

Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management

St. Kitts and Nevis



Terminal Evaluation

September 2013

Project Funded by:

The Global Environmental Facility (GEF)
The United Nations Development Program (UNDP)
The Government of St. Kitts and Nevis

Implementing Agency:

The United Nations Development Program (UNDP)

Executing Agency:

The Ministry of Sustainable Development: St. Kitts and Nevis

Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management

St. Kitts and Nevis

PIMS 3415/ATLAS Project ID 00046155

Terminal Evaluation

Evaluation Time Frame: July to September 2013

Principal Donor:

The Global Environmental Facility (GEF)

GEF Operational Programme:

OP 15

Implementing Agency:

The United Nations Development Program

Executing Agency:

The Ministry of Sustainable Development – St. Kitts and Nevis

September 2013

Table Of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Executive Summary | 4 |
| 2. Introduction..... | 8 |
| 3. The Project and its Development Context | 10 |
| 4. Findings..... | 12 |
| 4.1 Project Formulation..... | 12 |
| 4.2. Project Implementation | 14 |
| 4.3. Results | 18 |
| 5 Conclusions and Recommendations..... | 25 |
| 6. Lessons Learned | 27 |
| 7. Annexes | 28 |
| 7.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR CONDUCTING THE TERMINAL EVALUATION | 28 |
| 7.2 ITINERARY | 41 |
| 7.3 LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED | 42 |
| 7.4 LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATOR | 43 |
| 7.5 QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR INTERVIEWS | 44 |
| 7.6 LIST OF WORKSHOPS..... | 46 |
| 7.7 LIST OF OUTPUTS..... | 47 |
| 7.8 LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE | 48 |
| 7.9 SAMPLE OF MINUITES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE | 49 |

Acronyms

| | |
|------|--|
| AOP | Annual Operational Plan |
| CBO | Community Based Organisation |
| CEHI | Caribbean Environmental Health Institute |
| CV | Curriculum Vitae |
| EU | European Union |
| GEF | Global Environment Facility |
| GIS | Geographic Information System |
| HACT | Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfer |
| IPS | Island Planning Services |
| LDC | Least Developed Countries |
| LRIS | Land Resource Information System |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MSP | Medium Size Project |
| MTE | Mid-Term Evaluation |
| MTES | Medium Term Economic Strategy |
| NAP | National Action Plan |
| NCSA | National Capacity Self Assessment |
| NGO | Non Government Organization |
| NPDP | National Physical Development Plan |
| PIR | Project Implementation Report |
| PSIP | Public Sector Investment Plan |
| SIDS | Small Island Developing States |
| SKN | St. Kitts and Nevis |
| SLM | Sustainable Land Management |
| TE | Terminal Evaluation |
| TOR | Terms of Reference |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |

1. Executive Summary

| Table 1: Project Summary | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Project Title: Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in St Kitts and Nevis | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | PIMS 3415 | | <i>at endorsement US\$</i> | <i>at completion US\$</i> |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00046155 | GEF financing: | 500,000 | 352,894.28 (as per audit report) |
| Country: | St. Kitts and Nevis | IA/EA own: | | |
| Region: | LAC | Government: | 500,000 | |
| Focal Area: | Land Degradation | Other: | 8,000 | |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | OP15 SP 1 | Total co-financing: | 508,000 | |
| Executing Agency: | UNDP | Total Project Cost: | 1,008,000 | |
| Other Partners involved: | Ministry of Sustainable Development | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | April 23, 2008 | |
| | | (Operational) Closing Date | Proposed: April, 2011 | Actual: June 30, 2012 |

Description of Project

The Sustainable Land Management project in St. Kitts and Nevis is part of global portfolio project funded by GEF entitled "LDC and SIDS Targeted Portfolio Approach for Capacity Development and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management". The overall goal of the global project is to assist Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and Least Developed Countries (LDCs) in promoting effective Sustainable Land Management (SLM), for both global and local benefits, by strengthening the capacity of these countries to sustainably manage their land resources. The St. Kitts and Nevis project was designed to address the land degradation problems resulting from subsistence agriculture and unrestricted livestock grazing on steep slopes, exacerbated by heavy rains. The degradation takes the form of landslides and extensive soil erosion in St. Kitts and Nevis. This lowers the productive capacity of the land and causes changes in the water regime, including sedimentation of river beds and reservoirs, declining water quality and sedimentation in coastal waters. Restoration of St. Kitts and Nevis' agriculture, forest resources and associated livelihoods depends on the capacity of the country to manage its land resources, thus making this capacity building effort a key factor in the country's development. Against this background, the Sustainable Land Management Project has four main Outcomes, namely: (1) mainstreaming sustainable land management into national development policies, plans and regulatory frameworks; (2) developing individual and institutional capacities for SLM; (3) developing capacities for knowledge management in support of SLM; and (4) the elaboration of investment planning and resource mobilization of SLM interventions.

Challenges and Execution Modality

The project was originally expected to be implemented over a three-year period beginning in 2007. However, the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis did not sign off on the project with UNDP until April 23, 2008, with work on the project not beginning until June, 2010. The Ministry of Sustainable Development, which is the Executing Agency for the project, considered that the delays were due to the very capacity constraints that the project was expected to partly address. Given the delays, the Government was obliged to seek an execution modality that would allow delivery of the outputs in 18 months. The decision was to contract a local firm, Island Planning Services (IPS), to lead the execution of the project. As an independent body, Island Planning Services could subcontract or hire any competent person they deemed valuable in completing any component of the project deliverables.

Context and Purpose of the Evaluation

A Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the project was conducted between July 16 and September 6, 2013. The country visit for the Evaluation took place from August 27 to August 28, 2013. The TE was conducted in accordance with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy. The principal purpose of the Evaluation was to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project, given the value placed on it by the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis, and the investment of the GEF and the UNDP. The Evaluation therefore examined the project execution, focusing on effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of outputs and outcomes. The key issues addressed were the mainstreaming of sustainable land management into the national development policies, plans and regulatory frameworks; capacity building at all levels and an assessment of the extent to which these efforts have supported land management; and an assessment of whether the capacities developed have been transferred to other projects and initiatives. The Evaluation also examined the management structure of the project itself, including its adaptive capacity and the overall management of project resources.

Main Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

About 85% of the targets were achieved by project completion, which is noteworthy given the late start of the project. Several factors contributed to this achievement, including that a competent consultant had been selected to execute the project, that the Physical Development and Environment Department of the Ministry of Sustainable Development was fully committed to the project and provided significant support to the consultant team, and that there was strong emphasis on inter-agency coordination and collaboration throughout project execution.

The project got off to a good start with a well organised Inception Workshop that was well received. The capacity development component of the project included a Training Workshop on the Use of Soil Conservation techniques which targeted farmers and other stakeholders, and a GIS Training Programme which targeted members of Government Ministries, Agencies and Units, as well as persons from civil society. There was also an emphasis on models for Land Degradation Monitoring. The project provided hardware and software to facilitate the collection, storage, management and use of data, and provided training in the techniques required for Data and Knowledge Management specific to land management.

Public awareness was heightened through participation in the capacity development initiatives, but the project also participated in several public awareness initiatives across the country. The Ministry of Sustainable Development has established a World Environment Month and the project has ensured that SLM issues are incorporated into these activities. There is also a schools programme where schools are visited and SLM information disseminated, and summer camps which are also used for information dissemination. SLM information will be available on the Ministry of Sustainable Development's website in the future.

The project has made acceptable progress in mainstreaming SLM into national policies and practices. A legislative review has been conducted as a necessary first step towards the development and approval of a more SLM oriented policy framework. Sustainable Land Management and Development Regulations have been created in draft and are awaiting finalisation and approval by Cabinet. St. Kitts and Nevis is about to produce a new National Physical Development Plan, and this affords the opportunity for SLM issues to be fully incorporated into the Plan. Finally, the inter-agency coordination and collaboration developed during the project is expected to continue and allows all Agencies to be kept abreast of, and contribute to, SLM issues and initiatives in the country.

The project was successful in creating a Strategic Framework for Investment Planning and Resource Mobilisation of Sustainable Land Management Interventions. This augers well for the sustainability of the impacts of the project. By linking sustainable land management financing to the public sector investment programme, as was done in the resource mobilization plan, the project is better assured of long term economic resources and continued political support.

What is now required to further ensure sustainability is strong ownership of the activities and a champion to advocate strongly for the continuing mainstreaming of project outputs into the national development processes. The Ministry of Sustainable Development has a central role in the development agenda of St. Kitts and Nevis in the areas of water resources, agriculture, housing and tourism, all of which are dependent on sustainable land management. This Ministry should therefore be the required advocate and champion. To be effective in this context, it will be necessary for the Ministry to have a strong institutional framework and governance platform that supports staff development in order to move the sustainable land management agenda forward.

Perhaps the biggest cause for concern in project execution was the moderately weak participation of NGOs, CBOs and the private sector in project implementation. However, this is perhaps not surprising given that there are very few NGOs and CBOs in St. Kitts and Nevis. The Inception Workshop Report does record two of these as participating in the Workshop, but there is no record of their subsequent involvement in the project until the Capacity Building Workshop for Farmers, where they also participated.

The main recommendations emerging from this Terminal Evaluation are:

- Project formulation should, to the extent feasible, allow for opportunities for input from all stakeholder groups, including Civil Society. The use of local personnel in formulation, design and implementation of future projects should be encouraged wherever possible. This will have the effect of strengthening project ownership, allowing better flow of information and data, and expediting the execution of projects.
- Project development for St. Kitts and Nevis should take cognizance of the political arrangement of the twin island state and should therefore ensure that project design and funding for project implementation accommodate stakeholders from both islands.
- There should be a post-project monitoring programme to ensure that key stakeholders are using the information provided and tools developed during the project as part of their ongoing operations. This would be a mechanism to assess whether SLM activities and initiatives continue to be mainstreamed into programmes and activities in St. Kitts and Nevis.
- Future projects of a similar nature should include a Demonstration Project component, since this provides a practical and hands on approach to the assimilation of tools and techniques relevant to the attainment of the Project's goals.

The key lessons learned from this project include:

- Effective adaptive management is a powerful tool in ensuring project success. One example of this, in the present case, was Government hiring a knowledgeable and competent local consulting firm to assist with project execution.
- Full commitment of the entity in Government principally responsible for the execution of the project, in this case the Ministry of Sustainable Development, is a necessary pre-requisite for project success.
- There is a need for effective inter-agency coordination and collaboration that goes beyond personal relationships and into a structure which can influence project implementation and the development of policy. The inter-agency collaboration developed during this project was very effective, not only for the implementation of SLM, but also for the implementation of projects in housing, roads, drainage and water resource management.
- Governments need to find mechanisms to capture the actual cost of projects, specifically Government's co-finance contributions. This is necessary for reporting to donors, as well as for use in the national budgetary process.

Table 2- Main Project Ratings

| Project Formulation | | Rating |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | Conceptualization | Highly Satisfactory |
| | Stakeholder Participation | Moderately Satisfactory |
| Project Implementation | | |
| | Implementation Approach | Highly Satisfactory |
| | Monitoring and Evaluation | Satisfactory |
| | Stakeholder participation in implementation | Satisfactory |
| Results | Attainment of outcomes/ Achievement of objectives | Highly Satisfactory |
| Sustainability | Financial resources | Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. |
| | Socio-political | (L). There are negligible risks that are likely to affect this element of sustainability. |
| | Institutional framework and governance | Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. |
| | Environmental | Likely (L). There are negligible risks that are likely to affect this element of sustainability. |

2. Introduction

The Sustainable Land Management project in St. Kitts and Nevis is a component of the global project entitled “LDC and SIDS Targeted Portfolio Approach for Capacity Development and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management”. The overall goal of the global project is to assist Small Island Developing States and Least Developed Countries in promoting effective Sustainable Land Management (SLM), for both global and local benefits, by strengthening the capacity of these countries to sustainably manage their land resources. At the country-specific level, the project was entitled ‘Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in St. Kitts and Nevis’. It was funded by GEF, UNDP and the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis, with UNDP being the Implementing Agency and the Ministry of Sustainable Development in St. Kitts and Nevis being the Executing Agency.

UNDP and GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures require that all full and medium-sized projects supported by GEF undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) upon completion of implementation. The principal purpose of Terminal Evaluations is to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. They assess early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. They also identify and document lessons learned and make recommendations with the intention of improving the design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects. In accordance with the policies and procedures of UNDP/GEF, the present Terminal Evaluation has four objectives:

- i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- iii) to promote accountability for resource use;
- iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

In meeting these objectives the TE examined the project execution, focusing on effectiveness, efficiency and relevance of outputs and outcomes. The key issues addressed in the evaluation were: the mainstreaming of sustainable land management into the national development policies, plans and regulatory frameworks; capacity building at all levels and an assessment of the extent to which these efforts have supported land management; and an assessment of whether the capacities developed have been transferred to other projects and activities. The evaluation also examined the management structure of the project itself, including its adaptive capacity and the overall management of project resources.

As indicated above, the TE took cognizance of all elements of project implementation, with a strong emphasis on sustainability of the successes achieved under the project. However, there were some issues which received particular attention in the TE based on their state of completion at the time of the Mid-Term Evaluation. These included the status of the national legislative and regulatory instruments relevant to SLM, the status of implementation of the Investment Plans in key economic sectors, and the formalisation and hence sustainability of the Government’s integrated coordination mechanism for project implementation.

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) was conducted between July 16 and September 6, 2013. The country visit to St. Kitts and Nevis took place from August 27 to August 28, 2013. The TE closely followed the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy. It was conducted by a single independent evaluator who had also been responsible for the Mid-Term Evaluation and was therefore familiar with St. Kitts and Nevis, and with the requirements and mode of operation of GEF and UNDP. Many sources of information were used and many methodological approaches taken, including both qualitative and quantitative methods, in the execution of the evaluation. The

qualitative aspects included a desk review of: the project document, the project implementation report (PIR), the project inception report, the country's National Physical Development Plan, the project workshop reports, and the UNDP/GEF guidance policies on the evaluation process.

The evaluator then developed a questionnaire to guide the interviews and group discussion sessions which took place during the TE exercise in St. Kitts and Nevis. Interviews and discussions were held with the following organizations and persons: The UNDP Programme Manager who oversaw the project, the available members of the Project Steering Committee, the Consultant who was responsible for project execution on behalf of the Ministry of Sustainable Development, and the Director of the Physical Planning and Environment Department. Since the project was completed in August, 2012, some of the persons who were involved in the project and whom it would have been useful to interview, were unavailable due to retirement, migration or other current commitments. However, some additional interviews were conducted on an *ad hoc* and less structured basis with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Having completed the qualitative analyses indicated above, the indicators in the project document were quantitatively analysed to assess the relevance and efficiency of UNDP-GEF support and the overall project performance.

The Results of the Evaluation are presented in this Report in the following organisational structure: Introduction; The Project and its Development Context; Findings, including Project Formulation and Project Implementation; Results; Conclusions and Recommendations; and Lessons Learned.

3. The Project and its Development Context

The global project “LDC and SIDS Targeted Portfolio Approach for Capacity Development and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management” evolved out of a concern that there is a land degradation challenge which affects the economic well-being of people at the local level, and which affects the integrity, stability, function and services of ecological systems at the global level. The contention is that this challenge can be mitigated through sustainable land management practices.

The global project was approved by the GEF in September 2004 and is the source of support to the current Sustainable Land Management project in St. Kitts and Nevis. The national project was originally expected to be implemented over a three-year period beginning in 2007. UNDP received delegation of authority to proceed with the project on October 17, 2007. However, the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis did not sign off on the project with UNDP until April 23, 2008, with work on the project not beginning until June, 2010. At the time of the Mid-Term Evaluation, the target date for project completion was December 2011, but the project was finally completed in August, 2012.

The long-term goal of the national project was to ensure that “agriculture, forest, residential, tourism and urban land uses of St. Kitts and Nevis are sustainable so that ecosystem productivity and ecological function are maintained while contributing directly to the environmental, economic and social well-being of the country”. This requires that land degradation problems, which are significant in St. Kitts and Nevis, be addressed. The land degradation problems are associated with subsistence agriculture and unrestricted livestock grazing on steep slopes, exacerbated by heavy rains, and have frequently resulted in landslides and significant soil erosion. This degradation lowers the productive capacity of the land and causes changes in the water regime, including sedimentation of riverbeds and reservoirs, declining water quality and sedimentation in coastal waters.

There are two main factors that underlie the vulnerability of St. Kitts and Nevis to land degradation. The first is that areas which were not used for sugar cultivation have poor or non-existing drainage infrastructure, leading to erosion and channelized run-off during and following heavy rains. The second is that, in the 1990s, the closure of the sugar industry due to the loss of preferential markets and other reforms of the World Trade organization with respect to EU market access resulted in an increased acreage of unproductive lands in St. Kitts. These lands, which were previously managed by the Sugar Industry, are now left unattended and have been taken over by wild vegetation and exposed to degradation by the elements, particularly during heavy rainfall and floods. These land use changes are very evident in the physical landscape and have had significant economic implications.

Despite the fact that there have been several projects and project-related activities (e.g. the National Physical Development Plan, the National Action Plan, the Institutional Strengthening for Social and Economic Development Project) that had direct bearing on capacity building and land management in St. Kitts and Nevis, none have been particularly successful in addressing the land degradation challenge. Prior to the Sustainable Land Management Project, there was no clear coordinated, effective institutional response to the degradation challenge and there was limited capacity to address it. The current project was therefore designed to provide support to the development of a strategy that would contribute to judicious use of land resources through sustainable land management practices. In this context, the project’s main expected Outcomes were: (1) mainstreaming sustainable land management into national development policies, plans and regulatory frameworks; (2) developing individual and institutional capacities for SLM; (3) developing capacities for knowledge management in support of SLM; and (4) the elaboration of investment planning and resource mobilization of SLM interventions.

The information generated by the project will be useful to all national agencies and groups whose mandate encompasses land management, and all of whom are key stakeholders in the activity. These include the Department of Economic Affairs and Public Sector Investment Planning, the Ministry of Sustainable Development, the Water Services Department, the Public Works Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Lands and Surveys, the Department of Physical Planning and Environment and the Farmer's Groups. The Project Steering Committee was drawn primarily from these Ministries but also included other stakeholders. However, it is important to appreciate that all citizens of St. Kitts and Nevis must be seen as stakeholders of the project, since their long term economic well being depends heavily on sustainable land management in the country.

4. Findings

4.1 Project Formulation

Rationale

Approximately 4,000 hectares of land owned by the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis that were previously used for sugar cane farming now lie idle. The land is used by squatters and is targeted by real estate developers. Given this, the Ministry of Sustainable Development felt strongly that there was a pressing need to address the issue of land use and management in the “post-sugar” era, both in terms of how the land should best be used and in terms of soil conservation and management following the new land uses. The project was developed against this background and places strong emphasis on stakeholder participation to ensure that the various sectors in St. Kitts and Nevis can together address a central national issue of relevance to all citizens.

Conceptualisation and Design

Although the broad project themes were stipulated by the funding agency, the project design, including the specific activities to be implemented, was developed nationally, but with input from UNDP and the Caribbean Environmental Health Institute (CEHI). The various elements of the project evolved from the National Physical Development Plan (NPDP), the Agricultural Strategic Plan and the National Adaptation Strategy. All of these preceded the Sustainable Land Management Project and spoke to issues of land use strategy, legislative support for land management efforts, capacity building for stakeholders, particularly farmers, and the management of land-related information. The project formulation also encompassed aspects of sustainable development that can be found in the national Medium Term Economic Strategy (MTES) Paper for St. Kitts and Nevis. Given the extent to which the project design encompassed nationally identified priorities, and utilised technical resources provided by UNDP and CEHI, the design can be considered Highly Satisfactory (HS). The project targets identified were clear and achievable, and the achievement indicators in the project were similar to those identified in the MTES. The logical framework of the project was clear and was closely followed in project implementation.

Stakeholder Participation

There was a requirement for stakeholder consultations during the project development stage, and Government Ministries, which were aware of prior national priorities identified for land use management, were involved in the discussions that led to project design.

Dissemination of project information to the general public during the project design stage was very limited. Perhaps the most critical deficiency in stakeholder participation in project design was the lack of involvement of national NGOs. There are few Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) or Community Based Organizations (CBOs) in St. Kitts and Nevis and few of these have been involved in any aspect of the project. A meeting was held during formulation to discuss and agree on project activities and indicators, but although civil society was invited to participate, very few NGOs or CBOs did so.

Given the acceptable consultation among Government Ministries, but the limited involvement of NGOs and the poor dissemination of information during project formulation, this evaluation rated stakeholder participation during project formulation as Moderately Satisfactory (MS).

Country Ownership

The project design was clearly linked to the national development agenda and had a strong environmental focus. Perhaps because of this, the project team, the Project Steering Committee, and other public sector stakeholders were strongly committed to the project. Despite this, there is a sense that a champion(s) has not really emerged who advocates aggressively and strongly for the project, and who continues to press, beyond the call of duty, to ensure that outcomes are mainstreamed into the national development process. The limited participation of civil society may also have constrained full country ownership. A greater effort should be made to achieve this, to ensure continuity and sustainability of project outcomes.

Replication Approach

Elements of several previous projects, strategies and plans influenced the design of the Sustainable Land Management Project. Among these were the National Physical Development Plan (NPDP), the Agricultural Strategic Plan, the National Adaptation Strategy, and the national Medium Term Economic Strategy (MTES) Paper for St. Kitts and Nevis. All of these preceded the Sustainable Land Management Project and spoke to issues of land use strategy, legislative support for land management efforts, capacity building for stakeholders, particularly farmers, and the management of land-related information.

Partnerships and Linkages

UNDP provided both technical and financial support to the project development process. This included the identification of consultants to help with project formulation. Linkages were created with other UNDP-GEF initiatives such as the National Capacity Self Assessment (NCSA) and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. UNDP's presence on the ground during project formulation was advantageous, as the consultants and national authorities could obtain instant responses to challenges and issues. The Caribbean Environment Health Institute (CEHI) also assisted in project development. On several occasions CEHI personnel worked with the local Government staff to assist in project design, to identify gaps in project deliverables and to provide baseline data.

4.2. Project Implementation

Implementation Approach

The project was originally expected to be implemented over a three-year period beginning in 2007. However, the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis did not sign off on the project with UNDP until April 23, 2008, with work on the project not beginning until June, 2010. The Ministry of Sustainable Development, which is the Executing Agency for the project, considered that the delays were due to the very capacity constraints that the project was expected to partly address. Given the delays, the Government was obliged to seek an execution modality that would allow delivery of the outputs in 18 months. Several sound, creative and flexible approaches were developed and used to ensure that the project could meet a significant proportion of its deliverables within the shortened timeframe available. The implementation of these clearly demonstrates adaptive management at work in project execution. These adaptive approaches are identified numerically below:

1. A decision was made to contract a local firm, Island Planning Services (IPS), to lead the execution of the project. As an independent body, Island Planning Services could subcontract or hire any competent person they deemed valuable in completing any component of the project deliverables. The quality of Island Planning Services contributed significantly to the effectiveness of project implementation.
2. Activities were grouped for greater efficiency. For example, the Capacity Building Workshop for Farmers occurred at the same time as the legislative review, so that public awareness activities for both events could be conducted simultaneously. This approach also allowed farmers to get first-hand information on legislation relevant to their livelihoods.
3. The investment planning for resource mobilization to support sustainable land management in St. Kitts and Nevis was framed within the context of the broader National Physical Development Plan, taking into account the Public Sector Investment Plan (PSIP) and the economic climate in St. Kitts and Nevis. Linking sustainable land management financing to public financing was an innovative and positive action, since, if accepted and approved, it locates land management financing within the general financial plan of the country.
4. Given national limitations in the generation of maps and spatial data for land management and planning in St. Kitts and Nevis, the Capacity Building and Knowledge Management components of the project were structured to meet these needs, while remaining true to the deliverables and indicators in the project. Particular attention was therefore paid to the generation of information on land use, land tenure, land degradation and land zoning in St. Kitts and Nevis.
5. The location of the project execution unit facilitated project implementation in that several Government Departments and Units relevant to project execution were located within the same physical building. This encouraged communication and collaboration and was the core of the inter-agency network that became established and operational during project implementation. The effective functioning of this inter-agency network contributed significantly to successful project implementation.
6. The training and data management activities conducted in support of Outcomes 2 and 3 made good use of electronic information technology. Several persons were trained in the use of Geographic Information

Systems (GIS) as a tool for recording land use changes and forecasting future trends. To support this training, the necessary equipment for GIS operationalisation was purchased and installed. This now allows the Government Planning Department to capture, manage and disseminate data in a timely manner, and stakeholders can make decisions on the future use of land and natural resources using updated technology and the stored data sets.

Despite the fact that not all outcomes were fully achieved, but given the shortened time frame available for project execution, the evaluator considers that the project implementation process was both effective and efficient and gives it a grade of Highly Satisfactory (**HS**).

Monitoring and Evaluation

Effective monitoring and evaluation requires that good baseline data be available to characterize the situation prevailing at the start of a project. This Terminal Evaluation found that baseline data for the project were available, were well defined and were appropriate for measuring progress towards the targets, even though some of the data were somewhat dated because of the long delay before the commencement of the project. Moreover, the indicators, as provided in the project document, were achievable and practical, thereby potentially facilitating the monitoring of project progress. Despite this, no specific monitoring and evaluation strategy or tool was developed to quantitatively track project progress against baseline data and targets. While the Government has an established protocol for monitoring and evaluation of its budgeted programmes, it has no formally established M&E protocol for projects implemented by external agencies.

The principal role in monitoring and evaluation of the SLM project was carried out by the UNDP and the Project Steering Committee. UNDP conducted constant evaluation through Operational Reports, Annual Reviews, Consultants' Reports, PIRs and Country Visits. It should be noted that there was a lack of quarterly narrative and project reporting by the implementing agency and this needs to be addressed in future projects. These reports are important in for evaluating the progress of implementation, assessing budget line balance and actual expenditure, and achievement of goals. The Project Steering Committee met regularly and served as the eyes of the Government on the project, ensuring that monitoring and evaluation at the local level was well served.

Given the above, it can be considered that the monitoring and evaluation effort was Satisfactory (S), and did assist the project in achieving its success.

Stakeholder Participation

In terms of stakeholder awareness, the Inception Workshop was well attended by a wide cross-section of stakeholders, and the resulting report widely circulated. The farmers' and stakeholders' training manual was reproduced and disseminated to participants, Ministries and relevant agencies. However, stakeholder awareness is not necessarily synonymous with stakeholder participation.

There were challenges in terms of the extent to which NGOs and CBOs could participate effectively in project implementation. The consultant firm contracted to execute the project was very focused with respect to timelines, deliverables and targets, and had to execute the project in a shortened timeframe. This pace of implementation was not consistent with the much slower interactive type of implementation associated with NGOs and CBOs. This situation was aggravated by the fledgling stage of development of the NGO community in St. Kitts and Nevis; there was no group sufficiently organized or financially capable of matching the pace of the project's implementation. The Farmers Cooperative was very vocal in bringing their concerns to the attention of the Workshop organisers of issues they wished to be addressed, namely, developing guidelines for land preparation to promote soil conservation. They specifically raised the issues of; the preparation of fields on

hillsides for cultivation with respect to soil conservation, and the use of tractors in ploughing with respect to creation of channels that exacerbate erosion during heavy rainfall.

In contrast to the low level of NGO and CBO participation, Government’s support for the project was very strong. The Ministry of Sustainable Development maintained a clear and active presence in the project. The Ministry provided human resources, physical office space and financial support for project staff, in addition to paying overheads. It also provided funds for data management, workshop logistics and procurement. The Planning and Environment Unit, which was the principal component of the Ministry of Sustainable Development responsible for project execution, attempted to involve all of its Officers in all activities undertaken by the project in order to create an inter-disciplinary Unit in which every Officer was effective with respect to the total mandate of the project.

Beyond this, the project management team was able to maintain good inter-agency coordination and collaboration in project implementation. It is fair to conclude that, at the local and national public sector level, there was a good participation by stakeholders. Regional and international participation in project execution was limited to the roles of UNDP and CEHI.

Given all of the above activities and constraints, the evaluator considers a rating of Satisfactory (S) to be appropriate for stakeholder participation in implementation.

Financial Planning and Management

The expected costs of the various project activities and the source of the funds to implement them (i.e. GEF budget vs. Co-financing), as anticipated in the Project Document, is summarised below.

| Project Outcome | Outcome Budget as in Prodoc. US\$ | Co-financing as in Prodoc. US\$ |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Mainstreaming | 123,000 | 29,000 |
| Capacity Development | 181,500 | 289,000 |
| Knowledge Management | 59,000 | 0 |
| Investment Planning | 32,000 | 25,000 |
| Project Management | 50,000 | 165,000 |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | 39,500 | 0 |

All GEF funds due under the budget were disbursed and the disbursement well recorded. However, the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT) system used by UNDP for payments resulted in some delays, and the time required for annual budget approval by UNDP was also lengthy. The delays in disbursements from the UNDP led to delays in the payment of suppliers by the project team. The project team noted that there needs to be more flexibility in the shifting of funds between budget lines so as to be able to facilitate increased

expenditure in areas that emerged as important during the implementation of the project (e.g. training, to recognise and advise on mitigation, for Government Officers undertaking and reviewing Environmental Impact Assessments).

Fund disbursement, as it pertains to the co-financing by the Government, is not well documented. It is therefore not possible to make accurate quantitative statements about the sums involved since there is no separate record of funds being transferred to the project or of specific project activities which were supported by the Government. Such funds are lumped together with the general expenses of the Ministry or Department from which the support comes. What is clear, however, is that the project could not have made the progress it did without significant Government co-financing. All project activities were executed within the budget agreed to in the project document and annual workplan. It can therefore be concluded that the project outputs have been delivered in a cost effective manner.

Administrative costs associated with the project related mainly to bank charges and communication charges. Project management costs were absorbed by Government, as was the cost of office support and maintenance.

Finally, it is important to note that, as reported by the auditors, there is no evidence to suggest any inappropriate conduct as regards the management of the funds under the project. All funds provided by the GEF were accounted for, and were found to be in accordance with the specifications of the project document.

Execution and Implementation Modalities

Following project approval by the GEF, UNDP assumed the role of implementing agency. In this role, UNDP holds fiduciary responsibility and is the lead agency for monitoring and evaluation. As indicated in Section 4.1, technical persons in the various Government Departments, UNDP and CEHI were all involved in project development. Once the project was fully developed, all management authority was relinquished to the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis, although the technical resources within UNDP and CEHI remained at the disposal of the Government upon request. Execution of the project therefore became the sole responsibility of the Government, ably assisted by the consulting firm IPS.

UNDP and the Project Manager participated in the development of TORs for the technical positions required by the project. Once applications were received, the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis was informed by the project team and Project Steering Committee, and where necessary, CVs were shared. All contracts were issued according to the recruitment procedures and laws of St. Kitts and Nevis. In all cases, UNDP required the contracts, TORs and CVs in order to create Vendor Forms in Atlas to facilitate direct payment of the person contracted by the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis.

Throughout implementation of the project, the logical framework for the project was rigidly observed and therefore gave clear direction to project implementation, except with respect to the delivery timeframe. It is to the credit of the project team that activities which originally had an eighteen-month timeframe or longer were forced to have their timelines shortened, but yet were effectively implemented in most cases.

UNDP as an implementing agency was proactive and supportive in the development and implementation of the project, and the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis has been responsible in project execution. The occasional problems experienced in project implementation and execution could readily be solved by more dialogue between UNDP and the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis to better understand the characteristics of each other's procedures and systems. Another issue raised by the Farmers Cooperative and the tour operators was the desire to have had a demonstration project attached to the execution of the SLM project to bring it more to the fore of stakeholders and provide a basis for a more sustainable deliverable.

4.3. Results

Attainment of Outcomes

There were four main results expected from the Project. These were: (1) mainstreaming sustainable land management into national development policies, plans and regulatory frameworks; (2) developing individual and institutional capacities for SLM; (3) developing capacities for knowledge management in support of SLM; and (4) the elaboration of investment planning and resource mobilization of SLM interventions.

The capacity development component of the project was among its most successful outcomes. A total of seven Workshops were conducted. These were: The Inception Workshop to introduce the project to stakeholders; A Workshop on the importance and functions of a Sustainable Land Management Unit in the context of coordinating SLM activities in St. Kitts and Nevis; A Workshop on the Guidelines for Sustainable Land Management in St. Kitts and Nevis which emphasised the approaches to be taken to SLM and the role of Government agencies in this context; A Training Workshop in the use of soil conservation techniques in areas affected by soil erosion; Two GIS Training Workshops targeting Government agencies and NGOs which introduced stakeholders to the use of GIS in sustainable land management, with a focus on the provision of hands-on training; and, A Training needs assessment for sustainable land management to identify where capacity primarily needed to be developed. Members of Government Ministries, Agencies and Units, NGOs, local communities and specific target groups all benefitted from these Workshops.

General public awareness of SLM issues was also an expected output of the project. Public awareness was heightened through the capacity development Workshops identified above, but the project also participated in several public awareness initiatives across the country. The Ministry of Sustainable Development has established a World Environmental Month and the project has ensured that SLM issues are incorporated into these activities. There is also a schools programme where schools are visited and SLM information disseminated, and summer camps which are also used for information dissemination. SLM information will be available on the Ministry of Sustainable Development's website in the future. There will be ongoing activities as public awareness of SLM issues will be included in the programmes of other initiatives e.g. Agriculture, Solid Waste Management, Disaster Management, Climate Change, Biodiversity Conservation etc.

In the context of developing capacities for knowledge management in support of SLM, the SLM project provided hardware and software to facilitate the collection, storage, management and use of data, and provided training in the techniques required for Data and Knowledge Management. The equipment obtained through project funding was greatly needed and the Government would have been unable to acquire these in a timely manner due to challenging economic times. The equipment is housed in the Ministry of Sustainable Development and there is now a dedicated Senior GIS Officer who manages the database stored in the system. The service is available to all Ministries and Agencies, with data being available on request. Residential data, conservation data and agricultural data are all available in the system, with the Ministry of Agriculture currently being the biggest user. The next developmental step in the process is to establish the St. Kitts and Nevis LRIS system, and funds are currently being sought to purchase the necessary supporting hardware for this.

The stakeholders interviewed believe that the project has made acceptable progress in mainstreaming SLM into national policies, practices and activities, and has laid the foundation for further progress in this context. An important consequence of the Training Workshops was that all stakeholders participating obtained a much greater sense of the value of sustainable land management in the economic development of the country, and deeply appreciated the consequent need to mainstream SLM into national development policies, plans and activities. The Government inter-agency collaboration which was established during project implementation, allowed all Government agencies to understand the relevance of SLM issues to the successful execution of their Agencies' mandates, and through this contributed significantly to mainstreaming SLM into the work programmes of Government. This inter-agency collaboration is expected to continue beyond the life of the project, but has not yet been formally institutionalised. Finally, a legislative review was conducted as a necessary first step towards the development and approval of a more SLM-oriented policy framework for St. Kitts and Nevis. Sustainable Land Management and Development Regulations have been created in draft and are awaiting finalisation and approval by Cabinet. It is fortuitous timing that St. Kitts and Nevis is about to produce a new National Physical Development Plan, since this affords the opportunity for SLM issues to be fully incorporated into the Plan.

The project was successful in creating a Strategic Framework for Investment Planning and Resource Mobilisation of Sustainable Land Management Interventions. The Investment and Resource Mobilisation Plan has very clear directives and guidelines for the generation of financial resources to support future SLM initiatives. The Plan clearly links sustainable land management financing to the Public Sector Investment Programme. Once the Plan is accommodated and approved in the Government's broader financial plans and budgets, this approach will virtually assure that there will be economic and political support for SLM initiatives beyond the life of the current project, and should contribute significantly to the sustainability and growth of project impacts. Beyond this, the project has developed linkages with several current national initiatives and has potential for involvement in future projects. This will ensure that land management issues are fully integrated into national activities, and financially supported, beyond the life of the SLM project. During the implementation of this project the need for more training in Environmental Impact Assessments was highlighted and this is now being addressed by the Ministry of Sustainable Development.

The extent to which Outcomes of the project were achieved is summarised in Table 3. As can be seen from the Table, the major challenges remaining are the approval and adoption by Cabinet of the draft revised national legislative and regulatory instruments that incorporate the principles of SLM; and the accommodation and acceptance of the Investment Planning and Resource Mobilisation Plan into the national budget. This is also an activity dependent on a Cabinet decision. Despite these remaining activities, the significant achievements in other Outcomes as a whole resulted in this evaluator recommending a Highly Satisfactory (**HS**) rating for Attainment of Outcomes.

Table 3 Assessment of Activities in the Four Major Outcomes

| OUTCOME 1: SLM Mainstreamed into National Development Policies, Plans & Regulatory Frameworks | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| Output # | Indicator | Degree of Success | Comment |
| 1.1 Planning and Policy documents for integration of SLM into macro-economic policies and regulatory frameworks of SKN. | SLM considerations are incorporated into macro-economic policies and development planning. | Completed | Policy has been drafted and is currently awaiting Cabinet approval. |
| 1.2 Policy instruments incorporating SLM. | Key national legislation and regulations regarding land management and planning incorporates principles of SLM. | Completed | Work undertaken in Nevis shows the national scope of the project. |
| 1.3 Revised national legislative and regulatory instruments that incorporate principles of SLM. | | 50% Completed, in that Draft Regulations for Sustainable Land Management and Development have been completed, but the rest of this activity is dependent on approval by the SKN Cabinet. | A review of the legislation has been undertaken, but there has been no actual change in legislation or regulations to date. |
| OUTCOME 2: Institutional Arrangement for SLM created | | | |
| Output # | Indicator | Degree of Success | Comments |
| 2.1 Trained technical staff from the Ministry of Sustainable Development and other relevant agencies and NGOs actively engaged in providing technical support and policy guidance on SLM to stakeholders. | Increase in contact frequency by technical staff from the Ministry of Agriculture (Forestry and Agriculture Divisions), Ministry of Sustainable Development, Public Works Department and NGOs in provision of technical support and policy guidance on SLM to stakeholder groups. | Completed | Personnel from several government sectors, NGOs and community groups were targeted for this training. |
| 2.2 Train farmers and other resource users within construction, commercial and tourism sector on practices of SLM. | Increase in the number of farmers and other resource users (within construction, commercial, and tourism sectors) that have modified means of economic livelihoods to incorporate SLM principles. | Completed | 125 copies of the training manual has been distributed to these groups. |
| 2.3 Public education and awareness strategy. | Target stakeholders and the general public to have heightened awareness of issues of land degradation and approaches for sustainable land management and demonstrate positive behavioural change. | Completed | The SLM project facilitated participation in several initiatives across the island during World Environment Month and school outreach programmes throughout the year. |
| 2.4 Sustainable development inter-agency coordination mechanism for SLM established. | Dedicated government institutional node to foster inter-agency coordination is created and supported by formal cooperative arrangements with key allied agencies. | 80% completed | This was developed during the implementation of the project but has not yet been formally institutionalised. |

| Outcome 3: Develop Capacity for Knowledge Management in Support of SLM | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|--|
| Output # | Indicator | Degree of Success | Comments |
| 3.1 Computerised Land Resources Information System (LRIS) within National GIS node. | Computerized Land Resources Information System established within the Ministry of Sustainable Development and other key agencies including the new Land Management Unit is accessible to users via intra and internet exchange protocols. | 80% completed | Some equipment procured and information collected, but not yet operationalised. Awaiting additional funding. |
| 3.2 Information databases on land use, land tenure, land degradation, land zoning for St. Kitts and Nevis set up. | Information on land use, land tenure, land degradation, land zoning in St. Kitts and Nevis is readily available to policy planners, technical departments and land users in implementing SLM. | 80% completed | Data collection is an ongoing process, will be continued beyond the life of the project. |
| 3.3 Monitoring and evaluation system for state of environments assessments established. | SLM M&E systems are operational for state of environment assessment (agricultural, pasture, forest lands and coastal ecosystems) and information used to update the land information system in SLM planning. | Partially completed | The Monitoring system that exists is not specific to the purpose of this project and therefore does not totally reflect the project's objectives. |
| 3.4 Technical Staff trained in analytical applications for decision making to support SLM. | Technical staff in the lead agencies with SLM responsibilities, specifically the Ministries of Sustainable Development & Environment, Agriculture, Housing, the Land Management Unit, and other relevant stakeholder agencies are developing spatial information products for decision making based on agency and stakeholder requirements for SLM planning. | Completed | GIS training workshop. |
| 3.5 Technical staff in all relevant user agencies trained in the operation, maintenance and information-access of the LRIS. | Technical staff in the Ministries of Sustainable Development & Environment, Agriculture (and others), and the new Land Management Unit, are using guidelines for operation, maintenance and information-sharing of the LRIS. | 80% | Still to develop a centralised system that can be accessed by multiple agencies. |
| Outcome 4: Investment Planning and Resource Mobilisation for implementation of SLM | | | |
| 4.1 Investment plans in key economic sectors that incorporate priority actions for SLM as defined in the NAP. | The investment plans in key economic sectors (agriculture, tourism, construction, commercial) incorporate priority actions for SLM as defined in NAP. | 50% | The Investment Plan has been fully developed but not yet incorporated into the Government financial plans and budgets. This awaits a Cabinet decision. |
| 4.2 Major sectors incentive regime that incorporates SLM including payment for environmental services established. | Major sector incentive regimes that include protocols for fiscal development incentives reviewed and amended to include incentives for SLM. | 50% | The plan has been developed but not yet incorporated into the Government Plans. |
| 4.3 Strategy for donor resource mobilization. | | Completed | Document completed and strategy in place awaiting implementation. |

Sustainability

Several project activities and Outcomes are likely to contribute positively to the sustainability of project benefits over time. These include the public awareness programme, the enhanced capacity in SLM knowledge and skills, the draft legislation that would incorporate principles of SLM into the national legislation, and the Investment and Resource Mobilisation Plan which clearly links sustainable land management financing to the public sector investment programme. When the draft legislation and the resource mobilisation plan are approved by Cabinet and operationalised, they will go a long way towards ensuring the sustainability of project benefits over time. Another project output which speaks well to sustainability is the data and knowledge management capacity that was developed during the project and has resulted in an active GIS database, with a dedicated Senior GIS Officer, which supplies SLM data services to Government Ministries and agencies on request. Other matters that would enhance the sustainability of project benefits are the formal institutionalisation of the public sector inter-agency network which was developed during the project, the clear emergence of a strong advocate and champion for the continuation of project outcomes, and an increased sense of country ownership driven in part by increased participation by the NGO community in SLM matters.

Given all of the above, the evaluator rates the sustainability of this project as Satisfactory (**S**).

The sustainability of project activities and benefits will be further explored below by analysing key risks that could affect the persistence of project outcomes. Four dimensions of sustainability will be addressed, with each dimension of sustainability of the project Outcomes rated as shown in the footnote below¹:

Country Ownership

The project team, the Project Steering Committee, and other public sector stakeholders showed strong commitment to the project during implementation, which implies a sense of country ownership of the project at the public sector level. By contrast there was limited participation of Civil Society in project implementation, despite a reasonably active public awareness programme. There is a sense that a greater effort should still be made, particularly in public awareness initiatives, to increase the philosophy of country ownership of SLM issues in St. Kitts and Nevis. Given this, the sustainability of project outcomes as a consequence of country ownership, is assessed to be Moderately Likely (**ML**).

Mainstreaming

For nationals of St. Kitts and Nevis, mainstreaming is the integration of SLM into policies, development plans, programmes and activities in the country. The stakeholders interviewed believed that the project has made acceptable progress in mainstreaming SLM in St. Kitts and Nevis, primarily through the ongoing impacts of the Training Workshops, the ongoing public awareness programmes, and the production of draft legislation which, when approved, would incorporate SLM into the national legislature. Based on this, the sustainability of the SLM outcomes as a result of mainstreaming is assessed to be Likely (**L**).

Four aspects of Mainstreaming relevant to sustainability will now be specifically addressed. These are Financial Resources, Socio-political risks, Institutional Framework and Governance, and Environmental Risks.

1 Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.
Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Financial Resources

The project has successfully created a Strategic Framework for Investment Planning and Resource Mobilisation of Sustainable Land Management Interventions which links sustainable land management financing to the Public Sector Investment Programme. Once this Plan is formally incorporated into the Government's financial plans and budgets, SLM initiatives can be funded through the country's national budget. Beyond this, SLM initiatives are likely to be involved in future projects which will seek external donor support. These initiatives together increase the chance that SLM activities will be financed in St. Kitts and Nevis, but there remains an element of risk given current global and regional financial realities. Based on all of the above, this evaluation rates the sustainability of the project Outcomes through the availability of financial resources as Moderately Likely (**ML**).

Socio-Political Risks

In a socio-political context, St. Kitts and Nevis is in a unique position whereby the majority of the land is state owned. This means that, once positive political directives are assured, sustainable land management can become a reality. The Government of St. Kitts and Nevis showed a consistently strong commitment to the SLM project, which suggests a strong likelihood of continued socio-political support on project completion. It is important to note that, like other SIDS in the OECS, St. Kitts and Nevis is primarily a two-party state, and changes do come with changes in Government. However, these changes are more often in personnel and staff, rather than in project or program goals and priorities. Continuing public awareness efforts will further increase socio-political support for SLM initiatives, and it is recommended that an enhanced public awareness effort be specifically integrated into the Workplan of an appropriate national agency. It is concluded that the sustainability of the project outcomes in the context of socio-political risks is Likely (**L**).

Institutional Framework and Governance

A draft planning and policy document for integration of SLM into the national policy and regulatory framework was developed during the project, as was a strategic framework for investment planning and resource mobilisation. Once these are approved by Cabinet and operationalised, they will create a strong institutional framework for ensuring the mainstreaming of SLM into national programmes and activities in St. Kitts and Nevis. The formal institutionalisation of the public sector inter-agency network established during the project will further enhance an appropriate institutional framework for SLM. It is critical that the Ministry of Sustainable Development creates a strong institutional framework and governance platform that manages SLM initiatives and supports further staff development in order to move the sustainable land management agenda forward. Given the above, it is therefore Moderately Likely (**ML**) that the appropriate institutional framework and Government structure will be established to ensure that project outcomes will be sustained beyond the life of the project.

Environmental

The stated long-term goal of the SLM project was to ensure that "agriculture, forest, residential, tourism and urban land uses of St. Kitts and Nevis are sustainable so that ecosystem productivity and ecological function are maintained while contributing directly to the environmental, economic and social well-being of the country". This requires that land degradation problems, which are significant in St. Kitts and Nevis, be addressed. The expectation is therefore that, to the extent that project outcomes are achieved and sustained over time, the project will have a positive environmental impact in St. Kitts and Nevis. This speaks to impacts of the project on the environment, not to impacts of the environment on the project outcomes. In the context of the latter perspective, there is little likelihood of negative environmental impacts on the sustainability of project outcomes, apart from the possibility of major earth movements like volcanic eruptions or earthquakes which could undermine the future flow of environmental benefits. The sustainability of the project outcomes in the context of environmental risk is therefore Likely (**L**).

Contribution to Upgrading Skills of the National Staff

The capacity development component of the project was among its most successful outcomes, with several training Workshops being conducted. There was strong emphasis on general sustainable land management issues and approaches, appropriate institutional and legislative approaches for sustainable land management, the use of soil conservation techniques to manage soil erosion, the use of GIS in sustainable land management, and training in techniques required for data and knowledge management. Members of Government Ministries, Agencies and Units, NGOs, local communities and specific target groups all benefitted from these Workshops. Given these training initiatives, it is therefore Likely (L) that the capacity development which occurred through the project will contribute to the sustainability of project activities and outcomes.

5 Conclusions and Recommendations

The start of the project was significantly delayed, and there were some smaller delays during project implementation in contracting and paying consultants and in disbursement of funds by UNDP. The consequence of the late start was that the duration of the project had to be decreased and deliverables realised in a reduced time frame. The Ministry of Sustainable Development, which was the Executing Agency for the project, and particularly the Physical Development and Environment Department of the Ministry, should therefore be commended for achieving about 85% of expected outputs, as measured by the targets in the logical framework, in the shortened project time available.

Several factors contributed to this achievement. The Government of St. Kitts and Nevis gave strong support to both project development and implementation. The Project Team and Project Steering Committee were highly capable and worked in harmony and with flexibility to achieve effective project outcomes. The public sector inter-agency network that was established contributed significantly to a holistic approach to project implementation. The consulting firm hired to lead the execution of the project was highly competent and very focused with respect to timelines, deliverables and targets. This ensured a rapid and effective pace of project execution. Strict adherence to budgetary guidelines further ensured that project execution was cost effective. The UNDP Programme Manager was on excellent terms with the project team and was always available to supply recommendations and guidance in a prompt and effective manner.

A noticeable area for improvement in future projects is the limited participation of NGOs and CBOs in both project formulation and implementation.

The following key recommendations emanate from this evaluation and are intended to add value to future projects as well as contribute to the sustainability of Outputs of this project.

- Project formulation should, to the extent feasible, allow for opportunities for input from all stakeholder groups, including Civil Society. The use of local personnel in formulation, design and implementation of future projects should be encouraged wherever possible. This will have the effect of strengthening project ownership, allowing better flow of information and data, and expediting the execution of projects.
- Project development for St. Kitts and Nevis should take cognizance of the political arrangement of the twin island state and should therefore ensure that project design and funding for project implementation accommodate stakeholders from both islands.
- There should be adequate notice of upcoming activities since this would better facilitate the participation of the wider public, and in particular participants from Nevis.
- The public awareness programme should be continued and expanded and should become institutionalised in the Workplan of an appropriate Government agency. There should be emphasis on effective mechanisms to disseminate data and information to the wider community.
- There should be more encouragement for sustained participation of NGOs and CBOs during the implementation of future projects.
- There is need for better dialogue between the UNDP and the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis, since this would allow a better understanding of each others' procedures and systems, thereby enhancing the effectiveness of project implementation. One example of this relates to the issue of

UNDP requiring serial numbers before payment which results in the Government often being required to provide parts of the cost before the equipment is delivered.

- There should be a post-project monitoring programme to ensure that key stakeholders are using the information provided and tools developed during the project as part of their ongoing operations. This would be a mechanism to assess whether SLM activities and initiatives continue to be mainstreamed into programmes and activities in St. Kitts and Nevis.
- Future projects of a similar nature should include a Demonstration Project component, since this provides a practical and hands on approach to the assimilation of tools and techniques relevant to the attainment of the Project's goals.
- It is vital to ensure that Cabinet reviews and approves the Draft Legislation which would incorporate SLM into the formal macro-economic regulatory framework of St. Kitts and Nevis.
- It is vital to ensure that Cabinet reviews and approves the Investment and Resource Mobilisation Plan for implementation of SLM, thereby providing financial support for the continuing mainstreaming of SLM into national activities and policies of St. Kitts and Nevis.
- The proposed Land Management Unit in the Department of Physical Planning and the Environment should be established.

At the end of this project it could be determined that the issue of sustainable land management is currently at the forefront of the important sectors of the St. Kitts and Nevis community, i.e. the farmers, the legislators, the planners, and wider community. There has been improvement in land use by farmers and the wider community, improved management of watershed areas, and there have been more informed decisions made by planners. The issues and principles raised from this project are set to influence and inform the development of key national development and planning tools, namely, the National Physical Development Plan, the operationalisation of the draft legislation and the Investment and Resource Mobilisation Plan, and the establishment of the Land Management Unit. It appears that this heightened awareness of the sustainable land management issues will inform decisions and implementation of future projects in St. Kitts and Nevis.

6. Lessons Learned

Lessons Learned from the implementation of the Sustainable Land Management Project in St. Kitts and Nevis include:

- Effective adaptive management is a powerful tool in ensuring project success. One example of this, in the present case, was Government hiring a knowledgeable and competent local consulting firm to assist with project execution.
- Full commitment of the entity in Government principally responsible for the execution of the project, in this case the Ministry of Sustainable Development, is a necessary pre-requisite for project success.
- There is a need for effective inter-agency coordination and collaboration that goes beyond personal relationships and into a structure which can influence project implementation and the development of policy. The inter-agency collaboration developed during this project was very effective, not only for the implementation of SLM, but also for the implementation of projects in housing, roads, drainage and water resource management.
- It is important to seek synergies through collaboration and cooperation among simultaneously operating projects where feasible. However, the extent to which this is achieved can be constrained by different projects having different timelines for the delivery of complementary components.
- There is greater probability of cooperation and collaboration when local personnel lead the project, as this makes it easier when attempting to source existing data from other agencies; i.e. the culture of data ownership is more easily overcome when the data are sought by local personnel and Ministry officers.
- The participation of a wide range of agencies in project workshops and activities, such as in this case the legislative review, can be an important educational tool in informing all agencies of legislation and other information relevant to the mandate of their offices which they may not be aware of on a day to day operational basis.
- Governments need to find mechanisms to capture the actual cost of projects, specifically Government's co-finance contributions. This is necessary for reporting to donors, as well as for use in the national budgetary process.

7. Annexes

7.1 TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR CONDUCTING THE TERMINAL EVALUATION

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

- v) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
- vi) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
- vii) to promote accountability for resource use;
- viii) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

1.2 The project objectives and its context

The project will support the mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in St. Vincent and the Grenadines through institutional, individual and systemic capacity building. The institutional capacity building will be directed at creating synergies to facilitate maximization of resource in the effective delivery of technical support to Government agencies, the private sector, community based organization and civil society groups.

The project objective is to strengthen and develop capacity for sustainable land management in relevant Government ministries, the private sector and civil society organizations, and to mainstream sustainable land management into national development planning. The project will realize five outcomes: (1) SLM mainstreamed into national development policies, plans and regulatory frameworks (2) Individual and institutional capacity for SLM developed, (3) Capacity for knowledge management in support of SLM developed, (4) Investment planning and resource mobilization for implementation of SLM interventions are elaborated (5) Adaptive Management and Learning. The three year project will be implemented by the Environmental Services Unit in the Ministry of Health and the Environment using the multi-stakeholder participatory approach involving public, private and non-government organizations.

2 OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) is a requirement of UNDP and GEF and thus it is principally initiated by UNDP CO in Barbados. It will be conducted according to guidance, rules and procedures for such

evaluations established by UNDP and the Global Environment Facility.

The overall objective of the TE is to analyze the implementation of the project, review the achievements made by the project to deliver the specified objectives and outcomes. It will establish the relevance, performance and success of the project, including the sustainability of results. 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 main stakeholders of this TE are the Ministries of Health and the Environment, Agriculture and Fisheries and Finance and Planning. Other stakeholders include the Steering Committee and the NGO community.

The TE must provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the project to date by assessing its project design, process of implementation and results vis-à-vis project objectives including the agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation. TEs have four complementary purposes:

- To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
- To synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future UNDP-GEF activities;
- To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues, for example in the midterm evaluation.

3 PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following products:

Oral presentation of main findings of the evaluation: This should be presented to UNDP CO before the mission is concluded in order to allow for clarification and validation of evaluation findings.

Evaluation written report: This report will be submitted to the UNDP Country Office, the UNDP-GEF regional Coordination Unit (RCU) and project team electronically within 2 weeks after the evaluation mission has been concluded. These parties will review the document and provide feedback to the evaluation team within 1 month after the evaluation report draft has been submitted. The evaluator will address these comments and provide a final report within a period of 1 week. In case of discrepancy between parties and the evaluation team an anNIM should be included at the end of the document explaining the discrepancies.

General considerations of the report:

- Formatting: Times New Roman – Font 11; single spacing; paragraph numbering and table of content (automatic); page numbers (centred bottom); graphs and tables and photographs (where relevant) are encouraged.

- Length: Maximum 50 pages in total excluding anNIMes
- Timeframe of submission: first draft within 2 weeks of completion of the country mission

4 METHODOLOGY OR EVALUATION APPROACH

An outline of the evaluation approach is provided below. However, it should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in line with international criteria and professional norms and standards as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group²². Any change must be cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

- (i) **Documentation review** (desk study): the list of documentation is included in AnNIM 2. All the documents will be provided in advance by the Project Team and by the UNDP Country Office. The evaluator should consult all relevant sources of information, including but not limited to the following list of documentation: UNDP and GEF evaluation policy, the project document, project reports, Project Steering Committee minutes and decisions, project budgets, project workplans, progress reports, PIRs, project files, UNDP guidance documents, national legislation relevant to the project and any other material that they may consider useful. The National Project Coordinator will also provide a report of the project’s accomplishments and lessons.
- (ii) **Interviews** will be held with the following organizations and persons as a minimum: The Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Health and the Environment, The Director of Finance (UNDP’s focal point), the Environmental Director/Coordinator, members **from the project Steering Committee and the National Project Coordinator**.
- (iii) **Field Visits** should be made to any site where there are demonstration activities.
- (iv) **Semi-structured interviews** – the team should develop a process for semi-structured interviews to ensure that different aspects are covered. Focus group discussions with project beneficiaries will be held as deemed necessary by the evaluation team
- (v) **Questionnaires**
- (vi) **Participatory Techniques and other approaches for the gather and analysis of data**

5 EVALUATION TEAM

This evaluation will be undertaken by a single consultant who must be familiar with the subject matter as well as the local conditions in St. Kitts and Nevis.

6 IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

6.1 Management Arrangements

²² www.uneval.org

The evaluation is being solicited by UNDP, led by UNDP Barbados and the OECS as project Implementing Agency. The UNDP Sub-regional Office for Barbados and the OECS has overall responsibility for the coordination and logistical arrangements. Briefing sessions will be scheduled as necessary.

Payment modalities and specifications: The evaluators will be contracted directly from the project budget. Payment will be 50% at the submission of the first draft to the UNDP-CO, and the other 50% once the final report has been completed and cleared by UNDP Sub-regional office. The quality of the evaluator's work will be assessed by the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF- RCU. If the quality does not meet standard UNDP expectations or UNDP-GEF requirements, the evaluators will be required to re-do or revise (as appropriate) the work before being paid final instalments.

6.2 Timeframe, resources, logistical support and deadlines

The total duration of the evaluation will be **24** days according to the following plan:

Preparation before field work: (4 days including travel time)

- Acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials with information about the project (PIRs, TPR reports, Terminal Evaluation report and other evaluation report, etc);
- Familiarization with overall development situation of country (based on reading of UNDP-Common Country Assessment and other reports on the country).
- Detailed mission programme preparation, including methodology, in cooperation with the UNDP Country office and the Project team.

Mission: (10 days-)

- Meeting with UNDP Country office team;
- Meetings with key stakeholders in St. Kitts and Nevis
- Joint review of all available materials with focused attention to project outcomes and outputs
- Visit to Project site
 - Observation and review of completed and ongoing field activities,(capacity development, awareness /education, sustainable use demonstration activities, community development, etc)
 - Interviews with key beneficiaries and stakeholders, including representatives of local authorities, local environmental protection authorities, local community stakeholders, etc.

Draft report (8 days-): To be provided within two weeks of mission completion

- Final interviews / cross checking with UNDP CO, Project team.
- Drafting of report in proposed format
- Telephone review of major findings with UNDP CO
- Completing of the draft report and presentation of draft report for comments and suggestions within 1 month

Final Report (2days-)

- Presentation of final evaluation report

7 SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

The scope of a TE will depend upon project type, size, focal area, and country context. In all cases, the TE should properly examine and assess the perspectives of the various stakeholders. In most cases, the TE will include field visits to ascertain project accomplishments and interviews of the key stakeholders at national and, where appropriate, local levels. It also analyses the use of GEF and co-financing resources in the broader context of the country.

In general it is expected that evaluations in the GEF explore the following five major criteria³:

- **Relevance.** The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- **Effectiveness.** The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- **Efficiency.** The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy.
- **Results.** The positive and negative, and 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.
- **Sustainability.** 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.

The following should be covered in the TE report:

General information about the evaluation.

The TE report will provide information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology. More details are provided in the template of Terms of Reference (**ToR**) in AnNIM 2.

Assessment of Project Results

TEs will at the minimum assess achievement of outputs and outcomes and will provide ratings for outcomes. This assessment seeks to determine the extent to which the project outcomes were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project's outcomes, the TE will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching the project's objective as stated in the project document, and also indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved and achieved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator- together with the Project Team- should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established. Since most GEF projects can be expected to achieve the anticipated outcomes by project closing, assessment of project outcomes should be a priority. Outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Examples of outcomes could include but are not restricted to stronger institutional

3

capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes in behaviour), and transformed policy frameworks or markets. **For GEF 4 projects it is required**, and for GEF 3 projects it is encouraged, that the evaluators assess the project results using indicators and relevant Tracking Tools.

To determine the level of achievement of project results and objectives following three criteria will be assessed in the TE:

- **Relevance:** Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities? The evaluators should also assess the extent outcomes specified in the project appraisal documents are actually outcomes and not outputs or inputs.
- **Effectiveness:** Are the project outcomes commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? In case in the original or modified expected outcomes are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects.
- **Efficiency:** Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Wherever possible the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

The evaluation of relevancy, effectiveness and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of project's effectiveness and efficiency. Since projects have different objectives assessed results are not comparable and cannot be aggregated. To track the health of the portfolio, project outcomes will be rated as follows:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

The evaluators will also assess positive and negative actual (or anticipated) impacts or emerging long term effects of a project. Given the long term nature of impacts, it might not be possible for the

evaluators to identify or fully assess impacts. Evaluators will nonetheless indicate the steps taken to assess project impacts, especially impacts on local populations, local environment (e.g. increase in the number of individuals of an endangered species, improved water quality, increase in fish stocks, reduced greenhouse gas emissions) and wherever possible indicate how the findings on impacts will be reported to the GEF in future.

Assessment of Sustainability of project outcomes

The TE will assess, at a minimum, the “likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this.” The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. More details on the sustainability assessment are provided in the Template for TOR provided in AnNIM 2.

Catalytic role

The terminal evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out.

Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems

The TE will assess whether the project met the requirements for project design of M&E and the application of the Project M&E plan. GEF projects must budget adequately for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources for the implementation of the M&E plan. Project Managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to improve and adapt the project. Given the long duration of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans to measure results (such as environmental results) after project completion. The TE reports will include separate assessments of the achievements and shortcomings of these two types of M&E systems.

Final report Outline

1. Executive summary

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
- Table summarizing main ratings received

2. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

3. The project(s) and its development context

- Project start and its duration

- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

4. Findings

In addition to the Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency assessment described above, a descriptive assessment must be provided. All criteria marked with **(R)** should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Please see AnNIM 2 for an explanation on the GEF terminology.

4.1. Project Formulation

This section should describe the context of the problem the project seeks to address. It should describe how useful the project conceptualization and design has been for addressing the problem, placing emphasis on the logical consistency of the project and its Logical Framework. This section should seek to answer the following questions: *Was the project well-formulated? Were any modifications made to the Project’s LogFrame during implementation, and if so, have these modifications resulted or are expected to result in better and bigger impacts?*

- **Conceptualization/Design (R)**: This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy was the best option to address the barriers 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 (R)**: 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 relates to actual practices undertaken during implementation).
- Other aspects: to assess in the review of Project formulation approaches, the comparative advantage of UNDP 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.

4.2. Project Implementation

- Implementation Approach (R): Independent from the issue of whether the project was well designed or not, the NIMt question should be *how well has the project been implemented?* This section should include an assessment 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 & E activities if required.
 - (ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic workplans 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 (R): 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. For evaluating this, it is proposed that evaluators use the following criteria: i) to evaluate if the project has an appropriate M&E system to follow up the progress towards achieving the project result and objectives ii) to evaluate if appropriate M&E tools have been used, i.e baselines, clear and practical indicators, data analysis, studies to evaluate the expected results for certain project stages (results and progress indicators). iii) to evaluate if resources and capacities to conduct an adequate monitoring are in place and also if the M&E system has been utilized for adaptive management

- Stakeholder participation (R): 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 area.
 - (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: includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE. See more details and explanation of concepts in AnNIM 3 This section should include:
 - (i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
 - (ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements (has the project been the cost effective?)
 - (iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)
 - (iv) Co-financing Apart from co-financing analysis the evaluators should complete the co financing and leverages resources table provided in AnNIM 3.
- 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 the Government and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project. This section should seek to answer questions such as: *Was the project's implementation done in an efficient and effective manner? Was there effective communication between critical actors in response to the needs of implementation? Were the administrative costs of the Project reasonable and cost efficient?*

4.3. Results

Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of project objective (R): This TE seeks to determine the extent to which the project's outcomes and project objective were achieved and if there has been any positive or negative impact. For this it is important to determine achievements and shortfalls of the project in achieving outcomes and objectives. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators, with the Project Team, should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established. This analysis should be conducted based on specific project indicators.

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. The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. Following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability will be addressed. Each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as shown in footnote below⁴:
 - Financial resources: Are there any financial risks involved in sustaining the project outcomes? What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?
 - Sociopolitical: Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
 - Institutional framework and governance: Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits? While assessing on this parameter also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how is in place.

Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Likely (ML): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

- *Environmental:* Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.

- Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

5. Conclusions and recommendations

This section must provide the concluding points to this evaluation and specific recommendations. Recommendations should be as specific as possible indicating to whom this are addresses. Please complete the relevant columns of the management response Table provided in AnNIM 4 with main recommendations made. This section should include:

- *Final remarks or synthesis on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results and sustainability of the project;*
- *Final remarks on the achievement of project outcomes and objective;*
- *Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project;*
- *Actions to follow up on to reinforce initial benefits from the project;*
- *Proposals for future directions that reinforce the main objectives.*

6. Lessons learned

The evaluators will present lessons and recommendations on all aspects of the project that they consider relevant in the TE report. The evaluators will be expected to give special attention to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed or hindered: attainment of project objectives and results, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, and project monitoring and evaluation. Some questions to consider are:

- Is there anything noteworthy/special/critical that was learned during project implementation this year that is important to share with other projects so they can avoid this mistake/make use of this opportunity?
- What would you do differently if you were to begin the project again?
- How does this project contribute to technology transfer?
- To what extent have UNDP GEF projects been relevant to national / local efforts to reduce poverty / enhance democratic governance / strengthen crisis prevention and recovery capacity / promote gender equality and empowerment of women? Please explain.
- Has this project been able to generate global environmental benefits while also contributing to the achievement of national environmental management and sustainable development priorities? If yes, please elaborate.

7. Evaluation report Annexes

- Evaluation TORs
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

7.2 ITINERARY

August 27, 2013

9:00 am Meeting with the Head of Environment Department, Ministry of Sustainable Development
1:00 pm Interviews with available members of the Project Steering Committee

August 28, 2013

9:00 am Telephone interviews with Project Steering Committee members
1:00 pm Telephone interview with UNDP Project Manager responsible for the SLM Project in St. Kitts and Nevis.

7.3 LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

- Dr. Reynold Murray, Former Programme Manager (Energy and Environment), United Nations Development Programme
- Mr. Randolph Edmead, Head of Environment Department, Ministry of Sustainable Development
- Mr. Ellis Hazel, Consultant, Island Planning Services
- Ms. Claudia Walwyn, Nevis Department of Physical Planning, Natural Resources and Environment

7.4 LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATOR

- The Project Document of the Sustainable Island Resource Management Mechanism.
- The Project Implementation Report (PIR)
- The Project Inception Report
- Project Steering Committee Minutes
- Project Workshop Report
- UNDP and GEF guidance policies on the evaluation process
- Proposals of the Demonstration Projects
- The country's National Physical Development Plan
- National Legislation relevant to the Project
- The Mid Term Evaluation Report
- Annual Project Implementation Reports
- Annual Workplans
- Auditor's Report

7.5 QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR INTERVIEWS

Questions for Terminal Evaluation (TE).

1. What was the official closing date of the project?
2. Was adaptive management used to ensure efficient resource use and attainment of outcomes in a timely manner?
3. Were the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them used as management tools during implementation?
4. Which community organizations (NGOs) were involved in the project and what were their roles? Comment on Civil Society engagement.
5. How would you define mainstreaming?
6. To what extent has SLM been mainstreamed in St. Kitts and Nevis?
7. What would you consider as the greatest achievement of the project to date?
8. Capacity development is a major component of the project. What capacity has been developed at the: a) national institutional level?; b) national policy level?; c) individual and community level?
9. Now that the project has been completed is there evidence of the capacity development at work in St. Kitts and Nevis?
10. What impact has the SLM made at the national level? Is the public aware of the project?
11. Was the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?
12. What other national projects (specifically GEF projects) are being implemented jointly or in synergy with the SLM?
13. Have the GEF funds been used specifically to support this project? Are the GEF funds adequate?
14. Have government co-financing been forthcoming?
15. Is there a financial plan to support long term mainstreaming of SLM?
16. List all visible changes/impacts that are occurring in St. Kitts and Nevis as a result of the implementation of the SLM.
17. How could the impacts of the SLM be improved?

18. Is the implementation methodology of the SLM effective? How could it be improved?
19. What are the main successes of the SLM? What are its greatest failures/weaknesses?
20. How will you rate the quality of work delivered by (a) the local consultants (b) the international consultants?
21. Has time management on the projects been an issue? Explain.
22. Has the steering committee functioned? Are there meeting reports/minutes?
23. Has UNDP been helpful? Explain
24. To what extent were partnerships/linkages between institutions/organisations encouraged and supported?
25. What will be your overall rating of the project?
26. What are the lessons learnt from this project?
27. Has the project been effective in achieving its targets of expected outcomes?

7.6 LIST OF WORKSHOPS

Workshops for the Implementation of the Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management Project for St. Kitts and Nevis.

1. Inception Workshop for the Sustainable Land Management Project for St. Kitts and Nevis – July 2010
 - The objective was to introduce the project to stakeholders and to outline the extent of the project along with timelines.
2. Workshop on the importance and functions of a Sustainable Land Management Unit – August, 2010.
 - The objective was to outline the role and importance of a Land Management Unit for coordinating SLM activities in St. Kitts and Nevis.
3. Workshop the Presentation of Guidelines for Sustainable Land Management in St. Kitts and Nevis –October, 2010. A similar workshop was held on Nevis in June 11.
 - The objective was to present the guidelines developed for Sustainable Land Management and the role of Government agencies in implementing the guidelines.
4. Training Workshop in the use of Soil Conservation techniques in Sustainable Land Management in St. Kitts and Nevis, February, 2011.
 - The objective was to train stakeholders in the use and application of soil conservation techniques in areas affected by soil erosion.
5. GIS Training Workshop with Government Agencies and NGOs.
 - The objective was to introduce to stakeholders the use of GIS in Sustainable Land Management
6. Training Needs Assessment for Sustainable Land Management.
 - The objective was to identify issues and problems encountered by staff both in the field and in the review of development applications in St. Kitts and Nevis.
7. GIS Technical Training Workshop.
 - The objective was to encourage hands-on-training to those who were identified in the needs assessment as needing more training.

7.7 LIST OF OUTPUTS

Outputs for Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of SLM Project in St. Kitts and Nevis

1. Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in National Development Guidelines.
2. Strategic Framework for Investment Planning and Resource Mobilization of Sustainable Land Management Interventions.
3. A Training Manual for managing land Resources in St. Kitts and Nevis.
4. Review of Legal, Regulatory, Policy and Institutional Frameworks for Sustainable Land Management in St. Kitts and Nevis.
5. Knowledge management for Sustainable Land Management. Information Databases on Land Use, Land Tenure and Land Degradation and Land Zoning.
6. Draft Sustainable Land Management and Development Regulations
7. Annual Operational Plans

7.8 LIST OF THE MEMBERS OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

- Department of Physical Planning and Environment, Mr. Randolph Edmead
- Department of Public Works, Mr. Calvin Pemberton
- Department of Agriculture, Ms. Raquel Williams
- National Housing Corporation, Mr. Wayland Vaughn
- St. Christopher National Trust, Mrs. Jacquelyn Armony
- Representative of the Farmers Cooperative, Mrs. Arabella Nisbett
- Physical Planning
- Department of Agriculture
- Legal Department
- Nevis Island Administration, NIA.

7.9 SAMPLE OF MINUTES OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE

Report on the First Steering Committee (PSC) Meeting for the Sustainable Land Management Project

The First Steering Committee meeting for the Sustainable Land Management Project (SLMP) was convened on Wednesday 21st July at the Conference Room of the Department of physical Planning and Environment. This venue was after a last minute change from the Ministry of Health Conference Room.

The meeting was chaired by Mr. Randolph Edmead, Director, Department of Physical Planning and Environment (DPPE). The agenda for the meeting was as follows:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Welcome Remarks | Mr Randolph Edmead, Director, DPPE. |
| 2. Project Overview | Mr Ellis Hazel Project Consultant Island Planning Services |
| 3. Project Management Arrangements | Mr Ellis Hazel Project Consultant |
| 4. Project Activities And Outcomes | Mr. Randolph Edmead |
| 5. Project Workplan | Mr Ellis Hazel |
| 6. Roles and Responsibilities Of the PSC | Mr Randolph Edmead |

Composition of PSC

The SLMP Project Steering Committee is made up of representatives from the following agencies or organizations:

Department of Physical Planning and Environment

Department of Public Works

Department of Agriculture

Legal Department

National Housing Corporation

St. Christopher National Trust

Representative of the Farmers Cooperative

Physical Planning (NIA)

Department of Agriculture (NIA)

PSC Meeting Attendance

The PSC meeting was attended by the following:

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 7. Mr Randolph Edmead | DPPE |
| 8. Mr. calvin Pemberton | PWD |
| 9. Mrs Ryllis Vasquez | Legal Department |
| 10. Ms. Raquel Williams | Department of Agriculture |
| 11. Mrs Jacquelyn Armony | St. Christopher National Trust |
| 12. Mr. Wayland Vaughn | National Housing Corporation |
| 13. Mrs. Arabella Nisbett | Farmers Cooperative |

Apolgies were received from representatives of the Nevis Island Administration who were attending a national Disaster Management meeting convened on Nevis.

Presentations

The meeting convened at 9:35 a.m. with welcome remarks from Mr. Randolph Edmead, SLMP PSC Chairman. It was decided that due to the late start of the meeting, the agenda would be changed to focus on items 1, 2, 3 and 6.

Mr. Edmead informed the participants that this meeting was the first PSC meeting and it was convened shortly after the Project Inception Meeting.

PSC members were reminded of the heavy rainfall which was experienced over the past few days and were asked to think of what the overall impact on land would have been had the rainfall resulted from the passage of a hurricane instead of an easterly wave. This he said highlighted the urgent need to protect and conserve our valuable land resources which should be the concern of all nationals in a post sugar era.

PSC members were informed that the establishment of the SLMP Steering Committee was to guide the implantation of the project to achieve the protection and the sustainable use of land resources.

Participants were reminded of the importance of their involvement in the implementation of the SLMP and the role of their respective organizations in the SLM process for St. Kitts and Nevis. The roles and responsibilities of the PSC were outlined as providing high level policy and technical support as well as review and approve project outs, workplans and budget.

The PSC will be chaired by the Director of Physical Planning and Environment and meet at least once monthly.

Project Consultant Mr Ellis Hazel of Island Planning Services gave an overview of the project. During his presentation Mr. Hazel informed PSC members that the SLPM needs to go outside of United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification and Land Degradation (UNCCD), requirements of focusing on agricultural lands and productivity. Lands also had to be viewed in relation to development and other uses. Hence the need for coordinated development was highlighted as on one of the approaches to achieve the sustainable management of land resources.

It was also emphasized that the SLMP needs to be linked with what is occurring in the coastal zone as activities that take place on the land impacts the coastal areas.

The need for the development of regulations for land management and enforcement was also underscored.

Hazel pointed out that the SLMP will also focus on adoption learning to address issues of land management. The presentation ended with an explanation on the organization of the project activities to be undertaken.

PSC members made the following inputs:

- Ms. Arabella Nisbett of the Farmers Cooperative indicated that the needs of farmers must be given greater recognition especially in the area of land preparation for crop cultivation. The knowledge that farmers possess in this area must be taken on board. The need for greater supervision from the Ministry of Agriculture was also highlighted.
- Mr. Walyland Vaughn of NHC highlighted the need for public awareness in the area of land management. He stressed that this should be undertaken in relation to past experiences of individuals.
- Mr. Calvin Pemberton of PWD highlighted the need for equipment to assist in the area of land management.
- Mrs Jacquelyn Armony of the St. Christopher National Trust highlighted the need for the continuation and support of SLM activities the SLMP ends.

It was decided that a meeting will be convened in Nevis to update PSC members and other stakeholders of the activities undertaken thus far for the implementation of the SLMP.