capacity Self-Assessment
NEPA	National Environment and Planning Agency
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRV	Natural Resource Valuation
PIOJ	Planning Institute of Jamaica
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PMU	Project Management Unit
PSC	Project Steering Committee
QPR	Quarterly Progress Reports
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TEC	Terminal Evaluation Consultant
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UWI	University of the West Indies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

ANNEXES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE 1. PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Piloting Natural Resource Valuation within Environmental Impact Assessments			
GEF Project ID:	3619		*at endorsement (US$)*	*at completion (US$)*
UNDP Project ID:	00070518	GEF financing:	470,250	383,599
Country:	Jamaica	IA/EA own:		9,986 (Footnote 1)
Region:	LAC	Government:	82,000	47,000
Focal Area:	Multi focal Area	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Capacity Building	Total co-financing:	82,000	47,000
Executing Agency:	National Environment and Planning Agency	Total Project Cost:	552,250	430,599
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		25/09/08 (Footnote 2)
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 30/09/11	Actual: 30/12/12

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The objective of the "Piloting Natural Resource Valuation within Environmental Impact Assessments" Medium-Size Project (MSP) was to "develop a set of natural resource valuation tools, and incorporate these into policies and procedures governing the preparation and use of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA)." By end of this project, the expected outcome was that "environmental impacts of all major development projects would be assessed in terms of their financial and economic values, which would be used to make more informed decisions and choices about future development."

The project was intended to "strengthen the review and approval processes of policies, programs, plans and development projects in order to promote environmentally sound and sustainable development. This development should meet national socio-economic priorities while at the same time helps satisfy Jamaica's obligations to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Convention to Combat Desertification and Drought (CCD), and Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), among other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs)."

According to the project document (prodoc), "This project will strengthen the implementation of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA), as well as contribute to the implementation of Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) through the development and application of natural resource

1 UNDP TRAC funds were added to this project for a purpose not related to achievement of this project objective (i.e., for printing the State of the Environment Report) and are therefore not taken into account in this summary table.

valuation tools." "By providing a more robust and comparable valuation method for natural resources, consequences of development policies, programmes and plans will be better evaluated so as to promote biodiversity conservation; minimize, if not reduce the risks associated with land degradation; encourage climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies; and promote environmentally sound and sustainable development."

The Prodoc also specifies that, "Project implementation will take the approach of adaptive collaborative management, whereby project activities proceed as a process of learning; mistakes, errors or failures are considered as normal occurrences; local and non-local stakeholders participated in the process of setting goals, planning, management and evaluation."

The project budget at endorsement was US$552,250, of which US$ 470,250 was a grant from the Global Environment Facility (GEF), with the remaining $82,000 coming from the Government of Jamaica (GoJ) in the form of an in-kind contribution. In addition $29,750 in GEF funds was allocated for project preparation, of which 72% was spent.

Only 82% ($383,599) of the total budget allocated to the project was actually spent over what became a four year three month project after two extensions resulting in an addition of 15 months to the project period (representing an additional 42% of time over and above the original project time frame).

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) was the GEF Implementing Agency. The National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA) was the Executing Agency. The project began in September, 2008 and ended on December 30, 2012, approximately 3 and ½ months before this Terminal Evaluation (TE) began.

The Terminal Evaluation

This evaluation was initiated by UNDP/Jamaica as the GEF Implementing Agency for this project in accordance with evaluation requirements set forth by the GEF. According to the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the TE, the objective of the TE is to " assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming." "The evaluation will also evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of project design, implementation, monitoring and adaptive management and sustainability of project outcomes, including the project exit strategy." Annex 1 to this report is the full TOR for the TE.

This terminal evaluation report is structured around the five UNDP/GEF evaluation criteria: *Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Results/Impacts* and *Sustainability*. In accordance with the TOR for the TE, project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as well as monitoring and evaluation (M&E), Implementing Agency (IA) & Executing Agency (EA) Execution, and Assessment of Outcomes, have been rated using the obligatory GEF rating scale presented in Annex 2.

One International Consultant was contracted to undertake the TE over 22 work days, 12 of which were spent in country. All key stakeholders were interviewed, mostly in person although some Skype and telephone interviews were also conducted.

Table 1: Terminal Evaluation Ratings Assigned to the Project

GEF Ratings: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

TERMINAL EVALUATION RATINGS ASSIGNED TO THE PROJECT		
Criterion	**Comments**	**Rating**
Monitoring and Evaluation		
Overall quality of M&E		MS
M&E design at project start up	The TEC fully concurs with the assessment of the MTE which indicated that the project document's Logical Framework "is not a very practical tool for management and/or evaluation. The indicators tend to be vague rather than "SMART": specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and/or "trackable". Many of the indicators, baseline and target values are not coherently aligned to offer a clear measurement of project success. Managers and/or evaluators are challenged to see how the sum of achieved "target" values reflects a meaningful achievement of objective and/or outputs." Further compounding M&E design issues, the PSC was far too large, lacked clear and comprehensive TOR, and was erroneously designed to achieve institutionalization and project transparency, both of which are better achieved by other means and should not be functions of a PSC.	MS
Implementation of the M&E plan	A mid-term evaluation was conducted, but this was done very late in the project with only ten months left before the project was to close. There was a genuine effort by the PMU and the PSC to follow through with most MTE recommendations, but by that time it was very late**.** The logframe was revised as per the recommendation of the MTE, but this revision took place with only a few months left before project closure. Moreover, most revisions were to reduce targets to fit the actual reality of project performance which is not what was intended. The revised logframe is not a significant improvement over the original and does not address greater coherency and consistency or the development of S.M.A.R.T. indicators. In addition, a more robust analysis of assumptions and risks (which would have been helpful) was not undertaken. PSC meetings took place more regularly following the MTE, but still not as regularly as recommended. No exit strategy was prepared and there was no wrap-up PSC meeting. The TE was conducted within the specified time period according to GEF guidance on TEs. Nevertheless, best practice is to plan the TE while the PMU is still in place. The purpose of M&E is to provide feedback so that changes can be made if necessary to ensure a project achieves what it set out to achieve, not merely to produce what it set out to produce. Adaptive project management was weak. Stronger direction from the PSC to help steer the project and to authoritatively describe benchmarks and clear consequences for not achieving these would have been helpful in ensuring better project implementation, including development of a critical missing element, an Exit Strategy.	MU

IA & EA Execution:		
Overall Quality of Project Implementation/ Execution		MU
GEF Implementing Agency Execution (UNDP)	UNDP could usefully have provided more sharing of best practices/lessons learned from projects around the world including, for example, regarding constitution and TOR for PSCs and development of Exit Strategies. Given UNDP's vast experience with logframes, more effective support could have helped define S.M.A.R.T. indicators and ensure coherence of the logframe. UNDP should have assumed more of a leadership role in the PSC to keep the PSC on track, and as the GEF Implementing Agency, should have taken the initiative once it was obvious that serious problems existed with the project implementation to define benchmarks and describe clear consequences of not achieving them. UNDP should have insisted on a timely MTE, the development of an exit strategy, and on a final wrap-up PSC.	MU
Executing Agency Execution (NEPA)	The Project has not been effectively managed, sometimes providing inputs of inadequate technical quality, mostly not on time, and not in the most logical sequence. The project was slow to start due to recruitment problems and very slow to deliver on most project outputs. The work plan focused on achievement of outputs/deliverables but did not directly link these with achievement of project results. Although real roadblocks were encountered, they were not effectively dealt with. In some instances, insignificant matters were allowed to become roadblocks that presented major obstacles to project implementation. There was not enough thinking "outside the box" or adaptive project management. There is evidence of better adaptive management following the MTE, although this was never fully satisfactory.	MU
Outputs		
Overall Quality of Project Outputs		MS
Relevance	Although the relevancy of NRV to Jamaica is clear, the relevancy (including timeliness and readiness) of a project that specifically aimed to integrate NRV into EIAs in Jamaica is questionable, especially given the recognized weaknesses of EIA guidelines and practices in Jamaica and the fact that doing NRV as part of EIAs is not a common practice anywhere in the world. The project may have been more relevant if it had left the door open regarding NRV, i.e., introduce the concept and enhance awareness regarding the range of its possible applications (not only as a decision tool related to proposed development projects but also as a tool that could be useful in mitigation and in other ways), and focus first on identifying and gathering critical baseline data required to conduct NRVs and on enhancing the capacity of the private sector to conduct NRVs and of NEPA to critically evaluate these.	MS

Effectiveness	At the end of this project, most of the critical barriers to integrating NRV within EIAs still exist, including lack of baseline data, inadequate capacity, and lack of specific guidelines and policy directives regarding how this should be done. On the other hand, the project was very effective at enhancing awareness regarding NRV, institutionalizing it within tertiary learning and training institutions (thereby strategically ensuring sustainability and continued building of capacity even after project end), and was clearly successful in enhancing the capacity of NEPA and other key stakeholders, however not to the level expected as per the prodoc.	MS
Efficiency	Almost one fifth of the allocated budget was returned unspent to the GEF, but unfortunately this was not because of efficiency but rather due to poor project management. Despite two project extensions, the project objective was not achieved.	MU
Sustainability:		
Overall likelihood of Sustainability	According to GEF guidelines, each risk dimension of sustainability is deemed to be critical and therefore the overall rating for sustainability cannot be higher than the rating of the dimension with the lowest rating.	MS
Financial resources	There is no indication that lack of financial resources will affect the potential to sustain integration of NRV into EIA if this is someday achieved.	S
Socio-political	Awareness level has been significantly raised regarding the benefits of incorporating NRV into decision-making related to development policies, plans and programmes. Champions for NRV now exist within Government. Guidelines regarding integration of NRV into EIAs which were developed by the project are still in draft and have not been taken up by Government, therefore there are still no agreed guidelines or policies in place regarding use of NRV.	S
Institutional framework and governance	The capacity of NEPA regarding NRV has been significantly enhanced but not to the point where NEPA can critically evaluate NRVs done by others. Moreover, baseline data, which is a critical input required to do NRV, is still lacking.	MS
Environmental	NA	NA

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS

Main Conclusions

The significant effort put into this project by NEPA, UNDP and members of the PSC is not reflected in the project outputs. One fifth of the budget of this $552,250 MSP was returned to the GEF at the end of four years and three months after two project extensions and without fully achieving the project objective or the expected outcome. All three expected outputs were achieved, although with the exception of the output related to awareness-raising, training and incorporation into tertiary level academic institutions, not in a timely or efficient fashion, and in most cases either not contributing significantly to the project objective or of mediocre quality.

Although NRV can be a helpful tool and relevant to Jamaica, the project's relevance would have been greater had it been about enhancing awareness and capacity related to NRV without stipulating that NRV had to be done within the specific context of EIAs (which themselves suffer from important shortcomings that were known and acknowledged at the time the project was designed). A more flexible approach which would have left the decision to Government regarding how best they wished to use NRV would have been more appropriate given the newness of the tool in Jamaica, the recognized weaknesses of the EIA guidelines along with a poor implementation record, and the existence of other relevant and immediate applications for NRV, including as a tool in mitigation cases related to environmental damage.

The project was not particularly well managed and was poorly steered despite an enthusiastic and committed core group of PSC members who misdirected much of their energy to technical reviews of project deliverables while losing site of the bigger picture, the project itself. The project management required strong direction, and neither the PSC nor UNDP in its capacity of GEF Implementing Agency provided effective direction, even if many suggestions were offered.

At the end of this project, most of the critical barriers to integrating NRV within EIAs still exist, including inadequate baseline data, inadequate capacity, and lack of specific guidelines and policy directives regarding how this should be done.

Despite the project weaknesses, it is clear that NRV will continue and increase in applications in Jamaica. This is due largely to the effective and strategic sensitization/awareness raising activities conducted by the project and the highly effective and strategic institutionalization of NRV within key higher learning institutions.

To take full advantage of the project's accomplishments, several actions are now required without further delay. Key amongst these is development of a detailed exit strategy and a wrap up meeting of the PSC to discuss the exit strategy and to assign responsibilities and deadlines for follow on actions.

The main lessons to share from this project experience are presented in Section 4, along with key recommendations. Key recommendations include: 1) Prepare an Exit Strategy. 2) Convene a meeting between high-level representatives of PIOJ, the Ministry, and UNDP to discuss the lessons highlighted by this project experience. 3) Convene a final meeting of the PSC to review the draft exit strategy and agree on a plan of action to wrap up pending matters. 4) Host a wrap up meeting within 3 months after the last PSC meeting to discuss what has been done on the action plan. 5) Under its existing MOU with UWI, NEPA should approach UWI (especially the department of UWI which has incorporated NRV into its curriculum) regarding the possibility of engaging MSc students and Professors in gathering and updating baseline data regarding Jamaica's critical ecosystems, species and habitats for use in conducting future NRVs as well as for other possible application. 6) Post the Sourcebook on the NEPA website and inform key stakeholders of its posting. Draft a detailed outline of the sections of the Sourcebook that will be included in its next rendition based on consultations with NRV practitioners in Jamaica.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS EVALUATION

1. The evaluation was initiated by UNDP/Jamaica as the GEF Implementing Agency for this project in accordance with evaluation requirements set forth by the GEF Evaluation Office. According to the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Terminal Evaluation (TE), the aim of the TE is "to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits

from the project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming". In accordance with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, this TE is also intended to "promote accountability for the achievement of GEF objectives; including the global environmental benefits".

1.2 SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION

2. The evaluation was conducted by one International Consultant over a 22 day work period during March/April 2013, three and ½ months after the project was operationally closed on 30 December 2012. Twelve of the twenty-two work days were in-country.

3. The TE was conducted in accordance with the "UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-financed Projects", and the "*GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy*", and in line with GEF principles including independence, impartiality, transparency, and participation. It seeks to provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. In this regard, the TEC followed a participatory and consultative approach, and used a variety of evaluation instruments including:

4. ***Evaluation Matrix***: An evaluation matrix was developed based on the set of questions covering the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact which were included in the TOR for the TE and which were amended by the TEC to be most useful to this particular TE. The matrix (presented in Annex III) served as a general guide for the interviews conducted by the TEC.

5. ***Documentation Review***: The TEC reviewed more than 60 documents including the project document (prodoc), project reports including Annual APR/PIR, AOPs, project budget revisions, the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) report, annual and quarterly progress reports, project files, policy and national strategy documents, and project deliverables along with other relevant documents. A list of documentation reviewed by the TEC is included as Annex IV to this report.

6. ***Interviews***: Interviews were conducted with more than forty stakeholders representing all key individuals and institutions involved in project implementation, as well as those who would be most directly affected by project results. Because numerous key stakeholders including the Project Manager and two of the five key consultants were not in country during the evaluation mission, these interviews were conducted by telephone/Skype. The evaluation mission itinerary is included as Annex V. A complete list of stakeholders met is included in Annex VI.

7. ***Field Visits***: Although a field visit to the pilot project site at Old Harbour Bay was considered, following discussions with NEPA it was decided that this would not be beneficial. There was nothing to see at the pilot site as the proposed development had not been initiated. More importantly, there were no stakeholders to meet there as no one from local communities had participated in project sensitization or trainings. The Consultant who did the EIA for the proposed development to which the NRV was associated lives in Kingston (where a meeting was arranged), and the Manager of the nearby Protected Area (the same NGO which is the most involved in the local community development) was in Kingston on other business and able to meet the TEC then.

8. ***Terminal Evaluation Mission Itinerary:*** The TEC submitted her inception report to UNDP on time, two weeks prior to the date of the first day of meetings in country. The report outlined a list of stakeholders she wished to meet. Unfortunately, the inception report was not shared by UNDP with NEPA, the entity responsible for arranging the meetings, until the day the Consultant arrived Jamaica. This caused some last minute scrambling to arrange meetings, but NEPA's effort to ensure the TEC met with all key stakeholders was successful.

9. ***Ratings:*** In accordance with GEF guidelines for project evaluations, achievement ratings as well as sustainability and relevance ratings were assigned by the TEC. The TEC rated project achievements and outcomes according to the GEF project review criteria (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Results and Sustainability), using the obligatory GEF ratings of: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). A full description of these ratings and other GEF rating scales is provided in Annex I. The TEC also rated various dimensions of sustainability of project outcomes using the GEF obligatory rating scale of: Likely (L), Moderately Likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU), and, Unlikely (U).

10. ***Use of Revised Project Logframe:*** Changes were made to the original project logical framework (logframe) following the recommendation of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE). The original logframe is presented in Annex VII, while the revised logframe can be found in Annex VIII.

1.3 EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

11. The evaluation was conducted by Ms. Virginia Ravndal, an independent International Consultant. Ms. Ravndal has worked both as a staff member and a consultant for UNDP/GEF on project design, formulation, and evaluation in more than forty-five countries. She has over 20 years of professional experience designing and evaluating biodiversity conservation initiatives in diverse ecosystems around the world. She has consulted with many organizations including UNDP, FAO, the World Bank, UNEP, USAID, the U.S. National Park Service, Winrock International, and the Smithsonian Institution. She is President of the Board of Directors of two Non-Governmental Organizations.

1.4 STRUCTURE OF THIS REPORT

12. This terminal evaluation report documents the achievements and successes, as well as the shortcomings and constraints, encountered by the project and includes four sections. Section 1 briefly describes the purpose, scope and methodology of the evaluation; Section 2 presents an overview of the project; and Section 3 presents the findings of the evaluation. Conclusions, recommendations and lessons are presented in Section 4. Lessons and recommendations are cross-referenced to the relevant paragraph in the report for fuller context. Lessons are highlighted in blue for ease of reference, while recommendations are highlighted in green. Annexes are found at the end of the report.

1.5 CODE OF CONDUCT ADHERED TO BY THE TEC

13. The TEC reviewed and agreed to adhere to the UNEG "*Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations". The* consultant signed the "*Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form"* (Annex IX).
All information gathered by the TEC is considered by the TEC as confidential. Stakeholders interviewed were routinely informed by the TEC at the outset of each interview about the confidentiality of the information shared and also about the purpose of the evaluation.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

2.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DURATION

14. The "Piloting Natural Resource Valuation within Environmental Impact Assessment" project was conceived in 2006. The project document (prodoc) was signed two years later in September 2008 with a total project budget of US$ 552,250 including a grant contribution from the GEF of US$ 470,250 and a commitment of co-financing totalling US$ 82,000 from the GoJ. An additional $29,750 was allocated for

project preparation. The project inception workshop took place shortly after the project was signed. The Project was operationally closed a little more than four years later, in December 2012.

15. Natural Resource Valuation was new to Jamaica at the time this project began. There was little awareness of this tool and no local expertise in NRV. No NRVs had been done at the time the project started. As stated in the prodoc, "The national priority of socio-economic development and Jamaica's institutional framework governing natural resource use and environmental management… is heavily biased against protection in favor of extraction and exploitation for short-term economic gains." "Activities related to agriculture, forestry, mining, tourism and infrastructure development are degrading Jamaica's environmental integrity."

16. As the MTE describes, "The EIA is the primary tool used by the Government of Jamaica to evaluate and mitigate impacts from many of these development sectors. Both the EIA and SEA processes are weak, in part, because they do not provide stakeholders with the ability to analyze the economic value of natural resources and ecosystem services potentially lost to unrestrained development. Although Jamaica would like to integrate natural resource valuation into the EIA and SEA processes, the Government and other national stakeholders do not have the capacity to get this done. The NRV is designed to address this capacity barrier thereby strengthening the EIA/SEA process and setting in a place a tool to mitigate the adverse impacts of proposed development."

17. As stated in the Project Document, the project aims to "strengthen the review and approval processes of policies, programs, plans and development projects in order to promote environmentally sound and sustainable development. This development should meet national socio-economic priorities while at the same time helps satisfy Jamaica's obligations to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Convention to Combat Desertification and Drought (CCD), and Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC), among other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs)."

18. During the life of the project, several other NRVs were done, including one for the Cockpit Country (which was originally to have been the focus of this project), and three others for three protected areas (under a separate project, the Economic Valuation of Protected Areas project).

19. The project was originally intended to "strengthen the implementation of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA), as well as contribute to the implementation of Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) through the development and application of natural resource valuation tools. In particular, the project will work in parallel with the Environmental Action Programme (ENACT), as SEAs are undertaken on various sectoral policies, programmes and plans. The project will 'top-up' ENACT's capacity development activities of training and sensitization of the value of SEAs, and enforcement and compliance of EIAs with training and sensitization on the utility of natural resource valuation as a means to meeting both national and global environmental objectives over the long-term." The development of natural resource valuation tools was to "provide an opportunity for these to be institutionalized as part of ENACT Programme's capacity development activities. In this way, SEAs will be greatly improved in being able to make better predictions of possible consequences of policy interventions, facilitating the development of strategies to reduce policy resistances and facilitate the consideration of environmental risks and impacts associated with the implementation of government policies. By providing a more robust and comparable valuation method for natural resources, consequences of development policies, programmes and plans will be better evaluated so as to promote biodiversity conservation; minimize, if not reduce the risks associated with land degradation; encourage climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies; and promote environmentally sound and sustainable development."

2.2 PROBLEMS THAT THE PROJECT SOUGHT TO ADDRESS

20. The project sought to "enable the GoJ to make more informed decisions regarding development project proposals by providing a more robust and comparable valuation method for natural resources which would enable a better evaluation of consequences of development policies, programmes and plans so as to promote biodiversity conservation, minimize land degradation, encourage climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies and promote environmentally sound and sustainable development."

2.3 IMMEDIATE AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

21. The objective of the project was "to develop a set of natural resource valuation tools, and incorporate these into policies and procedures governing the preparation and use of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA)." The expected outcome of the project was "At the end of the project, the Government of Jamaica will be better enabled to make more informed decisions by placing greater value to ecosystem functions within the framework of environmental impact assessments of development projects. Specifically, the environmental impacts of all major development projects would be assessed in terms of their financial and economic values, which would be used to make more informed decisions and choices about future development."

2.4 CHANGES MADE TO THE PROJECT DESIGN

The original project logical framework (Annex VII) was revised following the recommendations of the MTE but this happened in July-August of 2012 only a few months before project closure. Based upon a comparison of the original logframe with the revised logframe, it appears that most changes were made to update the logframe to delete references to the Cockpit Country, and to reduce some targets to fit the reality of actual project achievement.

2.5 EXPECTED RESULTS INCLUDING INDICATORS AND TARGETS

22. An overview of the project's expected results (its expected outcomes, indicators and targets) is provided in *Table 3: Expected Project Results,* which is an extract of the Project's revised logframe (included in its entirety in Annex VIII, *Revised Project Logical Framework*). An analysis of the attainment of project Outputs, Outcomes and Objectives is presented in Section 3.3 (Project Results and Impacts). The TEC's assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the logframe is included in Section 3.1 (Assessment of Project Design Logic, Strategic approach and Scope).

TABLE 2: EXPECTED PROJECT RESULTS (WITH PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND TARGETS)

Expected Result	Targets & Indicators
Outcome 1 At the end of the project, the Government of Jamaica will be better enabled to make more informed decisions by placing greater value to ecosystem functions within the framework of environmental impact assessments of development projects. Specifically, the environmental impacts of all major development projects would be assessed in terms of their financial and economic values, which would be used to make more informed decisions and choices about future development.	**Outcome Indicators:** ▪ NEPA, NRCA Advisory Board, and Technical Review Committee (TRC) capacitated to interpret natural resource valuation ▪ Increased selection of development alternatives that are environmentally friendly, sound, and sustainable. ▪ The financial and economic values of ecosystem goods and services are determinant variables in the permitting and licensing process of development projects. ▪ A cadre of local expertise developed to apply natural resource valuation skills within the framework of EIAs. ▪ Capacity development monitoring scorecard rating **Outcome Targets:** ▪ By the end of the project a Sourcebook with a literature review would have been completed and widely circulated ▪ By project end EIA guidelines revised and now incorporates NRV to aid the decision making process where appropriate ▪ By the end of the project, natural resource valuation tools and techniques will have been demonstrated to at least 50 government representatives ▪ By end of project 20 community group members across the island trained ▪ By the end of the project 15 environmental professionals from the private and public sector trained in NRV. ▪ By the end of the project at least two tertiary institutions offering modules in NRV in existing courses
Output 1.1 Natural Resource Valuation Tools Developed	**Target 1.1.1** Within the first year of the project an assessment of current experiences and theories in the use of natural resource valuation tools and techniques conducted. By the beginning of year 4, an independent assessment of the natural resource valuation sourcebook conducted. By the end of the project, the natural resource valuation sourcebook updated to incorporate lessons learned from the pilot EIA project **Indicator 1.1.1** A primer/sourcebook on tools and techniques for the use of natural resource valuation specific to the Jamaican context developed
	Target 1.1.2 By the end of the project new guidelines for EIAs developed that incorporate natural resource

	valuation, and updated periodically during project implementation. **Indicator 1.1.2** Guidelines developed for the application of natural resource valuation tools and techniques within the EIA process. An implementation plan developed for undertaking natural resource valuation tools within the framework of EIAs.
Output 1.2 Natural Resource Valuation tools piloted within the framework of an EIA	**Target 1.2.1** By May 2012, the Pilot Project proposal is developed **Indicator 1.2.1** Pilot EIA project proposal that integrates the use of natural resource valuation developed and approved Independent evaluation of the pilot EIA project conducted
	Target 1. 2.2 By the end of the project , the pilot project has been implemented **Indicator 1.2.2** Lessons learned from pilot project are widely disseminated
	Indicator 1.2.3 Recommendations for the development of SEA implementation guidelines provided
OUTPUT 2 Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes	**Target 2.1** By the end of the project MIND, UWI and UTECH have integrated NRV in at least one course By the end of the project, at least five professionals trained at MIND as trainers of natural resource valuation tools **Indicator 2.1** Curriculum on natural resource valuation developed for three tertiary institutions Natural Resource Valuation curriculum integrated into course offerings of three tertiary level institutions
	Target 2.2 By the end of year 3 at least four training sessions conducted, and at least 10 people trained in each By the end of the project, at least 50 professionals trained in natural resource valuation tools and techniques. **Indicator 2.2** Key NEPA staff trained on interpreting natural resource valuation data and information.
	Target 2.3 By the end of the project, key NEPA staff and members of the NRCA Advisory Board and TRC responsible for reviewing EIAs trained on the interpretation of natural resource valuation information **Indicator 2.3** Members of the NRCA Advisory Board and TRC responsible for reviewing proposed developments are sensitized on NRV integration into the EIA process

	Target 2.4 By the end of the project, at least 10 sensitization workshops on natural resource valuation **Indicator 2.4** NGOs involved in community-based development actively participated in sensitization workshops on valuation tools.
	Target 2.5 By the end of the project, lessons learned presented to at least one conference/workshop **Indicator 2.5** Lessons learnt publication widely disseminated

Sources: Final Review Report (2012) & Revised Project Logical Framework (2012)

2.6 MAIN STAKEHOLDERS

23. The project's main stakeholders were the National Environmental and Planning Agency (NEPA) which served as the Executing Agency for the project, the Planning Institute of Jamaica (PIOJ) which is the entity of Government which deals with relations with international donors, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) which was the GEF Implementing Agency for the project, the University of the West Indies (UWI) which was contracted to undertake key project activities and which along with the University of Technology (UTECH) and the Management Institute for National Development (MIND) were key players in adding to the sustainability of the effort by incorporating NRV into their curricula, as well as developers and those they contract to do EIAs.

3. FINDINGS

3.1 PROJECT DESIGN AND FORMULATION

3.1.1 Assessment of Project Logic, Strategic Approach, and Scope

24. Although NRV can be a helpful tool and relevant to Jamaica, the project's design may have been more relevant had it been about enhancing awareness and capacity related to NRV without stipulating that NRV had to be done within the specific context of EIAs (which themselves suffer from important shortcomings that were known and acknowledged at the time the project was designed). A more flexible approach which would have left the decision to Government regarding how best they wished to use NRV would have been more appropriate given the newness of the tool in Jamaica, the recognized weaknesses of the EIA guidelines along with a poor implementation record, and the existence of other relevant and immediate applications for NRV, including as a tool in mitigation cases related to environmental damage

3.1.2 Assessment of Project Logical Framework

25. Upon the recommendation of the MTE, the logframe was revised. According to the MTE, "the current framework is not coherent and does not reflect current approaches, e.g., SMART indicators." Although somewhat of an improvement over the original, the revised logframe also suffered from these and other weaknesses including: lack of consistency between some Outputs and Indicators and Targets, several targets appear to have been revised to reflect actual project performance rather than having been established as legitimate targets, weak analysis and description of risks and assumptions, it is not clear how indicators and targets relate to a comprehensive measurement of project success.

3.1.3 Design of the M&E Plan

Indicators and Targets

26. Indicators and targets are critical elements of an M&E plan, both in terms of how they are defined, and how and when they are measured. The indicators specified in the revised logframe are not especially S.M.A.R.T., and several targets appear to have been revised to reflect actual project performance rather than being based on meaningful criteria. This has a significant effect on both the ability to monitor a project and the ability to assess project impact.

The Project Steering Committee (PSC)

27. This Section relates to the *design* of the PSC whereas Section 3.2.5 provides an assessment of the *functioning* of the PSC.

28. The PSC included 25 individuals and was chaired by the Executing Agency. This is far too large of a PSC and detracts from accountability and ownership while adding to logistical difficulties. The prodoc specified that the PSC would include representatives from several Government entities and indicated this would ensure eventual institutionalization of NRV within the member institutions. Such an inclusive PSC would also, according to the prodoc, help ensure transparency. The PSC should not be used as a mechanism to ensure institutionalization. This is better achieved by other means. Some stakeholders interviewed expressed the opinion that if government agencies sit on a PSC it is easier to convince them of the need to institutionalize the theme later as one can point to the fact that they were involved all along and therefore should institutionalize the subject matter. If the reason an institution takes up a topic is because they sat on a PSC, this will not lead to meaningful institutionalization and is not sustainable. Likewise, the PSC should not be used as a mechanism to achieve transparency. This is also better achieved by other means. PSC meeting minutes can be published on the web, for example. Non PSC members may be invited as "observers" to PSC meetings.

29. It is helpful to involve some international expertise on PSCs, especially in the case of NEX projects, and most especially when the subject of the project is new to the country. If the appropriate international expertise does not exist in country, participation can be via Skype or other remote means.

30. The TOR for this PSC was a template. Using a basic template as a foundation on which to build is fine, but simply adopting the template is usually insufficient. TOR must clearly and comprehensively outline the tasks, responsibilities, and authority of the PSC, as well as the relationship between the PSC and the PMU, and the relationship between the PSC and UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency. An inception workshop for the PSC would be a helpful standard practice to help orient new PSCs. This would help ensure they understand their TORs and their authority at the very outset of the project. The PSC must be crystal clear on what is intended by each of the project outputs described in a prodoc and must ensure they are relevant and reflecting of current priority needs. Time lapses between project conceptualization and project start are often significant for GEF projects. This means situations may well have changed by the time a project begins. It is the responsibility of the PSC to ensure at project outset that activities and outputs are still relevant. If these require modification, even if additional authorization is required, these changes must be pursued rather than simply adhering to a prodoc because it specifies something that was called for when the project was conceptualized.

31. The Chair of the PSC was a staff of the Executing Agency and the Secretary of the PSC was the Project Manager. Although this is fairly common practice, it is not best practice. To avoid potential for conflict of interest and to ensure an independent perspective, it is best practice that the Chair of the PSC is

not an employee of the Executing Agency. It is also not best practice for the Project Manager to be the Secretary of the PSC as this detracts from her ability to participate meaningfully in meetings.

3.1.4 Linkages with other Interventions in the Sector within the Country

32. Strong linkages were made between this project and the EVPA project but, unfortunately, there is no documentation of lessons learned from the EVPA experience that were applied to this project's pilot NRV experience. This would have been helpful. An interview with the former Project Manager of the EVPA project revealed that the Sourcebook produced by this project was not used as a reference by the EVPA project, an indication of its utility, or lack thereof, and also of the awareness of the existence of the Sourcebook, and the strength of linkages between the two projects. The two projects shared the same PSC but in the end this seems to have been more detrimental than helpful as explained later in this report.

33. Closer communication between the PMU and the Legal Branch of NEPA, which was preparing new draft regulations for EIAs, would have been helpful and might have ensured that the new draft regulations incorporated use of tools such as NRV at both approval and mitigation stages. As it stands, NRV is not specifically mentioned and what is interpreted by the Legal Branch as for allowing for its use is only within the context of mitigation.

3.1.5 Incorporation of Lessons from Relevant Initiatives into Project Design

34. It would have been helpful to have identified institutions of excellence in NRV that exist in other countries during the project preparation stage. Almost three quarters of the Project Preparation Grant awarded to this project was returned to the GEF unused. Contact could have been made with select institutions identified as having expertise in NRV to discuss possible use of the materials they had already developed for training/awareness purposes and to develop institutional partnerships that may have lasted even after project end. Linkages were indeed made with EcoNorthwest, a consulting firm in the U.S. with extensive experience in this field. This was a good linkage and is likely to continue into the future, but this linkage was made late in the project and did not serve the purpose of informing the design of the project.

3.2 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT

3.2.1 UNDP and Implementing Partner Implementation /Execution, Coordination and Operational Issues

<u>NEPA as Executing Agency & the Project Management Unit (MU)</u>

35. As the Executing Agency for the project, NEPA was, according to the prodoc, "responsible for the achievement of the results expected from the project and, in particular, for ensuring that the outputs are produced through effective management and use of project funds."

36. Although at first glance, NEPA was the most logical Executing Agency, given that it is the entity responsible for managing EIAs, Direct Implementation by UNDP may have been a more efficient and effective approach. This project dealt with a topic completely new to NEPA. All project activities were implemented through sub-contracts, including sub-contracting international expertise. The role of the Executing Agency in this project was therefore primarily managing sub-contracts. NEPA is not the most agile entity in this respect.

37. Although much time and effort was exerted, NEPA was not effective in overseeing the PMU to ensure timeliness of delivery of project outputs or of their quality. A results-based pay system could have usefully been applied instead of paying the Project Manager as a regular employee. Contracts should clearly stipulate benchmarks with associated time frames and also terms for termination.

38. The project struggled, as many MSPs do, with the 10% lid on project management costs. A solution to this would have been for NEPA as Executing Agency to assign an existing staff member to manage aspects of the project instead of contracting someone to manage the entire project. Had UNDP been assigned the role of managing sub-contracts and recruiting and contracting the expertise required by the project, NEPA's role would have been more focused on ensuring guidelines for integrating NRV into EIA were drafted, acceptable, and applied, while UNDP would have secured the necessary expertise to develop the Sourcebook, do the sensitization and training, and conduct the pilot project. It should be noted that in the original project design, funds allocated under this line were for a Project Assistant. NEPA sought UNDP's intervention and received their no-objection to hire a Project Manager. However, the funds could not be increased due to GEF ceilings. This was one of several factors contributing to slow delivery rate during the first year of project implementation.

39. In selecting an Executing Agency, its track record in project management must carefully be considered. Moreover, if the Executing Agency itself does not possess the necessary in-house expertise, or cannot afford to allocate it to project management and must therefore contract out for this, the benefits and drawbacks of assigning the role of Executing Agency to that entity must be carefully weighed.

40. The PMU was not highly effective at managing the project in terms of identifying and securing the needed expertise or ensuring that project deliverables were delivered on time and were of high quality. As one example, according to NEPA, the first time the RFP was issued for the Lead Economic Expert, no one responded. The RFP was re-issued and two entities bid on it that time, neither one which were considered by the PSC to possess the required qualifications. Instead of reaching out to target institutions of excellence in this field globally, the decision was taken to award the contract to one of the bidders, knowing that the main individual involved was not available within the needed time frame and despite the fact that the PSC had questioned the quality of his work under the other project for which they were also the PSC (the EVPA project). The Project Manager explained that because the prodoc called for the Lead Economic Expert to be a local person, it was felt that international expertise could not be sought. This was one example of many of lack of adaptive management and the perceived need to adhere strictly to the prodoc whether or not it was helpful in ensuring project results were achieved.

41. Had the PMU been more proactive and innovative in its search for international expertise, such as for example by identifying institutions with expertise in NRV and targeting them to let them know that the project was recruiting specialized expertise, there would have been no long time lag in recruiting the main consultant. The approach of contracting one consultant to develop the sourcebook and to draft guidelines was illogical. NEPA was best placed to do the later, whereas an international expertise would have been more appropriate for the former, and a combination of international expertise and local expertise would have been most effective in implementing the pilot project.

42. Unfortunately, although evidence exists that the Executing Agency, the PSC and UNDP all devoted significant time and energy to trying to resolve problems, their inputs were not effective. They allowed themselves to be stumped instead of thinking outside the box and finding innovative solutions.

<u>UNDP as GEF Implementing Agency (MU)</u>

43. Although UNDP provided many inputs to the Project, their support was not fully effective. UNDP could usefully have applied itself in its capacity as a knowledge management broker to a greater

extent and should have assumed a more authoritative and proactive role as the GEF Implementing Agency ultimately responsible to the GEF for project performance. UNDP could have:

- Done more sharing of lessons learned from other projects around the world, especially regarding best practices for effective project management and effective project steering.
- UNDP should have clarified from the start that the project document is a guide and that it should not stand in the way of adaptive management when situations change on the ground that render impractical, irrelevant or less than best practice, approaches or activities specified in the prodoc. Approaches outlined in a prodoc should not be strictly adhered to if they no longer make sense. There must be strong justification for deviating from the prodoc, but if the justification exists, deviation is perfectly acceptable. Depending on the type of deviation, further authorization may need to be sought outside of the PSC, but if need be, this should be done.
- Provided greater support in reviewing TOR to ensure these were sufficiently detailed and of high quality.
- Recognizing the general tendency of NEX projects to depend heavily on national expertise, UNDP could have been more insistent of the need to contract international expertise where it was required. The TEC recognizes that UNDP expressed concern when NEPA contracted the national consultant incorporating the international expertise within the same contract. UNDP had specifically indicated that this was not adequate. UNDP had requested that the international consultant on the national project be asked to speak with the PSC. UNDP had also requested that the MTE recommendation to hire international expertise be implemented. UNDP had recommended that a selection of relevant stakeholders should be sent overseas for international training in NRV to build the cadre of professionals required. Unfortunately, these suggestions were not effectively translated into action. On critical matters such as this one, there must be sufficient follow through to ensure necessary actions for project success are undertaken.
- UNDP should have insisted that the MTE take place earlier than it did. The MTE took place with only ten months left before the project was originally to close. The justification was that the project didn't have much to show due to slow start up and roadblocks encountered. Even if an Executing Agency or a PSC doesn't recognize the benefit of having a MTE under those situations, UNDP should have understood that a MTE can help resolve the reasons why a project at mid-term has very little to show and should have insisted on a timely MTE.
- Although UNDP did provide support on the development of the revised logframe, even greater support to developing S.M.A.R.T. indicators and targets based on meaningful criteria would have been useful. More importantly, the timing of the revision made the exercise fairly futile as the log frame was revised with only several months left before project closure. As GEF Implementing Agency, UNDP should have ensured a more timely response to the MTE recommendation to revise the logframe.
- UNDP could have shared best practices related to effective PSC composition. This is not a lesson that needs to be learned from direct experience.
- In keeping with well-known best practices, UNDP could have strongly urged that an Exit Strategy be prepared and that the PSC meet specifically to discuss the draft Exit Strategy several months before project closure.
- UNDP should have insisted on a final PSC wrap-up meeting. There was no wrap up and many of those interviewed by the TEC felt the project came to an abrupt end with many matters still pending. UNDP should have insisted that minutes be prepared for all PSC meetings. Although minutes were routinely recorded for all other PSC meetings, no minutes were prepared for the last meeting.

- NEPA, as Executing Agency for the project, should have assumed responsibility for most of the above, but when they didn't, UNDP should have stepped up to the plate.
- The UNDP CO could have managed the TE mission more efficiently. Incorrect TOR were sent to the TEC. The TEC's inception report was not shared with the Executing Agency until after she arrived in country, causing some last minute scrambling by NEPA to arrange more than 30 meetings with stakeholders. Drafts, rather than final editions, of key project deliverables were shared with the TEC for review, causing her to spend significant time reviewing documents which then had to be reviewed again. The documents shared with the TEC were those which NEPA had forwarded to UNDP. The project summary table as presented in the TOR was incorrect. The Final Review Report for the project was not yet available at the time the TE mission began despite UNDP's persistent requests that it be finalized following project completion. Although a shortcoming of the PMU and of NEPA as Executing Agency, it is also a shortcoming of UNDP as GEF Implementing Agency not to ensure sufficient follow up to secure this report in a timely fashion. The TE took place 3 and ½ months after project closure. The final review report should have been readily available by the time of the TE.

In addition to being more proactive as a knowledge management broker, UNDP could have assumed its role as GEF Implementing Agency in a more authoritative manner, identifying benchmarks and clear consequences of not adhering to them. If a PMU is not responsive to the PSC, or an Executing Agency is not adequately assuming their role, UNDP must step up to the plate. UNDP must understand that as GEF Implementing Agency, no matter who is to blame for what, "the buck stops here".

3.2.2 Partnerships & Institutional Arrangements

44. Involvement of partnering institutions in Jamaica was well thought out and, at least in the case of UWI, a true partnership was formed between the project and the university with the project providing the course materials and the expert to teach the new NRV course the first semester it was introduced into the university curriculum (on a trial basis), a shared teaching arrangement the second semester to enable the capacity of the university staff to be built, and finally with the university assuming all teaching and other responsibilities regarding the new and now fully incorporated course. The project correctly understood that sustainability of the effort depended on involving tertiary-level academic and training institutions and these relationships were very effective, although again, established late in the project. Had these institutional partnerships been established from the project outset, it may have been possible for the project to support actual collection of baseline data through innovative partnerships with the universities where students and professors could be involved in collected important baseline information on ecosystems and natural resources that could be used in NRV while applying the information gained to Masters theses or peer-reviewed publications.

3.2.3 Project Finance

45. The total project budget was adequate, as was the way in which it was assigned to the various project outputs.

46. Planned co-financing for the project was to total $82,000, all of which was to come from the GoJ. In addition, a total of $758,000 was expected in associated financing, $50,000 of that from the private sector (a bauxite mining company) which would pay for the EIA, and the remainder was "hopeful" financing which apparently was to be secured through a project proposal not yet written related to the ENACT programme.

Actual co-financing amounts secured are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5: ACTUAL CO-FINANCING SECURED BY THE PROJECT

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US$)		Government (mill. US$)		Partner Agencies (mill. US$)		Total (mill. US$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants								
Loans/ Concessions								
• In-kind support			.082	.047			.082	.047
• Other								
Totals			**.082**	**.047**			**.082**	**.047**

Financial management of the project was in keeping with UNDP and GoJ normal accounting procedures and was without issue according to the financial audit of the project (2010).

3.2.4 Project Time Frame & Work Planning

47. The original project time frame of three years should have been adequate for this MSP to achieve its objective even considering the newness of NRV in Jamaica. Significant delays in recruitment of consultants and inadequate steering around roadblocks, along with insufficient focus on achieving the project objective, are to blame, not the project design. The project design was weak in other ways, but not in the time frame allocated. Even with two project extensions, which together represented an addition of 42% of time over the original time frame for the project, the project was unable to achieve its objective.

48. Work planning was weak. The PMU should have begun looking for an alternative EIA right from the project inception when it was already clear that the Cockpit Country would not be the pilot project site, rather than waiting until more than two thirds of the project time had transpired before taking up that search in earnest. By the time the search was taken up in earnest, according to the Applications Branch of NEPA, there were few EIAs with which an NRV could have been effectively linked.

3.2.5 Implementation of the M&E Plan

The Project Steering Committee

49. The PSC met ten times during the project life. This was not sufficiently frequent to effectively monitor the project, especially given the difficulties with the PMU. The PSC did meet more frequently after the MTE, but still not as frequently as recommended in the MTE report.

50. Several PSC members referred to a difficult relationship with the PMU and a lack of responsiveness by the Project Manager to PSC recommendations and requests. The PSC never found an effective solution to this problem and never considered giving the Project Manager defined benchmarks that had to be achieved within certain time frames in order to continue in that position. Rather, the Project Manager was treated as any employee of NEPA would be, with a regular salary.

51. The PSC spent a disproportionate amount of time on technical reviews of project deliverables (mostly of the EVPA project which shared the same PSC), sometimes confusing that project's

deliverables with the NRV project, and significantly detracting from its effectiveness in providing overall supervision and direction to the NRV project.

52. The PSC did not effectively steer the project around both perceived and real roadblocks. The main roadblocks encountered were: 1) the need to find a new pilot project site. This required identifying another EIA for another proposed development project other than the original one planned for bauxite mining in the Cockpit Country, 2) the perceived need to wait on the outputs of the EVPA project before proceeding with the pilot project, and, 3) the need to wait for the consultant hired as the Lead Economic Expert who was otherwise occupied and thus not available to devote time to the NRV project. The first roadblock should not have been such a hurdle. It was known from the very outset of the project that bauxite mining had been suspended in the Cockpit Country since 2006. An alternative site should have been sought from the inception rather than waiting until almost the end of the project to do so. The second roadblock should not have presented a barrier. Although it would have been nice to have the NRVs done by the EVPA project, these were certainly not critical or even necessary for this pilot project. Finally, the third roadblock was created by the project itself. There was no need to hire the same consultant if he was not available within the specified time frame. If no other qualified national expertise existed, even if the prodoc called for national expertise, the decision should have been taken to hire an international consultant. If no international consultant responded to the RFP, further targeting should have taken place, including identifying universities and other institutions with NRV expertise around the world and contacting them to inform them of the project's needs.

53. Two important meetings of the PSC did *not* take place. The PSC should have met specifically to discuss in detail an Exit Strategy to ensure this represented a solid plan of action, identifying critical areas which would continue to require support and how this was to happen after project end. In addition, a final wrap-up meeting of the PSC never took place, leaving many matters pending.

The Monitoring System

54. Overall there was insufficient focus on assessing impact. The focus of the monitoring was mostly on inputs and activities, not so much on impact. The approach was more of checking things off a list of things to do. As one example, a document called Guidelines for Integrating NRV into EIAs was developed, but it is of little use as it stands because further work is required on it to distill the many recommendations made in the report into a form that can actually be taken up by decision makers, and further elaboration is required on many of the recommendations to make them more specific. Instead of insisting that the guidelines be of real practical use, the fact that they exist was viewed as sufficient. The same can be said of the Sourcebook. It exists, but there is no evidence that it will be used or that if it were to be used, it would be helpful. Other sections of this report go into further detail about the problems with both of these key project outputs.

Independent Evaluations (MTE & TE)

55. The MTE was conducted in December 2011 with only ten months left in the project (before the second extension of 3 months was granted). Numerous recommendations were made by the MTE which were, for the most part, followed by the project, although not necessarily in a timely fashion.

56. The MTE was conducted very late in the project with only ten months remaining before closure. The TE was conducted after the project closed. By that time, the PMU was of course no longer in place. The Project Manager was no longer in the country. Although the TE was conducted within the specified time period according to GEF guidance on TEs, it is best practice to conduct TEs while the PMU is still in place. The TE mission could have been better managed by UNDP (e.g., sending TEC final documents instead of drafts; timing of mission to ensure Project Manager and key consultants were in country;

ensuring TORs were accurate in reflecting revised instead of original expected outputs, a correct objective for a TE, and an accurate project summary table; sharing of inception report with Executing Agency to enable scheduling meetings before TEC arrived in country). It should be noted that the TE was originally planned for January but due to recruitment delays it did not take place until April.

3.2.6 Adaptive Project Management

57. Lack of adequate adaptive management, including, but not limited to, at the beginning of the project, is one reason why the project did not achieve its objective. The exception to this is the feedback from the MTE which was used successfully for adaptive management. As a result of the MTE, it was agreed that the NRV could be done as a non-binding exercise, making it easier to identify an EIA to which it would be attached.

58. All key entities involved in a project are responsible for ensuring adaptive management takes place as needed. An effective PMU should be most aware of the day to day needs for this, and when necessary, bring this to the attention of the Executing Agency (in this case, NEPA, where the PMU was housed). As the Executing Agency for the project, NEPA has the responsibility to engage in adaptive management as needed to ensure the project achieves its expected results and when necessary to bring certain issues to the attention of the PSC when there are questions regarding the parameters that can legitimately be applied in adaptive management. The PSC has the responsibility to be fully informed regarding how flexible a project can legally be while ensuring it is in keeping with the "contract" made with UNDP and the GEF. As the GEF Implementing Agency for a project, UNDP has the responsibility to ensure the PSC is aware of what can and can't be modified regarding the project activities and approach. In the case of this project, most key entities indicated that it was their understanding that there was little possibility to deviate from the project document even when parts of it were no longer applicable. Although there were problems with all the key entities not fully assuming their responsibilities regarding adaptive management, had UNDP been clear from the start about what types of changes could and could not have been made, this may have helped the PSC steer around both real and perceived roadblocks.

3.3 PROJECT RESULTS AND IMPACTS

3.3.1 Overall Results

59. A summary of the attainment of the overall project objective is presented in this Section, followed immediately by a summary of key project achievements, and then a description of some shortcomings. This is followed by a Review of Outcomes to Impacts in Table 7. Evaluation of the achievement of the expected Outputs is next. The TEC offers its evaluation of project achievements using the performance indicators as specified in the revised logframe. This Section (3.3.1) also includes an assessment of how relevant the project was, the degree of country ownership, the sustainability of project results, and how well the project was mainstreamed with UNDP priorities (Note: Whereas this section focuses on mainstreaming with UNDP priorities, mainstreaming with *Government* priorities is addressed in the sections on country ownership and in the section on sustainability).

Attainment of project objectives

60. The objective of the project was only partially achieved. NRV tools were "developed" but these were not truly piloted within the framework of an EIA. Draft guidelines for integrating NRV into EIAs were developed but these require significant refinement before they can be presented to decision-makers. NRV within EIA has not been institutionalized within NEPA although much greater awareness and

appreciation of this tool now exists throughout that agency. Project deliverables have not been widely disseminated and there is little awareness of their existence (the Sourcebook, the Guidelines, the Pilot Project) even by many key stakeholders. NRV tools have not been incorporated into policies and procedures governing the preparation and use of Environmental Impact Assessments.

Summary of achievements

61. Key project achievements include:

- Awareness level has been significantly raised regarding the existence, benefits, and applications of NRV through the sensitization workshops which effectively targeted a diverse set of stakeholders including policy makers, NGOs interested in sustainable development and environmental conservation, EIA practitioners and other environmental professionals, and developers.
- Inclusion of NRV in university curricula and in the curricula of the governmental institution responsible for in-service training, guarantees continued enhanced awareness of NRV and may well eventually result in a cadre of young professionals with this expertise as the curricula continue to expand.
- The technical capacity of NEPA regarding NRV has been enhanced, enabling more effective use of this tool for both decision making and for mitigation purposes, even though consultants may still need to be hired to do NRV exercises until such a time as in-house capacity exists to do this.

Main Shortcomings

62. The main shortcomings identified by the TEC are:

- Faulty project design. The project should not have specified that NRV be specifically applied within EIAs. It would have been far better to have a project to introduce the concept of NRV, investigate the various applications for it in Jamaica, and if seen to be a helpful tool, prioritize the baseline data that would be needed for NRV of Jamaica's ecosystems and natural resources, and begin to collect and collate this through partnerships with universities, NGOs, and others.
- Although draft guidelines for integrating NRV within EIAs were developed, these are not yet well enough developed and defined to allow decision-makers to discuss and decide on them. As a result of this and the lack of follow through by NEPA to ensure that draft guidelines were well developed, no policy decisions have been taken regarding use of NRV within EIA and the main questions which existed at project start regarding how NRV would be integrated into EIAs still mostly exist now after project end. An excerpt from the agenda of the last PSC is indicative, "As the project comes to a close on December 31, 2012, there are several contending issues. Should NRV be integrated in the EIA process, how should it be done and which projects would benefit from this?" These are in fact some of the same questions that were being asked at the beginning of this project and the reason why a project existed to answer them.
- There was not enough country ownership of the project or steering by the PSC to ensure that the "Guidelines", "Sourcebook", and "pilot project" would be of real practical use to the country. These are the main project tangibles and none of them are of much use.
- The technical capacity of NEPA regarding NRV has been enhanced although it is not clear whether anyone in NEPA could adequately critically assess NRVs done by others. Most NEPA employees involved in the training indicated they may be able to contribute to this as part of a

large team but as they have never been asked to apply this knowledge they are unsure about whether they could effectively do so.

- Poor project management and inadequate project steering.
- Inadequate adaptive measures applied to ensure relevance and timeliness.

3.3.2 Effectiveness and Efficiency

Achievement of Project Outputs

63. This section provides the TEC's evaluation of how well project Outputs were achieved using the GEF rating scale of HS = Highly Satisfactory; S = Satisfactory; MS = Marginally Satisfactory; MU= Marginally Unsatisfactory; U = Unsatisfactory; HU = Highly Unsatisfactory.

TABLE 6: EVALUATION OF ACHIEVEMENTS OF EXPECTED PROJECT OUTPUTS AT PROJECT END

Project Output	Evaluation					
	HS	S	MS	MU	U	HU
Output 1.1			X			
Output 1.2				X		
Output 2			X			

EFFECTIVENESS OF DEVELOPMENT & TESTING OF NRV TOOLS

Output 1.1 "Natural resource valuation tools developed." (MS)

Output 1.2 "Natural resource valuation tools piloted within the framework of an EIA." (MU)

64. A Sourcebook of NRV tools was developed and was in keeping with the description in the TOR of what the Sourcebook should be, i.e., "A Natural Resource Valuation Sourcebook, which includes a literature review, primer on natural resource valuation tools and techniques, and best practices is prepared. The Sourcebook would also contain an annex of preliminary actuarial data. The Sourcebook would be modular in format for ease of updating and produced in hard copy and Internet." Another reference in the prodoc indicates that, "Building upon an in-depth review of the literature on natural resource valuation, specialized expertise will be responsible for developing methods and approaches to undertake natural resource valuation. This will form the basis of a reference sourcebook for practitioners, modeled after the 1997 primer on Concepts and Techniques of Natural Resource Valuation prepared for the United States Department of Energy." The prodoc goes on to indicate that, "Actuarial expertise will be used to create core actuarial products. These include input data for modeling environmental risk associated with natural resource exploitation and degradation and developing monitoring systems and validation tests. Core actuarial products will be limited to the pilot project…"

65. Notwithstanding the fact that the Sourcebook is indeed what was asked for, with the exception that it does not contain an annex of "preliminary actuarial data", and is not on the Internet, the Sourcebook does not seem to serve any practical purpose other than as an academic exercise that may generate a peer-reviewed publication. There is no indication that it will in fact be used or that it will be regularly updated. No one with whom the TEC met outside of NEPA, UNDP and some (although not all) members of the PSC, were aware of the Sourcebook. When potential future practitioners of NRV were shown the Sourcebook by the TEC, they did not see its utility. There is no plan to update/revise the

Sourcebook and no funds to do so. This is a design as well as a project management and country ownership issue.

66. This TEC does not see the utility of the Sourcebook as described in the prodoc and as it currently exists. A practical reference for practitioners would have been useful if it had included the following: 1) a comprehensive listing and review of NRVs done in Jamaica and in the Caribbean, 2) a list (with names and contact information) of NRV practitioners in Jamaica, in the Caribbean and in the world who are able to teach NRV, those able to do NRV, and those able to critically review and assess NRVs done by others, 3) a list of institutions of excellence in NRV, 4) a comprehensive listing of available valuation data on ecosystems and natural resources which exist in Jamaica and where this data can be gotten along with a description of any data access issues, 5) a list of available valuation data on ecosystems and natural resources from around the world that could be used to value Jamaica's similar ecosystems and natural resources when this data is not available for Jamaica and a description of the issues to be considered when using non-Jamaica data and applying to Jamaican ecosystems for valuation purposes, 6) issues particular to Jamaica that affect NRV (e.g. high inflation rates). There was no need in the opinion of the TEC to re-invent the wheel regarding a primer on NRV. Good materials exist which explain NRV and they are in English.

67. False and/or tenuous assumptions were made that were not adequately critically analyzed including the assumption that: 1) certain NRV tools are relevant to certain countries, and, 2) adding NRV onto EIAs would improve decision making capabilities regarding proposed development projects. Regarding the first assumption, a variety of NRV methodologies exist. These are not particular to a country but rather are specific to each particular situation. There is no one NRV tool that is "most appropriate to the Jamaican context". Disproportionate attention was given to one methodology, "stated preference", in the Sourcebook. This caused a great deal of energy to be focused on whether that was the most appropriate methodology when really the more appropriate question was why are we asking this question when there is no single methodology that is most appropriate to all situations. Rather, the methodology to be used will depend on the specific context. Neither the prodoc, the PSC nor the PMU asked the right question. The analysis of the second assumption has been addressed in the section of this report dealing with project design.

68. The fact that a significant proportion of project funds and energy was directed toward the production of a Sourcebook for which nobody really understood its purpose or whom the end users of it would be, indicates a lack of country ownership. If this were a product considered worthwhile by NEPA, its use would have been clarified from the beginning. The rating assigned by the TEC for the effectiveness of this output would be lower than "MS" except that, unfortunately, what was asked for was mostly done.

69. A pilot NRV project was done, but does not serve the purpose of piloting NRV within the framework of an EIA. The pilot was done with only a few months remaining before project closure. This meant that it did not serve to inform either the guidelines or the Sourcebook, both of which were done before the pilot project. Although a great deal of effort went into identifying an alternative EIA to which the NRV could be attached, in the end, the NRV exercise was basically conducted as a stand-alone NRV. The developer of the proposed development project never even saw the NRV. By the time this NRV was done for the pilot project site, four other NRVs had already been completed in Jamaica. Thus, it is unclear what value was added, if any, by this so-called pilot project as it was not significantly different from doing a stand-alone NRV exercise and did not, as one would have hoped, document the step-by-step process undertaken, along with difficulties encountered along the way, how these were addressed, special issues to consider, etc.. Even more detailed TORs for the pilot project, although these would have been helpful, would not have rectified this situation as the pilot project was simply done far too late in the project life to be able to serve the intended purpose. Finally, lessons learned from the pilot were not

widely disseminated, as was called for, probably in part because not many lessons were learned as a result of the approach adopted. As called for in the prodoc, a consultant was contracted to describe lessons learned, but due to the late start of the pilot project, the Pilot was being conducted at the same time the lessons learned assignment was being undertaken. Therefore, the pilot project report was not available before the lessons learned assignment was completed. Consequently no comparisons could be made between what the draft Guidelines called for and what actually happened.

EFFECTIVENESS OF CAPACITY BUILDING EFFORTS TO DEVELOP THE HUMAN AND INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES TO MANAGE NRV TOOLS AND ACTUARIAL DATA

Output 2. "Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes." (MS)

70. This project brought about a much enhanced awareness of NRV and its potential applications in a wide variety of stakeholders in Jamaica including Government entities, universities and other tertiary-level training institutions, NGOs, and communities. This is the greatest success of the project. As a result of this newfound awareness, stakeholders found uses for NRV outside the intended scope defined by the project, i.e., within the context of EIAs. NRV is now being used as a tool in mitigation cases related to environmental damage/degradation in Jamaica. This would not likely have been the case without this project.

71. Although not accomplished during the life of the project, it does seem likely that NRV will be used to complement EIAs. Finalizing and agreeing on guidelines for integrating NRV into EIAs is included in NEPA's 2013 Annual Operating Plan and there was agreement by all parties concerned that a detailed exit strategy would be developed that would detail the necessary actions to make this integration a reality. New regulations for EIAs will be drafted this year which, if approved, will significantly enhance the effectiveness of EIAs and this will provide the necessary foundation to enable effective use of NRV within the EIA context.

72. The project's training efforts were helpful. The capacity related to NRV was clearly enhanced but not to the level expected according to the prodoc and revised logframe. This shortcoming was not due to inadequate time, as several stakeholders indicated, but rather to lack of a strategic approach to the training. More emphasis should have been placed on criteria used to select the persons to be trained. Those possessing the necessary educational and experiential foundation, and with the most immediate and direct need for applying the training, should have been sent abroad to acquire the necessary training. Fewer people would have been trained, but these would have achieved the level required to be able to apply their training.

73. There was also some confusion in the training regarding whether the expected outcome was greater awareness of NRV and its potential applications in Jamaica or whether the participants were expected to be able to actually do NRV or even critically analyze an NRV done by others. Because of this lack of clarity, many of those who went through several weeks of training and who were exposed to a level of detail that goes far beyond basic awareness, only took away a good solid awareness of NRV, i.e., a one day seminar would have had the same impact at a much lower cost.

74. Incorporating NRV into the curricula of the universities and training institution was particularly strategic and effective and will undoubtedly enhance sustainability of the project effort. This effort was highly successful and strategic although the TEC believes that even more could have been done to involve university students and professors in acquiring baseline data important for the country while enhancing further their capacity related to NRV.

75. The rating assigned for effectiveness of the project's capacity building efforts is S because, although awareness raising was highly successful, as was incorporation of NRV into tertiary-level academic and training institutions, training was helpful (although not as efficient as could be) but capacity was not enhanced to the level expected.

3.3.3 Impact

Review of Outcomes to Impacts

76. The GEF recognizes that, given relatively short project time frames (most projects averaging 3 to 5 years), many GEF-supported projects, and in particular MSPs, will not fully achieve the desired impact within the project period. To describe the likelihood that expected project outcomes will eventually be translated into intended impacts, the UNDP/GEF Evaluation Office recently outlined the "Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI)" methodology which provides an indication of the overall likelihood of achieving the desired impact through evaluating both the achievement of outcomes as well as the progress towards intermediate states. The methodology uses an A to D rating scale to rate achievement of outcomes and to rate progress toward what is referred to as "intermediate states". The overall likelihood of achieving the impact is rated with a combined rating. The rating scale is described in full in Annex 1.

TABLE 7: REVIEW OF OUTCOMES TO IMPACTS AT PROJECT END

Component	Findings	Review of Outcomes to Impacts
Outcomes		
Outcome 1: "At the end of the project, the Government of Jamaica will be better able to make more informed decisions by placing greater value to ecosystem functions within the framework of environmental impact assessments of development projects. Specifically, the environmental impacts of all major development projects would be assessed in terms of their financial and economic values, which would be used to make more informed decisions and choices about future development."	The GoJ is better able to make more informed decisions by placing greater value to ecosystems but has not yet applied NRV within the framework of environmental impact assessments of development projects. No assessment of major (or other) development projects has been done to date using NRV although there have been positive moves in that direction (e.g., Mention was made by NEPA of the need to quantify ecosystem services in relation to a proposed road that would cut through most of the country's major watersheds. Nevertheless, there is no concrete plan to actually follow through with that quantification.). Regulations have been drafted to enhance EIAs and it seems likely that the Ministry will approve their further elaboration this year. Once in place, these new regulations will greatly improve the framework within which NRV would exist. Although Guidelines for integrating NRV into EIAs were produced by the project, these guidelines require further elaboration and refinement before they can be taken up by policy makers. There is movement toward institutionalization in that NRV is now part of NEPA's 2013 Annual Operating Plan. Moreover, universities and tertiary level training institutions have fully incorporated NRV into their curricula. Thus, the measures designed to move towards intermediate states have started, but have not yet produced results.	BC

In a strict interpretation of the rating scale, the project's intended outcomes were not delivered, which would signify a rating of "D". Such a rating would obviate the need to assign the second part of the rating. The TEC believes, however, that would not accurately reflect the contribution of the project. A more accurate assessment, using an adaptation of the ROtI method, indicates that even though the outcome was not achieved, there are measures designed to move towards intermediate states which have started even though they have not yet produced the specified results. Thus, the Project is moderately likely to contribute to the global environmental benefits described in the objectives it set out to achieve.

3.3.4 Relevancy

77. Although the relevancy of NRV to Jamaica is clear, the relevancy (including timeliness and readiness) of a project that specifically aimed to integrate NRV into EIAs in Jamaica is questionable, especially given the recognized weaknesses of EIA guidelines and practices in Jamaica and the fact that doing NRV as part of EIAs is not a common practice anywhere in the world. The project may have been more relevant if it had left the door open regarding NRV, i.e., introduce the concept and enhance awareness regarding the range of its possible applications (not only as a decision tool related to proposed development projects but also as a tool that could be useful in mitigation and in other ways). Nevertheless, the project was well aligned with Jamaica's "Vision 2030" in that NRV serves as a tool that can help decision makers ensure that development is environmentally sound and sustainable, and the project clearly raised awareness regarding NRV and its applications.

78. The project's development objective is relevant to the GEF under the "Cross-Cutting Development" strategic objective. The NCSA Capacity Development Action Plan for Jamaica which resulted from the NCSA prioritization process highlighted incorporation of NRV into EIA process as a way to maximize Jamaica's ability to meet their obligations under the Rio Conventions while meeting the goal of environmental protection.

79. The project supports the Jamaica 2012-2016 UNDAF Outcome 1: National, local authorities and most vulnerable communities island-wide improve natural resource management. This is also aligned to Vision 2030 Jamaica, Goal 4: Jamaica has a healthy natural environment, National Outcomes #13 and 14: Sustainable Management and Use of Environmental and Natural Resources. The project is also of direct relevance to the MDGs (MDG 7: Ensure environmental sustainability), and to UNDP's focus on environmental conservation and capacity building.

3.3.5 Country Ownership

80. **Country ownership of the project is deemed MS.** Although there appears to be great interest in NRV, the country ownership of the project and its objectives was not as strong as the interest in NRV itself perhaps because the project was specifically to integrate NRV into EIAs. NEPA has clearly adopted NRV as a helpful tool in mitigation cases (without any project to help them do so), but has taken no action to date on reviewing or taking policy decisions on the guidance developed through this project to integrate NRV into EIAs. The interest regarding NRV in NEPA, although generally strong, varies significantly, with much less interest or ownership of the concept and its application demonstrated in one of the key divisions of NEPA which would be using it, the Applications Branch.

81. The project is well aligned and consistent with "sustainable use and management of environment and natural resources", one of Jamaica's environmental priorities which is reflected in Vision 2030 Jamaica as well as in the 2009-2012 Medium-Term Plan.

82. Adoption of enabling policies, regulations and guidelines is an important indicator of country ownership. The project itself supported the elaboration of guidelines for integrating NRV into EIAs but

no action has been taken on these, not even to ensure they are in a form that would enable a serious discussion about them. On the other hand, a proposal to draft much improved regulations pertaining to EIAs has been submitted by NEPA to the relevant Ministry and according to communications with the Ministry, these are likely to be approved this year. This was not part of this project effort but will significantly help to ensure the success of this project.

3.3.6 Sustainability and Project Exit Strategy

83. **Overall likelihood of sustainability is ML**. According to GEF guidelines, sustainability is based on several dimensions including financial resources, socio-political considerations, institutional framework and governance factors, and environmental factors. Each risk dimension of sustainability is deemed to be critical and therefore, according to GEF guidelines, the overall rating for sustainability cannot be higher than the rating of the dimension with the lowest rating. Please refer to Annex 1 for the GEF rating scale used to assess sustainability.

TABLE 8: ANALYSIS OF RISKS THAT MAY AFFECT PERSISTENCE OF PROJECT OUTCOMES

Financial Resources Sustainability (Moderately Likely – ML)
Lack of financial resources will not present major impediments to continued use of NRV within the context of mitigation, but may present an impediment to the use of NRV within the context of EIAs. When used as a tool to estimate mitigation costs, if the mitigation is successful, the cost of the NRV is recovered. This is not the case when using NRV as a tool to help decision makers decide whether a proposed development is in the country's interest or not, i.e., within the context of an EIA. Although no decision has yet been taken, it seems likely that developers will be asked to incur the incremental cost to include a valuation of natural resources among the evaluation criteria of EIAs if this is ultimately required. In this case, the GoJ would not incur this cost but would still incur a cost for reviewing the NRV to ensure it was scientifically rigorous and statistically sound. As the capacity to do this does not currently exist in NEPA, this expertise would need to be contracted. There is a moderate risk that financial resources would not be made available for this purpose.
Socio-political Sustainability (Moderately Likely – ML)
The awareness level has been very significantly and successfully raised regarding the existence and benefits of NRV and the various applications of NRV in Jamaica. It seems clear that the use of NRV will continue and increase, but it is not clear whether this will be the case as NRV relates specifically to EIAs. A policy framework regarding the use of NRV within the context of EIAs has not yet been elaborated although draft guidelines for integrating NRV within EIAs have been prepared by the project. These guidelines still require refinement before they can be presented to decision makers. Even if policies are adopted regarding the need to do NRVs as part of EIAs, until the EIA guidelines themselves are strengthened, this will be of little practical benefit to the country. Draft regulations for enhancing EIAs were prepared and submitted to the relevant Ministry in December 2011 for approval. According to the TEC's communication with that Ministry, these are expected to be approved this year. NRV is not specifically mentioned in the current draft and where it might be interpreted as being possible, it is only within the context of mitigation, not within the approval process. According to the Chair of the NRCA, the opportunity still exists to improve the draft and it seems that there is sufficient socio-political interest in doing so. NEPA, UWI, UTECH, MIND all expressed interest in continuing and expanding on the use of NRV. This enhances prospects for sustainability, especially as new capacity will be built to enable applying this tool through the incorporation of NRV at three of the nation's important tertiary level academic and

training institutions. Considering the above, there are only moderate risks to social-political sustainability.
Institutional Framework and Governance Sustainability (Moderately Likely – ML)
NEPA's institutional capacity regarding understanding of the applications for, and the use of, NRV has clearly been enhanced, but NEPA does not yet have the capacity to do NRVs themselves and it is questionable whether NEPA staff or TRC members have the capacity to adequately critically analyze an NRV done by others. One NEPA employee who participated in the training believes he is capable of critically reviewing an NRV done by others, and a few people who participated in the training believe they could do an NRV if they did it as part of a team with others with more experience. The trainer who did the advanced level NRV training indicated that he did not feel that any of the trainees had achieved the level of being able to do an NRV. There are, according to the various interviews conducted by the TEC, likely 4 persons in Jamaica who now have this capacity but none of these are at NEPA or are part of the TRC. NEPA does have an economist (currently on maternity leave), but she has stated to NEPA that she is not comfortable with NEPA depending on her to conduct or review NRVs as she has been much more focused on environmental management and not so much on economics. The institutional capacity of NEPA was strengthened not only as this relates to NRV within EIAs, but even more broadly in applying NRV as a useful tool in mitigation cases and in pollution incident reporting. In addition, several linkages were established or strengthened with other Government entities such as MIND, with whom NEPA might otherwise not have interacted to such an extent, and with two leading universities (UWI and UTECH), leading to a more effective overall effort. Both UWI and UTECH have fully integrated NRV into their core curricula and have enhanced their own institutional capacities to be able now to effectively teach these courses with no external assistance
Environmental Sustainability (Not Applicable – NA)
Due to the nature of this project (a capacity building initiative), environmental factors are not relevant to the sustainability of this project effort.

Project Exit Strategy

84. Even though the project has ended, the TEC recommends that an Exit Strategy be elaborated by NEPA, and once finalized, a last PSC meeting be jointly convened by PIOJ and NEPA to discuss it and to decide on a concrete plan of action to address pending matters.

85. An effective Exit Strategy can significantly enhance sustainability of project results. Unfortunately, no exit strategy was prepared by this project. As a result of the TE, NEPA has agreed to prepare an exit strategy which it will attach to the final draft of the Final Review Report for the project (still in draft at the time of the TE).

86. Exit Strategies should be realistic analyses of what still needs to be done to ensure the desired project impact is achieved. The strategy should identify and prioritize needed follow-on actions, and develop a plan for pursuing those actions. Exit strategies should place special attention on identifying project outcomes in jeopardy of *not* being achieved/sustainable.

87. Development of a meaningful exit strategy requires time and resources and should, in future, be considered as an actual expected output of a project. It should be drafted at a stage in the project at which there is still enough time to implement measures to enhance sustainability, normally ¾ of the way through project implementation, with ¼ of the project time still remaining. Exit strategies should also define where specific follow-on financial support is critical to sustainability of project outcomes. Exit strategies can include plans to convene donor roundtables (where appropriate, facilitated by UNDP) and other ways to approach donors to determine their interest in supporting identified follow-on actions.

3.3.7 Mainstreaming

88. This project helped Jamaica strengthen its national capacity to manage the environment in a sustainable way through the introduction of a tool, NRV, which can, if applied correctly, help build the capacity to integrate environmental considerations into development plans and strategies. NRV is already being effectively mainstreamed into NEPA's operations in the area of pollution incident reporting and in mitigation. If it is to be mainstreamed within EIAs, a policy decision will be required, guidelines will have to be agreed, and NEPA will have to assign specific staff the responsibility of critically assessing the quality of NRVs done by the private sector, providing them with additional training as required.

3.3.8 Cross-Exchange of Information & Replicability

89. The application of NRV in NEPA's pollution incident reporting and in cases in which NEPA has entered into mitigation with those who have harmed ecosystems or natural resources is evidence of replication and further adaptation of concepts introduced by this project. It also demonstrates that there has been cross-exchange of information and experience between the PMU and within the larger NEPA institutional context. This is a good indicator that there will be continued replication and use of NRV not only in the context of EIAs but also in other ways of perhaps even more immediate application.

90. Cross exchange of information and experience between this project and the Economic Valuation of Protected Areas project, a global UNDP project on NRV which was ongoing at the same time, was good in many ways but not helpful in other ways. Although the PSC was fully aware of the EVPA project (as the same PSC served for both projects), and as a great deal of information was shared between the projects, there is no evidence that lessons gleaned from the NRVs done for the three protected areas were applied to the pilot NRV done for the JPS site for this project. Also of concern is the fact that the same consultant who was hired to do the EVPA project was hired for this project despite serious concerns by the PSC regarding the quality of his work. Finally, there was little cross-exchange of information between the various project outputs, e.g., the Sourcebook developed by this project was not referenced in training materials nor do participants recall that it was ever mentioned, and the Guidelines for integrating NRV into EIAs which were developed by this project do not reference the Sourcebook or vice-versa.

91. As part of the project replication strategy, the prodoc called for wide distribution of products such as the Sourcebook and the report of the pilot project, but these have not been widely circulated or posted on the web. Even if they had been widely disseminated it is doubtful this would have significantly contributed to replication. The Sourcebook is more of an academic exercise which includes an extensive literature review, and the pilot project report, which would have had the greatest potential for promoting replicability, does not serve this purpose as it is not a documentation of what was done with lessons learned along the way, but simply an actual NRV of a site. Finally, a "lessons learned" document was produced but deals mostly with project evaluation and not so much with lessons that would enable replication of the effort.

4. CONCLUSIONS, LESSONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 CONCLUSIONS

The significant effort put into this project by NEPA, UNDP and members of the PSC is not reflected in the project outputs. One fifth of the budget of this $552,250 MSP was returned to the GEF at the end of four years and three months after two project extensions and without fully achieving the project objective or the expected outcome. All three expected outputs were achieved, although with the exception of the output related to awareness-raising, training and incorporation into tertiary level academic institutions, not in a timely or efficient fashion, and in most cases either not contributing significantly to the project objective or of mediocre quality.

Although NRV can be a helpful tool and relevant to Jamaica, the project's relevance would have been greater had it been about enhancing awareness and capacity related to NRV without stipulating that NRV had to be done within the specific context of EIAs (which themselves suffer from important shortcomings that were known and acknowledged at the time the project was designed). A more flexible approach which would have left the decision to Government regarding how best they wished to use NRV would have been more appropriate given the newness of the tool in Jamaica, the recognized weaknesses of the EIA guidelines along with a poor implementation record, and the existence of other relevant and immediate applications for NRV, including as a tool in mitigation cases related to environmental damage.

The project was not particularly well managed and was poorly steered despite an enthusiastic and committed core group of PSC members who misdirected much of their energy to technical reviews of project deliverables while losing site of the bigger picture, the project itself. The project management required strong direction, and neither the PSC nor UNDP in its capacity of GEF Implementing Agency provided effective direction, even if many suggestions were offered.

At the end of this project, most of the critical barriers to integrating NRV within EIAs still exist, including inadequate baseline data, inadequate capacity, and lack of specific guidelines and policy directives regarding how this should be done.

Despite the project weaknesses, it is clear that NRV will continue and increase in applications in Jamaica. This is due largely to the effective and strategic sensitization/awareness raising activities conducted by the project and the highly effective and strategic institutionalization of NRV within key higher learning institutions.

To take full advantage of the project's accomplishments, several actions are now required without further delay. Key amongst these is development of a detailed exit strategy and a wrap up meeting of the PSC to discuss the exit strategy and to assign responsibilities and deadlines for follow on actions.

4.2 LESSONS

92. Lessons gleaned from this project are presented below. Sharing these lessons is intended to help ensure the project's impact continues to be felt after project end, and to be helpful in ensuring that future projects in Jamaica and elsewhere around the world learn from this project experience.

Lesson # & Topic	Lesson
#1 Definition of critical barriers	It is essential to clearly define the critical barriers standing in the way of accomplishing the expected outcome of a project and not to define them in general terms such as barriers to achieving global environmental objectives.
# 2 Project Relevance	The Government entity responsible for coordinating external assistance must ensure that GEF projects are relevant and responsive to the country's priority needs. If a project does not meet these criteria, it should be modified to ensure it is relevant before project signing. (NRV within EIA or just NRV)
# 3 Prodoc	The project document serves as a guide. If situations change, the prodoc does not have to be adhered to so strictly as to disallow for adaptive management.
# 4 PSC	The PSC should not be used as a mechanism to ensure institutionalization. This is better achieved by other means.
# 5 PSC	The PSC should not be used as a mechanism to achieve transparency. This is better achieved by other means.
# 6 PSC	The Chair of the PSC should not be a staff member of the Executing Agency.
# 7 PSC	The Secretary of the PSC should not be the Project Manager.
# 8 PSC	Although the existence of, and TOR for, a PSC should be specified in the prodoc, the specific composition of the PSC should not be specified in the prodoc but should be determined at project inception.
# 9 PSC	The PSC size should be kept small, normally not to exceed 5 members. Few benefits are derived from large PSCs, while there are significant drawbacks including reduced sense of accountability and ownership by PSC members.
# 10 PSC	The purpose of the PSC is to steer a project, not to conduct detailed reviews of technical project deliverables/documents. Technical working groups can be established for that purpose. PSC members may serve on technical working groups, as may others not directly associated with the project.
# 11 PSC	The TOR for the PSC must clearly and comprehensively outline its tasks, responsibilities, and authority, as well as the relationship between the PSC and the PMU, and the relationship between the PSC and UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency.
# 12 PSC	An inception workshop for the PSC would be a helpful standard practice to help orient new PSCs. This would help ensure they understand their TORs and their authority at the very outset.
# 13 PSC	The PSC must be crystal clear on what is intended by each of the project outputs described in a prodoc and must ensure they are relevant and reflecting of priority needs. Time lapses between project conceptualization and project start are often significant for GEF projects. This means situations may well have changed by the time a project begins. It is the responsibility of the PSC to ensure at project outset that activities and outputs are still relevant. If these require modification, even if additional authorization is required, these changes must be pursued rather than simply adhering to a prodoc because it specifies something that was called for when the project was conceptualized.
# 14 PSC & PMU	Rarely are the same individuals who drafted a prodoc involved in project implementation. The PSC and the PMU must be clear on what is intended by each of the project outputs described in the prodoc, and as indicated above, must ensure these are still what is most needed. If not, adaptive management must be employed from the very inception of a project to ensure project funds are well spent. (sourcebook)
# 15	If the PMU fails to suggest adequate wrap up of the project, the PSC must take

PSC	responsibility for ensuring this happens, taking note of what you have, what you still need, and where you are in your exit strategy.
# 16 UNDP as GEF IA	As the GEF Implementing Agency, UNDP should assume its role as knowledge management broker, ensuring that lessons and best practices from around the world are brought to the attention of a PSC and PMU and that this is done proactively in order to promote the application of these practices and lessons from the outset thereby avoiding common pitfalls and obviating the need to fix problems by preventing them from the beginning. (ex: exit strategies, wrap up PSC meetings, delivering on time, contracting, TOR, composition and functioning of PSCs
# 17 UNDP as GEF IA	In its capacity as GEF Implementing Agency, "the buck stops here", applies to UNDP. If an Executing Agency is not effectively managing a project for whatever reason, no matter how understanding those reasons may be, and if a PSC cannot effectively steer a project around the roadblocks it encounters for whatever reasons, UNDP must step up to the plate to take the necessary actions to ensure the project is either on the right path and driving along at the right speed to achieve the expected project results or, if this is not possible, must take action to stop a project from going further down the wrong road. Ultimately, it is UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency for a project that is accountable to the GEF and must ensure that the projects for which it serves this purpose are effective, efficient, and of good quality. (understand your authority and act on it)
# 18 UNDP as GEF IA	If a project is experiencing difficulties, it is even more important to conduct an independent evaluation as soon as possible rather than postponing for lack of products to show. An independent evaluation can provide useful advice on identifying and removing roadblocks.
# 19 UNDP as GEF IA	Plan for terminal project evaluations to take place while the PMU is still in place rather than after a project has closed.
# 20 UNDP as GEF IA	Ensure information regarding evaluation missions is shared as early as possible with the PMU to allow for efficient evaluation mission execution.
# 21 PIOJ & UNDP	The choice of Executing Agency for a project should involve critical analysis to determine who is best suited to play this role not only according to the thematic focus of the entity but also their track record, ….
# 22 Executing Agency	Compensate Project Managers using a pay system dependent upon project achievements rather than as regular employees. Time benchmarks should be established by which specific project achievements are expected and if these are not achieved, recourse should be specified in contracts including non-continuation of services.
# 23 PMU	The PMU, rather than a consultant, should assume primary responsibility for collating and documenting lessons from a project and this should be an ongoing process from project inception to closure.
# 24 PMU	The PMU must be responsive to the PSC, not vice-versa. The PMU also has the responsibility to be analytical and pro-active in bringing issues to the attention of a PSC in a timely manner and even more than this, suggesting a variety of options for resolving these issues for consideration by the PSC. The PMU knows the project most intimately and must assume.
# 25 PMU	The PMU must assume the role of quality control to ensure that project outputs are not only timely but also of good quality.
# 26 PMU	Exercise the leverage you have as a PMU. Do not pay until you get what you expect. Ensure this is clear in contracts.
# 27 PMU	If you are unable to attract the expertise you seek for a project through normal advertisement, use innovative and allowable means of targeting including identifying

	institutions of excellence in the specific field of interest and informing them of your search.
# 28 TOR	TOR for consultancies and for the development of products (deliverables) must be very clear and detailed. In the case of technical documents (such as the Sourcebook), an outline of the chapters along with a brief description of what is expected in each chapter, should be part of the TOR. If the deliverable is recommended policy guidelines, a concise, yet specific, listing of recommendations regarding guidelines should be included in the Executive Summary. Good TOR are an essential requisite for good products and project outputs. Although outputs and other deliverables are normally intensively scrutinized, the TOR guiding the development of these deliverables is normally given less scrutiny. It may be especially helpful in NEX projects for UNDP Country Offices to assist in developing strong TOR.
# 29 NEX	One of the main justifications for NEX is to promote institutionalization within the Executing Agency. PMUs are not intended to be stand-alone units but should be fully integrated with the Executing Agency.
# 30 NEX	A Project Manager gains a lot of experience and their capacity, related both to project management as well as to the technical subject matter, is significantly enhanced as a result. To enhance institutionalization and sustainability, the Executing Agency should investigate ways of ensuring this enhanced capacity is not lost to their institution.
# 31 Exit Strategy	Development of an exit strategy is key to project success and sustainability. Development of the exit strategy should begin well before project end, usually with ¼ of the project time remaining to ensure adequate time to implement needed measures to enhance sustainability. Providing guidelines for the development of Exit Strategies may help ensure these are hard-core, realistic, analyses of what still needs to be done to ensure the desired project impact is achieved, and to prioritize these actions. Development of a meaningful Exit Strategy requires time and resources and should be considered as an actual Expected Output of a project. Exit Strategies should define where specific follow-on financial support is critical to sustainability of project outcomes. Exit strategies can include plans to convene donor roundtables (where appropriate, facilitated by UNDP) to identify donors interested in supporting identified follow-on actions. These strategies should focus on identifying project outcomes in jeopardy of *not* being sustainable, not on trying to convince readers that they are.
# 32 PMU & PSC	Returning funds allocated to a project when the project objective has not been achieved sends the message to the GEF that either absorptive capacity doesn't exist in the country or the country doesn't need the funds. This may have negative implications for future funding.
# 33 UNDP	GEF projects should not be used as a mechanism to channel TRAC funds which are not directly related to the achievement of project objectives.

4.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

93. The recommendations outlined below are intended to be helpful to this project in ensuring its impact continues to be felt after project end. Many of these recommendations were discussed with the entities responsible for implementing them while the TEC was in Jamaica. There was a very positive response to these recommendations by all key stakeholders and action is already being taken to implement some of them.

Recommendation # 1: Convene a meeting between high-level representatives of PIOJ, the Ministry, and UNDP to discuss the lessons highlighted by this project experience.		
Task &Entity Tasked	***Time frame***	***Deliverable***
Convene meeting (Ministry or PIOJ)	Within 1 month after submission of FinalTE report	
Recommendation # 2: Prepare an exit strategy.		
Task& Entity Tasked	***Time frame***	***Deliverable***
Draft Exit Strategy. NEPA	By 6/15/13	Exit Strategy
Recommendation # 3: Convene a final meeting of the PSC to review the draft exit strategy and agree on a plan of action to wrap up pending matters.		
Task & Entity Tasked	***Time frame***	***Deliverable***
Convene final PSC meeting. NEPA	By early July 2013	Minutes of the final PSC
Recommendation # 4: Host a wrap up meeting within 3 months after the last PSC meeting to discuss what has been done on the action plan.		
Task & Entity Tasked	***Time frame***	***Deliverable***
NEPA & PIOJ to co-host meeting.	7/15/13	Minutes of the wrap-up meeting
Recommendation # 5: Under its existing MOU with UWI, NEPA should approach UWI (especially the department of UWI which has incorporated NRV into its curriculum) regarding the possibility of engaging MSc students and Professors in gathering and updating baseline data regarding Jamaica's critical ecosystems, species and habitats for use in conducting future NRVs as well as for other possible application.		
Task& Entity Tasked	***Time frame***	***Deliverable***
NEPA	7/15/13	
Recommendation # 6: Post the Sourcebook on the NEPA website and inform key stakeholders of its posting. Draft a detailed outline of the sections of the Sourcebook that will be included in its next rendition based on consultations with NRV practitioners in Jamaica.	7/1/13	Sourcebook posted on web. Outline of new sections to include in next rendition of Sourcebook

ANNEXES

ANNEX I. TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Piloting Natural Resource Valuation within Environmental Impact Assessments* (PIMS 3619)

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Piloting Natural Resource Valuation within Environmental Impact Assessments			
GEF Project ID:	3619		*at endorsement (Million US$)*	*at completion (Million US$)*
UNDP Project ID:	00070518	GEF financing:	0.470	0.380
Country:	Jamaica	IA/EA own:		
Region:	LAC	Government:	0.082	0.047
Focal Area:	Multi focal Area	Other:	0.001	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Capacity Building	Total co-financing:		
Executing Agency:	National Environment and Planning Agency	Total Project Cost:	0.553	0.427
Other Partners involved:		ProDoc Signature (date project began):		September 2008
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: August 2011	Actual: December 2012

OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from

this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The evaluation will also collate and analyze specific lessons and best practices pertaining to the strategies employed, and implementation arrangements, which may be of relevance to other projects in the country and elsewhere in the world.

The evaluation will also evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of project design, implementation, monitoring and adaptive management and sustainability of project outcomes, including the project exit strategy.

BACKGROUND

"This project will strengthen the implementation of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA), as well as contribute to the implementation of Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEAs) through the development and application of natural resource valuation tools. In particular, the project will work in parallel with the Environmental Action Programme (ENACT), as SEAs are undertaken on various sectoral policies, programmes and plans. The project will 'top-up' ENACT's capacity development activities of training and sensitization of the value of SEAs, and enforcement and compliance of EIAs with training and sensitization on the utility of natural resource valuation as a means to meeting both national and global environmental objectives over the long-term."

"The development of natural resource valuation tools will provide an opportunity for these to be institutionalized as part of ENACT Programme's capacity development activities. In this way, SEAs will be greatly improved in being able to make better predictions of possible consequences of policy interventions, facilitating the development of strategies to reduce policy resistances and facilitate the consideration of environmental risks and impacts associated with the implementation of government policies. By providing a more robust and comparable valuation method for natural resources, consequences of development policies, programmes and plans will be better evaluated so as to promote biodiversity conservation; minimize, if not reduce the risks associated with land degradation; encourage climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies; and promote environmentally sound and sustainable development. The Mid Term Review took place during month 39 - 40 of the project.

The project directly supports the Jamaica 2012-1016 UNDAF Outcome 1: National, local authorities and most vulnerable communities island-wide improve natural resource management and resilience to disasters (FAO, IAEA, PAHO, UNDP, UNEP, UNESCO) This outcome epitomizes effective and efficient governance of natural resources, enhanced disaster risk reduction and better preparedness and response measures, and energy security recognizing their importance for human development particularly for the poor and vulnerable. This is also aligned to Vision 2030 Jamaica Goal 3: Jamaica's economy is prosperous; National Outcome #10: Energy Security and Efficiency and Goal 4: Jamaica has a healthy natural environment; National Outcomes #13 and 14: Sustainable Management and Use of Environmental and Natural Resources; Hazard Risk Reduction and Adaptation to Climate Change. The UNCT in cooperation with the Government and national partners will focus efforts on creating an enabling environment for better management of natural and cultural resources, disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation, as well as improving energy security to positively enhance the human development of vulnerable people.

Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation:

The GEF Terminal Evaluation was commissioned to review achievements made during the period September 2008 to December 2012. The Evaluation addresses the Outcomes:

Project Objective: "The objective of this project is to develop a set of natural resource valuation tools, and incorporate these into policies and procedures governing the preparation and use of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA)."

Project Outcome: "At the end of the project, the Government of Jamaica will be better enabled to make more informed decisions by placing greater value to ecosystem functions within the framework of environmental impact assessments of development projects. Specifically, the environmental impacts of all major development projects would be assessed in terms of their financial and economic values, which would be used to make more informed decisions and choices about future development."

Component 1: "Development of a set of actuarial data associated with ecosystem goods and services, natural resource commodities, opportunity cost of environmental damage arising from land degradation, among others."

Component 2: "Improving the decision-making process by using data and information on the economic and financial value of ecosystem functions within the framework of EIAs."

Outcome Indicator 1: The opportunity costs associated with the healthy maintenance of ecosystem goods and services are *estimated* during the implementation of EIAs, indicated by a section of the EIA report on natural resource valuation.

Output 1.1: "Develop a set of natural resource valuation tools, which will form an integral part of the implementation procedures of the Environmental Impact Assessments and the Strategic Environmental Assessments."

Output 1.2: "Pilot the incorporation of natural resource valuation tools into the EIA process.

Outcome Indicator 2: "The opportunity costs associated with the healthy maintenance of ecosystem goods and services are *determinant variables* in the approval processes of permitting and licensing. The extent to which meeting minutes and reports include a deliberation on the conditions of development and alternative options, including but not limited to the NRCA Board, will indicate this. The extent to which natural resource valuation data and information will result in more environmentally friendly, sound and sustainable development options of development project is uncertain."

Output 2: "Strengthen the capacities of the NEPA to use natural resource valuation within the EIA process in a cost-effective, transparent, and timely manner."

Project Mid Term Review

A mid-term review was conducted for the project in November 2011 which gave an overall rating of "moderately satisfactory" for this project. The report will be made available for Terminal Evaluator.

The PMU has worked to address the main issues and implement the recommendations as indicated in the management response.

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method[1] for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*Annex C*) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.
The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Jamaica including the following project sites *Old Harbour Bay.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: *National Environment and Planning Agency; Institute of Sustainable Development, University of the West Indies; Windsor Research Centre; Jamaica Conservation Trust; The Nature Conservancy; Management Institute for National Development; University of Technology; NRV Technical Expert; EIA Expert; Lessons Learnt Consultant and Planning Institute of Jamaica,*.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

The project evaluation is to be undertaken in accordance with UN evaluation norms and policies and should embody a strong results-based orientation[2]. It should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary and present its methodological proposal as part of the inception report. Evaluation methods should be selected for their rigor in producing empirically based evidence to address the evaluation criteria, to respond to the evaluation questions, and to meet the objectives of the evaluation.

EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in Annex D.

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	***rating***	**2. IA& EA Execution**	***rating***
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	

[1] For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

[2] The proposed methodology should be in line with the UNDP Manual for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results (2009): http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/, UNDP outcome level evaluation guidance, and norms and standards for UN evaluations: http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=21 and http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22.

M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	**rating**	**4. Sustainability**	**rating**
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental :	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

The project will use a capacity development monitoring and evaluation scorecard to monitor the project capacity development progress. It will monitor **the all fifteen indicators in the five categories of capacity development** for this project, (see table below). Although this scorecard was used at the time of project inception, it was incomplete. The TE will rate the capacity development indicators at the end of project implementation.

Capacity Result / Indicator	Contribution to which Outcome
CR 1: Capacities for engagement	
Indicator 1 – Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead environmental organizations	
Indicator 2 – Existence of operational co-management mechanisms	**1**
Indicator 3 – Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups	
CR 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge	
Indicator 4 – Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders	
Indicator 5 – Access and sharing of environmental information by stakeholders	
Indicator 6 – Existence of environmental education programmes	
Indicator 7 – Extend of the linkage between environmental research/science and policy development	
Indicator 8 – Extend of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making	
CR 3: Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development	
Indicator 9 – Extend of the environmental planning and strategy development process	
Indicator 10 – Existence of an adequate environmental policy and regulatory frameworks	**1**
Indicator 11 – Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making	**1**
CR 4: Capacities for management and implementation	
Indicator 12 – Existence and mobilization of resources	
Indicator 13 – Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer	**2**
CR 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate	
Indicator 14 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process	
Indicator 15 – Adequacy of the project/programme evaluation process	

PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US$)		Government (mill. US$)		NGO (mill. US$)		Total (mill. US$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support			0.082	0.047			0.082	0.047
• Other (cash)								
Totals			0.082	0.047			0.082	0.047

MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project achieved the planned impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.

CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **evaluation findings**, **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

Findings and Conclusions

In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria below should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

Project Formulation

Conceptualization/Design. This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy addressed the root causes and principal threats in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to

contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.

Country-ownership/Driveness. Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.

Stakeholder participation. Assess information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation in design stages.

Replication approach. Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also related to actual practices undertaken during implementation).

Other aspects to assess in the review of Project formulation approaches would be UNDP comparative advantage as IA for this project; the consideration of linkages between projects and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

Project Implementation

Implementation Approach. This should include assessments of the following aspects:

(i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M and E activities if required.
(ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management and/or; changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.
(iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.
(iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
(v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

Monitoring and evaluation. Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports.

Stakeholder participation. This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

(i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.

(ii)Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this arena.

(iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.

(iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

Financial Planning: Including an assessment of:

(i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities

(ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements

(iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)

(iv) Co-financing

Sustainability. Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the economy or community production activities.

Execution and implementation modalities. This should consider the effectiveness of the UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP and GoJ and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project,

Results

Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives: Including a description and rating of the extent to which the project's objectives (environmental and developmental) were achieved using Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory ratings. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established.

This section should also include reviews of the following:

Sustainability: Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end.

Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

Recommendations

- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Lessons learned

This should highlight the best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success.

IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *Jamaica.* The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be *22* days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	*4* days	*March 28 2013*
Evaluation Mission	*10* days	*April 11, 2013*
Draft Evaluation Report	*7* days	*May 1, 2013*
Final Report	*2* days	*May 17, 2013*

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final	Full report, (per annexed	Within 3 weeks of the	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU,

Report	template) with annexes	evaluation mission	GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft (you may want to specify the time scheduled for commenting draft report)	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

The key evaluation products the evaluator will be accountable for producing are:

- Evaluation inception report: this should be prepared before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise. It should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: methods, sources of data and data collection procedures. This report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables. This inception report provides the Project team and the evaluator with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation scope and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.
- Draft evaluation report: This version will be the one commented and made observations to before handing in the final evaluation report.
- Final evaluation report structured according to the template provided for in the UNDP handbook (Annex 7). (Max. 40 pages without annexes in English)

TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team will be composed of *1 international evaluator.* The consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Post-graduate degree in natural resource or related environmental management field
- Minimum 5 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies. Experience on strategic planning will be considered an asset ;
- Experience in the Caribbean Region

- Technical knowledge in Environment or Natural Resource management
- Excellent communication, writing and analytic skills.
- Fluency in English both written and spoken is essential
- Good interpersonal skills (especially important, as the evaluator will be in constant contact with civil society and other actors and stakeholders).

EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'

PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

%	Milestone
10%	Following submission and approval of Evaluation Inception Report
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online at http://jobs.undp.org/. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

ANNEX II: GEF RATING SCALES

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	***Sustainability ratings:***	***Relevance ratings***
6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML):moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR) ***Impact Ratings:*** 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)

RATING SCALE FOR OUTCOMES AND PROGRESS TOWARDS "INTERMEDIATE STATES" USING THE ROTI METHOD

Outcome Rating	Rating on progress toward Intermediate States
D: The project's intended outcomes were not delivered	**D:** No measures taken to move towards intermediate states.
C: The project's intended outcomes were delivered, but were not designed to feed into a continuing process after project funding	**C**: The measures designed to move towards intermediate states have started, but have not produced results.
B: The project's intended outcomes were delivered, and were designed to feed into a continuing process, but with no prior allocation of responsibilities after project funding	**B**: The measures designed to move towards intermediate states have started and have produced results, which give no indication that they can progress towards the intended long term impact.
A: The project's intended outcomes were delivered, and were designed to feed into a continuing process, with specific allocation of responsibilities after project funding.	**A**: The measures designed to move towards intermediate states have started and have produced results, which clearly indicate that they can progress towards the intended long term impact.

NOTE: If the outcomes above scored C or D, there is no need to continue forward to score intermediate stages given that achievement of such is then not possible.

RATING SCALE FOR THE "OVERALL LIKELIHOOD OF IMPACT ACHIEVEMENT" USING THE ROTI METHOD

Highly Likely	Likely	Moderately Likely	Moderately Unlikely	Unlikely	Highly Unlikely
AA AB BA BB+	BB AC+ BC+	AC BC	AD+ BD+	AD BD C	D

ANNEX III: EVALUATION CRITERIA MATRIX

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
• The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.	•	•	•
• the extent to which the project is in line with the GEF Operational Programs or the strategic priorities under which the project was funded.	•	•	•
• are the objectives of the intervention or its design still appropriate given changed circumstances.	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
• The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
• The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy.	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
• The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion.	•	•	•
• Projects need to be environmentally, as well as financially and socially sustainable.	•	•	•
• Ƒf	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
• The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention.	•	•	•
• In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other local effects	•	•	•

ANNEX IV: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. *UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation for Development Results*
2. *Project-Level Evaluation: GEF Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-Financed Projects*
3. *Annual Project Reviews (APRs)/Project Implementation Reports(PIRs)*
4. *Annual Progress Reports*
5. *Annual Operating Plans (AOPs)*
6. *Quarterly Progress Reports*
7. *Project Document -- Piloting Natural Resource Valuation within Environmental Impact Assessments (NRV)*
8. *Minutes of Project Steering Committee Meetings (missing final PSC meeting minutes)*
9. *All TORs & MOUs & Contracts*
10. *All financial audit reports (these can be shared once I arrive Jamaica)*
11. *Outcome Evaluation of UNDP's Environment and Energy Programme: A Mid-Term Perspective*
12. Capacity Development Monitoring and Evaluation Scorecard completed at project inception
13. MTE Report
14. Revised Logframe
15. *Natural Resource Valuation of Three Protected Areas (EVPA)*
16. *Contract with University of the West Indies Institute for Sustainable Development (to include a review of the Terms of reference contained therein)*

17. *Guidelines for Incorporating NRV in EIA (Project Product)*

18. *- JPS Pilot Project NRV Final Report (Project Product)*

19. *- Final Sourcebook (Project Product)*

20. *- Lessons Learnt Final Document (Project Product)*

21. *- EIA Expert Final Report (Project Product)*

22. *- NRV Technical Expert Final Report (Project Product)*

23. *Deliverables submitted under the contract with University of the West Indies Institute for Sustainable Development (Project Product)*

24. Economic Review of NEPA Guidelines (Project Product)

25. Training Manual (Project Product)

26. Community Training Manual (Project Product)

27. User Guide to Natural Resource Valuation (booklet) (Project Product)

28. NRV Facilitation Final Report (Project Product)

29. JPS NRV Final Report (Project Product)

30. Report on Consultations to Institutionalize NRV into Government and Private Sector Planning (Project Product)

Annex V: Terminal Evaluation Mission Itinerary & Meeting Schedule (April 11-23 2013)

DAY	DATE	TIME	MEETING	VENUE & CONTACT INFO
Wednesday	April 10	1:45 pm	Arrival Kingston	Arrival at Norman Manley International Airport, Kingston. JUTA transfer to the Four Seasons Hotel
Thursday	April 11	09:00-10:45	Inception Meeting with Environment and Energy Team, UNDP – Margaret Jones Williams, Nicole Brown	UNDP Meeting Room
		11:00-1:30	Meeting with PMU (NEPA)- Sheries Simpson, Novelette Douglas (Review list of requested meetings, ensure I have all documentation and final versions)	NEPA, 10 Caledonia Ave., Kgn. 5. Tel: 754-7540, Extns. 2336 (Sheries) and 2332 (Novlette). Email: **sasimpson@nepa.gov.jm and NDouglas@nepa.gov.jm. respectively**
		2:00-4:00	Meeting with Environment and Energy Team, UNDP	UNDP Meeting Room
		4:00-4:45	Meeting with Mr. Arun Kashyap, Resident Representative and Ms. Elsie Laurence-Chounoune, Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP	
Friday	April 12	09:00-10:30	Meeting with Donna Blake, Senior Policy Advisor, The Nature Conservancy	UNDP, Meeting Room Donna Blake, Tel: 577-9001, 754-4579 Email: dblake@tnc.org, Fax: 754-2365
		11:00-11:30	Security Briefing at UNDSS	UNDSS
		11:45-1:00	Meeting with EIA Expert - Eleanor Jones	UNDP
		3:00-4:00	Marlon Beale (PSC member)	Forestry Department, Tel: 924-2667, 969-6714 (str. Line) Email: mbeale@forestry.gov.jm
Weekend	April 13-14			
			Document Review	
Monday	April 15	09:00 – 10:00	Meeting with UNDP	UNDP
		12:30-1:30	Michelle Grant, Senior Customer Service Officer, Development Assistance Centre.	**NEPA; Mrs. Douglas' Office. Tel: 754-7540, extn. 4000, Email: MGrant@nepa.gov.jm**
		2:00-4:00	Meeting with PIOJ – Okley Coke, Research Assistant, External	PIOJ,

			Cooperation Management, Delores Wade, Senior Project Economist and Hopeton Peterson, Manager, Sustainable Development	16 Oxford Road, Kingston 5, Email Okley Coke: **Okley_Coke@PIOJ.gov.jm**
Tuesday	April 16	8:30 – 9:00		
		9:00 – 10:45	Meeting with Novlette Douglas, Acting Director, Planning, Policy, Evaluation and Research and Sheries Simpson, Manager, Projects Planning and Monitoring Branch, NEPA	NEPA, 10 Caledonia Ave., Kgn. 5. Tel: 754-7540, Extns. 2336 (Sheries) and 2332 (Novlette). Email: **sasimpson@nepa.gov.jm and NDouglas@nepa.gov.jm. respectively**
		11:00 – 12:00	Meeting with Frances Blair, key NEPA representative who will be involved in applying NRV; (Manager of EIA Process-NEPA), Applications Secretariat Branch	NEPA, Applications Secretariat Branch Meeting Room. Tel: 929-9148 or 754 – 7540, extn. 2114, Email: **FBlair@nepa.gov.jm**
		12:00 – 12:45	Meeting with Kapleton Hall, Environmental Monitoring Officer, Climate Change (Was Project Manager for EVPA Project)	
		I2:45 – 1:45	Meeting with Ms. Ingrid Parchment, Executive Director, Caribbean Coastal Area Management **(C-CAM)** Foundation, Tel: 383-2184, Email: iparchment@yahoo.com	NEPA; (Ms. Parchment will be here at 11:15 a.m. tomorrow for a meeting in the Red Room starting @ 11:30 a.m. and ending at 12:30 p.m.
		2:00 – 3:00 3:15 – 4:15	Meeting with Peter Knight, CEO, NEPA Meeting with Miss Yvette Strong, Senior Manager, Conservation and Protection Sub-Division, NEPA and Chair, EIA Committee.	CEO's Office, NEPA. Tel: 754-7526, extn. 2339, Email: peter.knight@nepa.gov.jm NEPA, 2nd Floor, Protected Areas Branch, 10 Caledonia Avenue, Kingston 5. Tel: 754-7540, extn. 2224
		5:30 – 7:00	SKYPE call with Dr. Mark Buckley, EcoNorthwest Consulting Firm	Skype
Wednesday	April 17	8:30-10:00	Mr. John Junor, Chair, NRCA Board	**NEPA, Tel: 909-4393, Email: honjohn2000@yahoo.com**
		11:00-12:15	Telcon with Mr. Mike Schwartz, Manager, Windsor Research Centre	Telephone call 876-997-3832

				Windsor@cwjamaica.com
		12:30-1:25	Meeting with Dr. Thera Edwards, Map Curator and Representative, Irish Town Red Light, Middletown Development Association	Geography and Geology Department, Map Registry, UWI, Tel: 927-2129, 927-2728 or 383-8372. Email: theraedwards@gmail.com
		1:25-1:30	Walk across to Mona School of Business	Directly opposite G&G Map Registry
		1:30 - 3:00	Meeting with Dr. Abdulkadri, Econometric Consultant	**Room 209, Block E at the Alister McIntye Complex, Mona School of Business and Management (970-6016, 977-1483). Email: abdullahi.abdulkadria@uwimona.edu.jm**
		3:00 – 4:30	Meeting with Ms. Leonie Barnaby, GEF Focal Point	**Ministry of Water, Land, Environment and Climate change (MWLECC), Environmental Management Department, 16A Halfway Tree Road, Kgn. 5. Tel: 929-2792**
Thursday	April 18	7:30 – 7;45	Telcon with Ms. Diana McCauley, CEO, Jamaica Environment Trust	Earth House, 11 Waterloo Road, Kg. 10, Tel: 906-9385, 906-9783, 960-3693 Email: jamentrust@cwjamaica.com
		8:30-9:30	Skype Call with Maurice Mason, Consultant who developed Sourcebook, Guidelines and did Pilot NRV	
		10:30 – 12:00	**Meeting with Ann-Marie Smith, Director, Public Capability Development, Alia Vaz-Heaven, formerly Acting Unit Manager, Craig Barham, Resident Faculty Member and Joy-Ann Bramwell, formerly Manager, Distance Learning MIND**	**MIND (927-1761 or 977-3445)** **Email for A. Smith: asmith@mind.edu.jm** **Email for A. Vaz-Heaven: avaz@mind.edu.jm** **Email for C. Barham: cbarham@mind.edu.jm** **Email for**
		1:00 – 2:00	Meeting with Leonard Francis, key NEPA representative who will be involved in applying NRV	**NEPA,** Tel: 754-7540, extn. 2124 Email: LFrancis@nepa.gov.jm
		2:00 – 2:45	Meeting with Novlette Douglas, Acting Director, Planning, Policy, Evaluation and Research and Sheries Simpson, Manager, Projects Planning and Monitoring Branch, NEPA	NEPA, 10 Caledonia Ave., Kgn. 5. Tel: 754-7540, Extns. 2336 (Sheries) and 2332 (Novlette). Email: **sasimpson@nepa.gov.jm and NDouglas@nepa.gov.jm. respectively**
		3: 00 – 5:00	Meeting with David Smith, Institute for Sustainable	**NEPA, ASB Meeting Room, 1st Floor**

			Development , UWI	
Friday	April 19	09:00–10:30	Meeting with Owen Evelyn; formerly of the Forestry Department. Now President, Spatial Innovision Ltd., Tel: 969-2239 or 941-1085 (Office), 809-5001 (cell)	Office @ 22 Annette Crescent, Kgn. 10; opposite Mega Mart Supermarket on Upper Waterloo Road Email: oevelyn@forestry.gov.jm
		10:30-11:30	Meeting with Michelle McNaught, member of TRC and National Coordinator, Caribsave , Jamaica.	**Office: 632 – 3075, Cell: 414-6770, 2½ Kingsway, Unit 27, Devon House East, Kg. 10, Jamaica, West Indies** **Email: michelle.mcnaught@caribsave.org**
		12:00 - 1:00	**Meeting with Professor Dale Webber, Director, Centre for Marine Sciences, re institutionalization of NRV at the University of the West Indies**	Centre for Marine Sciences, UWI Tel: 935-8835, cell: 869-9698 Email: dale.webber@uwimona.edu.jm
		2:00-3:30	Janet Bedasse, Lessons Learnt Consultant	**Janet Bedasse Tel contact: 847-6360** **Cannonball Cafe in the Loshusan Shopping Centre, 29 East Kings House Rd., Kgn. 6, Barbican** **Email: janet.bedasse@gmail.com**
		3:30 – 5:00	Meeting with Carlton Campbell, Managing Director, CL Environmental Co. Ltd., Consultant who did EIA for JPS Power Plant	UNDP **Tel/Fax: 876.756.0338 or cell: 371-2267** **Email: clenviro@cwjamaica.com** **Website: http://www.clenvironmental.com**
Weekend	April 20-21		Document Review and Report Writing	
Monday	April 22	09:00 – 10:15	Telcon Meeting with Georgia Marks-Dorman, Agricultural Economist and GoJ Representative who received training under NRV Project, external to NEPA and Decision Maker	Telcon Min. of Agriculture and Fisheries, Hope Gardens, Kgn. 6, (turn by main traffic light intersection) Economic Planning Division, 1st Floor, Room 112. Tel: 927-1731 – 41 or 927-1743 – 50

				Email: gsmarks-dorman@moa.gov.jm
		10:30 – 12:00	Telcon Meeting with Paul Carroll (Private Sector person who received NRV Training)	Telcon TEMN Consultancy, Tel: 968-3174-5 or 920-6012, **Cell 876 818 3997** Email: temnster@gmail.com
		12:30 – 2:30	Prepare for Presentation of Preliminary Results of TE	
		2:30 – 3:00	Meeting with Nicole Brown and Margaret Williams, UNDP	UNDP
		3:30 – 4:00	Telecon call with Lawrence Neufville, Programme Director, Masters in Built Environment, UTech, and participant in the NRV Training. Also a proponent for the institutionalization of the NRV in the Built Environment Programme	Lawrence Neufville, Tel: 970-5338-9 or cell: 881-1521 Email: lneufville@utech.edu.jm
		4:00 – 5:30	Debriefing meeting with Arun Kashyap, UNDP RR, Elsie Laurence-Chounoune, UNDP DRR and the Environment and Energy Team, UNDP – Margaret Jones Williams, Nicole Brown	UNDP Meeting Facilities
Tuesday	April 23			
		9:00-11:30	**Presentation of Preliminary Findings of the TE to key stakeholders**	**Environmental Management Department (EMD) Conference Room, 16 A Halfway Tree Road, Kgn. 5**
		12:00 -	Begin drafting report	
Wednesday	April 24	5:30 a.m.	Depart hotel for airport	
		5:30 p.m.	Arrive Santa Fe, NM	
Wednesday	May 1	3:30 p.m.	Telcon with Project Manager, Rosemarie Bryan	

ANNEX VI: REVISED PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value and date		
Long-term goal: To strengthen the review and approval processes of development projects in order to catalyze environmentally sound and sustainable development.					

Project objective: To develop, pilot, and institutionalize natural resource valuation tools, techniques, data and information within the framework of Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs).	**Outcome Indicators:** ▪ NEPA, NRCA Advisory Board, and Technical Review Committee (TRC) capacitated to interpret natural resource valuation ▪ Increased selection of development alternatives that are environmentally friendly, sound, and sustainable. ▪ The financial and economic values of ecosystem goods and services are determinant variables in the permitting and licensing process of development projects. ▪ A cadre of local expertise developed to apply natural resource valuation skills within the framework of EIAs.	▪ EIAs are limited to the scientific assessment of possible environmental impacts that could arise from proposed development. ▪ The recommendations and conditions included in EIA reports do not provide a financial or economic assessment of the opportunity costs saved by pursuing alternative options to development. ▪ Government capacities to interpret economic and financial values associated with development are weak. ▪ The capacities of NEPA are insufficient to implement EIAs for all development projects otherwise required.	▪ By the end of the project a Sourcebook with a literature review would have been completed and widely circulated ▪ By project end EIA guidelines revised and now incorporates NRV to aid the decision making process where appropriate ▪ By the end of the project, natural resource valuation tools and techniques will have been demonstrated to at least 50 government representatives ▪ By end of project 20 community group members across the island trained	▪ PSC Meeting Minutes. ▪ Technical Review Committee and NRCA Advisory Board meeting minutes ▪ UNDP Quarterly reports. ▪ APRs and PIRs ▪ Independent midterm and final evaluation reports. ▪ Rio Convention national reports and communications	▪ There is a risk that the decision-makers will not adequately consider the estimated economic values of ecosystem goods and services. ▪ The project will be executed in a holistic, adaptive, collaborative, integrative, and iterative manner. ▪ The GoJ and UNDP-GEF continue to support this project strategy, in particular key agencies such as PIOJ, and key Ministries, such as the Ministry of Water, Land, Environment and Climate Change ▪ Long-term sustainability of training programme assured by continued enrolment for environmental courses at UWI and UTECH ▪ Relevant individuals within key government agencies actively participate in the training and sensitization

	▪ Capacity development monitoring scorecard rating		▪ By the end of the project 15 environmental professionals from the private and public sector trained in NRV. ▪ By the end of the project at least two tertiary institutions offering modules in NRV in existing courses	▪ Newspaper articles	workshops. ▪ Recommendations for the institutionalization of best practices from the piloting of natural resource valuation tools and techniques are politically, technically and financially feasible.

64

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	**Baseline value**	**Target value and date**		
Output 1.1: Natural resource valuation tools developed	▪ A primer/sourcebook on tools and techniques for the use of natural resource valuation specific to the Jamaican context developed ▪ Guidelines developed for the application of natural resource valuation tools and techniques within the EIA process ▪ An implementation plan developed for undertaking natural resource valuation tools within the framework of EIAs	▪ The evaluation of development projects are skewed towards short-term socio-economic benefits ▪ The cost-basis of environmental impacts are not assessed ▪ Significant experience exists in the application of natural resource valuation tools and techniques in other countries	▪ Within the first year of the project an assessment of current experiences and theories in the use of natural resource valuation tools and techniques conducted. ▪ By the beginning of year 4, an independent assessment of the natural resource valuation sourcebook conducted ▪ By the end of the project, the natural resource valuation sourcebook updated to incorporate lessons learned from the pilot EIA project	▪ Sourcebook prepared, with accompanying in-depth review of literature ▪ Revised EIA guidelines or drafting instructions for the revisions where higher level approval is required for implementation	▪ The use of natural resource valuation does not represent too high a transaction cost in the EIA process, e.g., furthering delaying the review and approval timeline of EIAs or making EIAs prohibitively expensive

			▪ By the end of the project new guidelines for EIAs developed that incorporate natural resource valuation, and updated periodically during project implementation		

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	**Baseline value**	**Target value and date**		
Output 1.2: Natural resource valuation tools piloted within the framework of an EIA	▪ Pilot EIA project proposal that integrates the use of natural resource valuation developed and approved ▪ Independent evaluation of the pilot EIA project conducted ▪ Lessons learned from pilot project are widely disseminated ▪ Recommendations for the development of SEA implementation guidelines provided	▪ EIA guidelines were updated in 2005 ▪ No actuarial data on the economic value of Jamaican ecosystem goods and services	▪ By May 2012, the pilot project proposal is developed ▪ By the end of the project , the pilot project has been implemented	▪ Independent evaluation of the pilot project ▪ Consultations with local stakeholders ▪ Documentation on Pilot project contains lessons learnt	▪ The project will undertake the NRV exercise at the pilot site

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Assumptions
	Indicator	**Baseline value**	**Target value and date**		
Output 2: Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes	▪ Curriculum on natural resource valuation developed for three tertiary institutions ▪ Natural resource valuation curriculum integrated into course offerings of three tertiary level institutions ▪ Key NEPA staff are trained on interpreting natural resource valuation data and information ▪ Members of the NRCA Advisory Board and TRC responsible for reviewing proposed developments are sensitized on NRV integration into the EIA process ▪ NGOs involved in	▪ No training available on natural resource valuation ▪ Local communities recognize and appreciate the socio-economic values of ecosystem good and services, but not in terms of replacement and opportunity costs	▪ By the end of the project MIND, UWI and UTECH have integrated NRV in at least one course ▪ By the end of year 3 at least four training sessions conducted, and at least 10 people trained in each ▪ By the end of the project, key NEPA staff and members of the NRCA Advisory Board and TRC responsible for reviewing EIAs trained on the interpretation of natural resource valuation information. ▪ By the end of the project, at least 50 professionals trained in natural resource valuation tools and techniques. ▪ By the end of the project, at	▪ Course offerings publications ▪ Training reports ▪ Evaluation of Training sessions ▪ Monitoring and evaluation reports (e.g., APR/PIR), UNDP quarterly progress reports, independent evaluations	▪ Trainees are willing to learn natural resource valuation tools and techniques ▪ Stakeholders remain committed to the use of natural resource valuation ▪ Trained professionals remain available for future sub-contract opportunities ▪ Low NEPA staff turnover

	community-based development actively participated in sensitization workshops on valuation tools. ▪ Lessons learnt publication widely disseminated		least five professionals trained at MIND as trainers of natural resource valuation tools. ▪ By the end of the project, at least 10 sensitization workshops on natural resource valuation ▪ By the end of the project, lessons learned presented to at least one conference/workshop		

ANNEX VII: SIGNED EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[3]

[3]www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: __A. Virginia Ravndal_____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signature:__A. Virginia Ravndal at Santa Fe, New Mexico, USA on 3/28/13

Annex VIII. Capacity Development M&E Scorecard (At Project Start-Up, MTE & TE)

Project/Programme Name: Piloting Natural Valuation into Environment Impact Assessment
Project/Programme Cycle Phase: **Start-up**
Date: 2008

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
CR 1: Capacities for engagement						
Indicator 1 – Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead environmental organizations	Organizational responsibilities for environmental management are not clearly defined	0				
	Organizational responsibilities for environmental management are identified	1				
	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management are partially recognized by stakeholders	2	2			
	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management recognized by stakeholders	3				
Indicator 2 – Existence of operational co-management mechanisms	No co-management mechanisms are in place	0				**Output 1.2**: Natural resource valuation tools piloted within the framework of an EIA
	Some co-management mechanisms are in place and operational	1				
	Some co-management mechanisms are formally established through agreements, MOUs, etc.	2	2			
	Comprehensive co-management mechanisms are formally established and are operational/functional	3				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
Indicator 3 – Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups	Identification of stakeholders and their participation/involvement in decision-making is poor	0				
	Stakeholders are identified but their participation in decision-making is limited	1	1			
	Stakeholders are identified and regular consultations mechanisms are established	2				
	Stakeholders are identified and they actively contribute to established participative decision-making processes	3				
CR 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge						
Indicator 4 – Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders	Stakeholders are not aware about global environmental issues and their related possible solutions	0				
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues but not the possible solutions	1	1			
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and the possible solutions but do not know how to participate	2				
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and are actively participating in the implementation of related solutions	3				
Indicator 5 – Access and sharing of environmental information by stakeholders	The environmental information needs are not identified and the information management infrastructure is inadequate	0				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	The environmental information needs are identified but the information management infrastructure is inadequate	1	1			
	The environmental information is partially available and shared among stakeholders but is not covering all focal areas and/or the information management infrastructure to manage and give information access to the public is limited	2				
	Comprehensive environmental information is available and shared through an adequate information management infrastructure	3				
Indicator 6 – Existence of environmental education programmes	No environmental education programmes are in place	0				**Output 2**: Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes
	Environmental education programmes are partially developed and partially delivered	1	1	This is limited by financial and human resources		
	Environmental education programmes are fully developed but partially delivered	2				
	Comprehensive environmental education programmes exist and are being delivered	3				
Indicator 7 – Extent of the linkage between environmental research/science and policy development	No linkage exist between environmental policy development and science/research strategies and programmes	0				
	Research needs for environmental policy development are identified but are not translated into relevant research strategies	1	1	Some research needs identified in existing policy and plans but		

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	and programmes			these do not seem to get translated into research priorities.		
	Relevant research strategies and programmes for environmental policy development exist but the research information is not responding fully to the policy research needs	2				
	Relevant research results are available for environmental policy development	3				
Indicator 8 – Extent of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making	Traditional knowledge is ignored and not taken into account into relevant participative decision-making processes	0				
	Traditional knowledge is identified and recognized as important but is not collected and used in relevant participative decision-making processes	1	1			
	Traditional knowledge is collected but is not used systematically into relevant participative decision-making processes	2				
	Traditional knowledge is collected, used and shared for effective participative decision-making processes	3				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
CR 3: Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development						
Indicator 9 – Extent of the environmental planning and strategy development process	The environmental planning and strategy development process is not coordinated and does not produce adequate environmental plans and strategies	0				
	The environmental planning and strategy development process does produce adequate environmental plans and strategies but they are not implemented or used	1				
	Adequate environmental plans and strategies are produced but there are only partially implemented because of funding constraints and/or other problems	2	2	Several issues with implementation including timing and influences of other internal factors.		
	The environmental planning and strategy development process is well coordinated by the lead environmental organizations and produces the required environmental plans and strategies; which are being implemented	3				
Indicator 10 – Existence of an adequate environmental policy and regulatory frameworks	The environmental policy and regulatory frameworks are insufficient; they do not provide an enabling environment	0				**Output 1.2**: Natural resource valuation tools piloted within the framework of an EIA

	Some relevant environmental policies and laws exist but few are implemented and enforced	1	1	Several policies drafted but not finalized eg: Fisheries bill in draft for 10 years. Issues with capacity to implement some laws		
	Adequate environmental policy and legislation frameworks exist but there are problems in implementing and enforcing them	2				
Capacity Result / Indicator	**Staged Indicators**	**Rating**	**Score**	**Comments**	**Next Steps**	**Contribution to which Outcome**
	Adequate policy and legislation frameworks are implemented and provide an adequate enabling environment; a compliance and enforcement mechanism is established and functions	3				
Indicator 11 – Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making	The availability of environmental information for decision-making is lacking	0				**Output 1.1**: Natural resource valuation tools developed
	Some environmental information exists but it is not sufficient to support environmental decision-making processes	1	1			

	Relevant environmental information is made available to environmental decision-makers but the process to update this information is not functioning properly	2				
	Political and administrative decision-makers obtain and use updated environmental information to make environmental decisions	3				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators			Rating	Score	Comments
CR 4: Capacities for management and implementation						
Indicator 12 – Existence and mobilization of resources	The environmental organizations don't have adequate resources for their programmes and projects and the requirements have not been assessed	0				
	The resource requirements are known but are not being addressed	1				
	The funding sources for these resource requirements are partially identified and the resource requirements are partially addressed	2	2			
	Adequate resources are mobilized and available for the functioning of the lead environmental organizations	3				
Indicator 13 – Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer	The necessary required skills and technology are not available and the needs are not identified	0				**Output 2**: Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes
	The required skills and technologies needs are identified as well as their sources	1	1			
	The required skills and technologies are obtained but their access depend on foreign sources	2				
	The required skills and technologies are available and there is a national-based mechanism for updating the	3				

	required skills and for upgrading the technologies					

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	Score	Comments		
CR 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate						
Indicator 14 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process	Irregular project monitoring is being done without an adequate monitoring framework detailing what and how to monitor the particular project or programme	0				
	An adequate resourced monitoring framework is in place but project monitoring is irregularly conducted	1				
	Regular participative monitoring of results in being conducted but this information is only partially used by the project/programme implementation team	2	2			
	Monitoring information is produced timely and accurately and is used by the implementation team to learn and possibly to change the course of action	3				
Indicator 15 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring and evaluation	None or ineffective evaluations are being conducted without an adequate evaluation plan;	0				

process	including the necessary resources					
	An adequate evaluation plan is in place but evaluation activities are irregularly conducted	1	1			
	Evaluations are being conducted as per an adequate evaluation plan but the evaluation results are only partially used by the project/programme implementation team	2				
	Effective evaluations are conducted timely and accurately and are used by the implementation team and the Agencies and GEF Staff to correct the course of action if needed and to learn for further planning activities	3				

Project/Programme Name: Piloting Natural Resource Valuation Within Environment Impact Assessments
Project/Programme Cycle Phase: 3 months after Project Completion
Date: April 2012

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
CR 1: Capacities for engagement							
Indicator 1 – Degree of legitimacy/mandate of lead environmental organizations	Organizational responsibilities for environmental management are not clearly defined	0					Output 1.1: Natural resource valuation tools developed Output 1.2: Natural resource valuation tools piloted within the framework of an EIA Output 2: Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes
	Organizational responsibilities for environmental management are identified	1					
	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management are partially recognized by stakeholders	2	2	2	The situation remains unchanged from the MTE. Although the authority and legitimacy of NEPA is well recognized by stakeholders, the broader information generation, decision-making, and financial support duties for implementation of EIA procedures that integrate NRV are not fully clarified.		
	Authority and legitimacy of all lead organizations responsible for environmental management recognized by stakeholders	3					
Indicator 2 – Existence of	No co-management mechanisms are in place	0					Output 1.2: Natural resource valuation tools

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
operational co-management mechanisms	Some co-management mechanisms are in place and operational	1					piloted within the framework of an EIA Output 2: Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes
	Some co-management mechanisms are formally established through agreements, MOUs, etc.	2	2	NA	Co-management mechanisms are not applicable to NRVs		
	Comprehensive co-management mechanisms are formally established and are operational/functional	3					
Indicator 3 – Existence of cooperation with stakeholder groups	Identification of stakeholders and their participation/involvement in decision-making is poor	0					Output 1.2: Natural resource valuation tools piloted within the framework of an EIA Output 2: Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes
	Stakeholders are identified but their participation in decision-making is limited	1	1		The stakeholders are mostly indentified, but there is not a regular consultation mechanism established for participatory decision-making with regards to NRV/EIA	1. Trial NRV/EIA 2. Update administrative procedures/practices for incorporation of NRV/EIA	
	Stakeholders are identified and regular consultations mechanisms are established	2		2	Stakeholders have been accurately identified and consultations have taken place with all key stakeholders although no regular consultation mechanisms have been established. In this case, there is no need for such a mechanism.		

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	Stakeholders are identified and they actively contribute to established participative decision-making processes	3					
CR 2: Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge							
Indicator 4 – Degree of environmental awareness of stakeholders	Stakeholders are not aware about global environmental issues and their related possible solutions	0					Output 2: Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues but not the possible solutions	1					
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and the possible solutions but do not know how to participate	2	2	2	Training has contributed to advancement. There is better awareness of global environmental issues. Mechanisms for applying NRV training do not exist as NRV has not yet been integrated into EIAs.	1. Trial NRV/EIA 2. Update administrative procedures/practices for incorporation of NRV/EIA 3. Implement increasingly sophisticated training/capacity building program	
	Stakeholders are aware about global environmental issues and are actively participating in the implementation of related solutions	3					
Indicator 5 – Access and sharing of environmental information by	The environmental information needs are not identified and the information management infrastructure is	0		0	Environmental information needs and priorities, although known in		Output 1.1: Natural resource valuation tools developed Output 1.2: Natural resource

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
stakeholders	inadequate				general terms, have not been specified and no information management infrastructure for the information once gathered has yet been identified.		valuation tools piloted within the framework of an EIA Output 2: Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes
	The environmental information needs are identified but the information management infrastructure is inadequate	1	1			1. Trial NRV/EIA 2. Update administrative procedures/practices to identify information needs of NRV/EIA 3. Improve "Sourcebook" and data generation/management required for informed NRV/EIA decision-making	
	The environmental information is partially available and shared among stakeholders but is not covering all focal areas and/or the information management infrastructure to manage and give information access to the public is limited	2					
	Comprehensive environmental information is available and shared through an adequate information management infrastructure	3					
Indicator 6 –	No environmental education	0					

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
Existence of environmental education programmes	programmes are in place						Output 2: Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes
	Environmental education programmes are partially developed and partially delivered	1	1			Design, implement and institutionalize an increasingly sophisticated training/capacity building program	
	Environmental education programmes are fully developed but partially delivered	2					
	Comprehensive environmental education programmes exist and are being delivered	3		3	NRV has been fully incorporated into three tertiary-level academic/training institutions. In addition training on NRV at both basic and advanced levels was delivered to stakeholders in a variety of Government agencies, NGOs, communities, and others.		
Indicator 7 – Extent of the linkage between environmental research/science and policy development	No linkage exist between environmental policy development and science/research strategies and programmes	0					Output 1.1: Natural resource valuation tools developed Output 1.2: Natural resource valuation tools piloted within the framework of an EIA Output 2: Capacities
	Research needs for environmental policy development are identified	1	1		The project has helped move forward knowledge tools	Clarify administrative procedures/practices	

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	but are not translated into relevant research strategies and programmes			1	(e.g., draft sourcebook) and knowledge capacities (e.g., familiarization training), but has not fully identified research needs and/or strategies programs required to support NRV/EIA environmental policy. Policies are being considered, but not yet in place. So no movement to next rating level. Status at TE remains unchanged from MTE.	for incorporation of NRV/EIA, including detailing of information required for informed decision-making and acquisition process.	strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes
	Relevant research strategies and programmes for environmental policy development exist but the research information is not responding fully to the policy research needs	2					
	Relevant research results are available for environmental policy development	3					
Indicator 8 – Extent of inclusion/use of traditional knowledge in environmental decision-making	Traditional knowledge is ignored and not taken into account into relevant participative decision-making processes	0					Output 1.2: Natural resource valuation tools piloted within the framework of an EIA
	Traditional knowledge is	1	1			Trial NRV/EIA with	

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	identified and recognized as important but is not collected and used in relevant participative decision-making processes			NA		incorporation of traditional knowledge Integrate lessons learned within NRV/EIA administrative procedures/practices, NRV tools, and training	
	Traditional knowledge is collected but is not used systematically into relevant participative decision-making processes	2					
	Traditional knowledge is collected, used and shared for effective participative decision-making processes	3					

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
CR 3: Capacities for strategy, policy and legislation development							
Indicator 9 – Extent of the environmental planning and strategy development process	The environmental planning and strategy development process is not coordinated and does not produce adequate environmental plans and strategies	0					Output 1.1: Natural resource valuation tools developed Output 1.2: Natural resource valuation tools piloted within the framework of an EIA Output 2: Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes
	The environmental planning and strategy development process does produce adequate environmental plans and strategies but they are not implemented or used	1					
	Adequate environmental plans and strategies are produced but there are only partially implemented because of funding constraints and/or other problems	2	2	2	There are no EIA or SEA administrative procedures or practices that fully incorporate NRV as part of the assessment process. Situation remains unchanged at end of project.	Clarify administrative procedures/practices for incorporation of NRV/EIA	
	The environmental planning and strategy development process is well coordinated by the lead environmental organizations and produces the required environmental plans and strategies; which are being implemented	3					

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
Indicator 10 – Existence of an adequate environmental policy and regulatory frameworks	The environmental policy and regulatory frameworks are insufficient; they do not provide an enabling environment	0					Output 1.2: Natural resource valuation tools piloted within the framework of an EIA Output 2: Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes
	Some relevant environmental policies and laws exist but few are implemented and enforced	1	1	1	No substantial change to policies/laws regulating EIA and incorporating NRV although draft instructions to prepare new EIA regulations were submitted by NEPA to the relevant Ministry in December, 2011	Clarify administrative procedures/practices for incorporation of NRV/EIA	
	Adequate environmental policy and legislation frameworks exist but there are problems in implementing and enforcing them	2					

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	Adequate policy and legislation frameworks are implemented and provide an adequate enabling environment; a compliance and enforcement mechanism is established and functions	3					
Indicator 11 – Adequacy of the environmental information available for decision-making	The availability of environmental information for decision-making is lacking	0					Output 1.1: Natural resource valuation tools developed Output 1.2: Natural resource valuation tools piloted within the framework of an EIA Output 2: Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes
	Some environmental information exists but it is not sufficient to support environmental decision-making processes	1	1	1	The "Guidelines for Integrating NRV into EIAs" document exists and includes numerous recommendations, but these have not yet been taken up by the GoJ. The "Sourcebook" is mostly a review of NRV methodologies and an extensive literature review but does not offer this	Complete draft NRV tool, including source book. Trial NRV/EIA and record lessons-learned Clarify administrative procedures/practices for generation and dissemination of information required for NRV/EIA Review and apply Aarhus	

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
					type of guidance. The trial NRV/EIA took place close to project end but did not serve the purpose of being a true pilot and no lessons or protocols regarding were extracted from that experience as the project came to an abrupt end immediately after the pilot project was completely.	principles for public notice and comment	
	Relevant environmental information is made available to environmental decision-makers but the process to update this information is not functioning properly	2					
	Political and administrative decision-makers obtain and use updated environmental information to make environmental decisions	3					

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators Rating		MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
CR 4: Capacities for management and implementation							
Indicator 12 – Existence and mobilization of resources	The environmental organizations don't have adequate resources for their programmes and projects and the requirements have not been assessed	0					Output 1.1: Natural resource valuation tools developed Output 1.2: Natural resource valuation tools piloted within the framework of an EIA
	The resource requirements are known but are not being addressed	1		1	No costing of NRVs has been done and no decision has been taken on who is to pay for NRVs which are done as part of EIAs. Resources will be required for obtaining missing or out-of-date baseline data to use in NRVs but NEPA does not have these resources and no specific plan exists to acquire them although NEPA does have an existing MOU with the UWI and the TEC suggested that the universities be approached to see if students could be involved in class projects to help gather some baseline data.		
	The funding sources for these resource requirements are partially identified and the resource requirements are partially addressed	2	2		NEPA and GOJ know the general costs for EIA. There will likely be financial support for incorporation of NRV, but costs and responsibilities are not yet	Clarify administrative procedures/practices for incorporation of NRV/EIA	

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators Rating		MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
					identified.		
	Adequate resources are mobilized and available for the functioning of the lead environmental organizations	3					
Indicator 13 – Availability of required technical skills and technology transfer	The necessary required skills and technology are not available and the needs are not identified	0					Output 2: Capacities strengthened to use natural resource valuation within the framework of their review and approval processes
	The required skills and technologies needs are identified as well as their sources	1	1		Skills transfer is occurring with support from the project. The training has generated improvements. However, individual and institutional capacity has not been built to fully support an EIA incorporating rigorous NRV.	The project should be on-track to reach a higher rating with the development and implementation of more advanced training programs over the next 12 months.	
	The required skills and technologies are obtained but their access depend on foreign sources	2		2	Technical skills have been significantly enhanced as a result of the project's training efforts although only a handful (probably 4) individuals in Jamaica are fully trained to undertake NRVs or to critically and comprehensively review NRVs undertaken by others. Trainers have been trained through the project and courses are being taught at universities but foreign inputs		

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators Rating		MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
					will still be required to train to the skill level required to conduct NRVs.		
	The required skills and technologies are available and there is a national-based mechanism for updating the required skills and for upgrading the technologies	3					

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators	Rating	MTE Score	TE Score	Comments		
CR 5: Capacities to monitor and evaluate							
Indicator 14 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring process	Irregular project monitoring is being done without an adequate monitoring framework detailing what and how to monitor the particular project or programme	0					Output 1.1: Natu resource valuatio developed Output 1.2: Natu resource valuatio piloted within th framework of an Output 2: Capaci strengthened to u natural resource valuation within framework of the review and appro processes
	An adequate resourced monitoring framework is in place but project monitoring is irregularly conducted	1					
	Regular participative monitoring of results in being conducted but this information is only partially used by the project/programme implementation team	2	2	2	Project monitoring was regular and participatory but not effective in terms of enhancing project implementation or quality of results. The project logframe was revised but this was not very beneficial as it was done close to the end of the project (July/Aug 2012) with only a few months left of operations and the revisions do not represent significant improvements to the logframe. Moreover, some targets were modified to reflect the project reality which is not a legitimate revision.	Improve results framework and use as active tool for monitoring progress. Complete "close-out" plan for monitoring implementation of established NRV/EIA program	

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators Rating	MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome
	Monitoring information is produced timely and accurately and is used by the implementation team to learn and possibly to change the course of action	3				
Indicator 15 – Adequacy of the project/programme monitoring and evaluation process	None or ineffective evaluations are being conducted without an adequate evaluation plan; including the necessary resources	0				Output 1.1: Natu resource valuatio developed
	An adequate evaluation plan is in place but evaluation activities are irregularly conducted	1	1		Improve reporting and evaluation frequency, e.g., regular reporting by PMU to NEPA, UNDP, and PSC based upon results framework progress.	Output 1.2: Natu resource valuatio piloted within th framework of an Output 2: Capaci strengthened to u resource valuatio the framework o review and appro processes
	Evaluations are being conducted as per an adequate evaluation plan but the evaluation results are only partially used by the project/programme implementation team	2		2	The MTE was conducted late in the project. Recommendations were taken up and project implementation rate was improved to an extent although the quality of the products was not. A Lessons Learned document was produced which was more like a project evaluation but offered some good analysis. Nevertheless, because of the stage of the project when this was done (with only 2 months left in project operations), neither the PMU or the PSC used the report to improve the project. TE was conducted within the time frame specified by GEF.	
	Effective evaluations are conducted timely and accurately	3				

Capacity Result / Indicator	Staged Indicators Rating	MTE Score	TE Score	Comments	Next Steps	Contribution to which Outcome	
	and are used by the implementation team and the Agencies and GEF Staff to correct the course of action if needed and to learn for further planning activities						