



PROJECT TERMINAL EVALUATION
**“SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE ECOSYSTEMS OF DOMINICA'S
PROTECTED AREA SYSTEM”**

GEFSEC PROJECT ID: 5761;

GEF AGENCY ID: PIMS: 5089;

AWARD ID: 00082944

GEF FOCAL AREA: BIODIVERSITY

STRATEGIC PROGRAM OF GEF 5:

Strategic Objective 1 - Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems, and specifically the BD1 Focal area Outcome 1.1 “Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas”

Strategic Objective 2 – Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors, specifically BD 2 Focal area Outcome 2.1 “Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.”

IMPLEMENTING AGENCIES:

Forestry, Wildlife and National Parks Division (FWNPD) in the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MoAF).

Ministry of Health and the Environment; The Environmental Coordinating Unit.

COUNTRY: DOMINICA

Evaluation conducted by:
Mrs. Stephanie Hodge (International consultant)
from Feb 24, 2021–April 2020
Report submitted March 30 2021

Contents

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	6
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	8
• Project Summary Table	8
Project Information Table	8
• Project Description (brief)	11
• Evaluation Rating Table :.....	11
• Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons	23
Conclusions.....	23
Recommendations Table ^[1]	27
1. INTRODUCTION	27
1.1. Purpose of the evaluation	27
1.2. Scope	28
1.3. Methodology	30
1.4. Structure of the evaluation report	31
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	31
2.1. Project Start and Duration	31
2.2. Development Context	31
2.3. Immediate objectives	33
2.4. Development objectives (Threats and Barriers)	34
2.5. Expected Results (Baseline Indicators established)	39
2.6. Theory of Change	43
2.7. Main stakeholders	44
3. FINDINGS	47
3.1. PROJECT DESIGN/FORMULATION	47
3.1.1. Formulation Analysis of Results Framework: Logic and Strategy	47
3.1.2. Assumptions and Risks	49
3.1.3. Lessons from relevant projects incorporated into project design	49
3.1.4. Planned Stakeholder Participation	50
3.1.5. Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector	51
3.1.6. Gender Responsiveness in the Design	52

3.1.7. Social and Environmental Safeguards	53
3.2. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION.....	54
3.2.1. Adaptive Management.....	54
3.2.2. Stakeholder and Partners Engagement	57
3.2.3. Project Finance and Co-finance.....	58
Confirmed Sources of Co-Financing at TE Stage	58
3.2.4. Monitoring and Reporting: Design (MS), Implementation (MU), Overall (MS).....	58
3.2.5. Implementing Agency and Executing Agency Coordination and Operational issues (MU) 67	
3.2.6. Risk management including social safeguards (Annex 9: an updated risk management strategy, December 2019)	67
4. PROJECT RESULTS.....	70
4.1. Progress towards Expected Results (MU).....	70
4.2. Relevance (HS)	78
4.3. Effectiveness (MU)	79
Efficiency (MU).....	80
4.4. Impact (MU).....	81
4.5. Sustainability Overall Rating (ML).....	82
4.6. Country Ownership	83
4.7. Gender and Women Empowerment.....	84
4.8. Cross-Cutting Issues	84
4.10. GEF additionality.....	85
4.11. Replication and Scale-up.....	86
5. MAIN FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND LESSON LEARNED	86
5.1. Main Findings and Conclusions.....	86
5.2. Lessons Learned.....	87
5.3. Recommendations.....	88
ANNEXES	90
1. ToR.....	90
2. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED	101
3. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED.....	102
4. EVALUATION QUESTION MATRIX.....	105
5. RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN DECEMBER 2019.....	110

6. QUESTIONNAIRE USED AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS	112
7. EVALUATION CONSULTANT AGREEMENT FORM	122
8. REPORT CLEARANCE FORM	123
9. ANNEX ORIGINAL RISK LOG	124
10. ANNEX METT SCORES	125
11. ANNEXED IN A SEPARATE FILE: TE AUDIT TRAIL	127
12. ANNEXED IN A SEPARATE FILE: TERMINAL GEF TRACKING TOOLS, IF APPLICABLE	127
13. SAFEGUARDS SCREENING TOOL	127
14. Project sites.....	132

- **Acknowledgements**

The Terminal Evaluation consultant would like to thank all those who patiently took part in interviews and who generously took time out of their busy days to share perspectives and information crucial to the conduct of this review. I thank the Project Coordinator and the Project Administrative/Finance Assistant, for their important inputs and for the significant amount of time taken to meet. Sincere thanks to UNDP Programme Analyst, UNDP ME, UNDP RTA, UNDP UNV officer, and all responsible for this project (based in Dominica, Barbados and Panama), for sharing their perspectives and the effort invested in obtaining important background information. The TE thanks the many individuals in Government, the private sector, the donor community, and the NGO community who shared information with the TE critical to the conduct of this Terminal Review.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

APR	Annual Project Report
AWP	Annual Work Plan
ARR	Annual Review Report
BAM	Banana Accompanying Measures
CNP	Cabrits National Park
CARICOM	Caribbean Community Common Market
CARIFICO	Caribbean Regional Fisheries Co-Management
CARPHA	Caribbean Public Health Authority
CATS	Caribbean Aqua-Terrestrial Solutions
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBF	Caribbean Biodiversity Fund
CBO	Community Based Organization
CCCCC	Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre
CCI	Caribbean Challenge Initiative
CDR	Combined Delivery Report
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CO	Country Office
CPACC	Caribbean Planning for Adaptation to Climate Change
CPAP	Country Program Action Plan
CRMP	Community Resource Management Plan
CSO	Civil society organisation
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DDFWNP	Forestry, Wildlife and Natural Parks Division
DOAM	Dominica Organic Agriculture Movement
DOMLEC	Dominica Electricity Company Ltd.
DOWASCO	Dominica Water and Sewerage Company
DNCW	Dominica National Council of Women
ECDSS	Eastern Caribbean Decision Support System
ECMMAN	East Caribbean Marine Management Area Network
ECU	Environmental Coordinating Unit
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EIA	Environmental Impact Agreement
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GAP	Good Agriculture Practice
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Green House Gas
GIS	Geographic information system
GIZ	German Government's Agency for International Cooperation / (Deutsche) Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GNI	Gross National Income
GoCD	Government of Commonwealth of Dominica
GSPS	Growth and Social Protection Strategy
HDI	Human Development Index
IA	Implementing Agency
IDP	International Development Partners

INRM	Integrated Natural Resource Management
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
IW	Inception Workshop
IWCAM	Integrated Watershed and Coastal Area Management
LAMA	Local Area Management Authority
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
METT	Monitoring and Evaluation Tracking Tools
MoAF	Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
MPA	Marine Protected Area
MDNP	Morne Diablotin National Park
MTPNP	Morne Trois Pitons National Park
MTPNP WHS	Morne Trois Pitons National Park World Heritage Site
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NEMS	National Environmental Management System
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NIM	National Implementation Modality
NP	National Park
NPPAA	National Parks and Protected Areas Act
NPU	National Parks Unit
OECS	Organization of East Caribbean States
OPAAL	OECS Protected Areas and Associated Livelihoods
PA	Protected area
PACU	Protected Area Coordinating Unit
PAS	Protected area system
PC	Project Coordinator
PIR	Project Implementation Reviews
PoWPA	Programme of Work for Protected Areas
PPR	Project Progress Report
PSCM	Project Steering Committee Meetings
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RBM	Results-based management
RCU	Regional Coordinating Unit
REDD	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation
SBAA	Standard Basic Assistance Agreement
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SPACC	Special Program on Adaptation to Climate Change
SPCR	Special Project on Climate Resilience
SSMR	Soufriere Scots-head Marine Reserve
SWOT	Strength Weakness Opportunity Threats
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on Law of the Sea
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WNT	Waitukubuli National Trail
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

• Project Summary Table

UNDAF Outcome(s): Improved governance and regulations of environmental and energy issues for more resilient economies by 2016

UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017 Primary Outcome Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded

UNDP Strategic Plan Output(s): 1.3. Solutions developed at national and sub-national level for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystems services, chemicals and waste

UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome: [UNDP's Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Framework 2012-2020:] Signature Programme #2: Unlocking the potential of protected areas (PAs), including indigenous and community conserved areas, to conserve biodiversity while contributing to sustainable development

Expected SPD Outcome(s): Enhanced capacity of national, sub-regional and regional institutions and stakeholders to: effectively manage natural resources; build resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change and natural and anthropogenic hazards; improved energy efficiency and use of renewable energy; improved policy, legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks for environmental and energy governance.

Expected M-CPAP Output(s): Output 1.4: Knowledge and good practices disseminated and capacity development in the areas of natural resource management, disaster risk reduction, climate change, renewable energy, energy efficiency, low carbon emissions, biosafety and adherence to international standards and norms.

Executing Entity/Implementing Partner: Ministry of Health and the Environment; The Environmental Coordinating Unit.

Implementing Entity/ Responsible Partner: Forestry, Wildlife and National Parks Division (FWNPD) in the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MoAF).

Project Information Table

Project Details		Project Milestones	
Project Title	Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems of Dominica's Protected Area System	PIF Approval Date:	May 9, 2014
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #):	5768	CEO Endorsement Date (FSP) / Approval date (MSP):	8 October 2015
GEF Project ID:	5761	ProDoc Signature Date:	14 April 2016
UNDP Atlas Business Unit, Award ID, Project ID:	00082944	Date Project Manager hired:	2018-2020
Country/Countries:	Dominica	Inception Workshop Date:	8 November 2016

Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean	Mid-Term Review Completion Date:	<i>n/a</i>
Focal Area:	Biodiversity and Ecosystems	Terminal Evaluation Completion date:	March 30, 2021
GEF Operational Programme or Strategic Priorities/Objectives:	1.1 “Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas” 2.1 “Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.	Planned Operational Closure Date:	February 2020 (Actual: June 2021)
Trust Fund:	<i>GEF</i>		
Implementing Partner (GEF Executing Entity):	Ministry of Health and the Environment		
NGOs/CBOs involvement:	Dominica Organic Agriculture Movement, National Youth Council and National Association of Youth in Agriculture, Community Councils and Community Improvement Groups, Eco-balance – Biodiversity Center for Learning and Training, Bellevue Chopin Organic Farmers, Giraudel Women’s Group		
Private sector involvement:	<i>[Indicate as: Lead executing agency; one of the beneficiaries; through consultations]</i>		
Geospatial coordinates of project sites:	Focal communities of the project’s main activities. 1. La Plaine: 15.32, -61.25 2. Pont Casse’: 15.37, -61.34 3. Bellevue: 15.20, -61.34 4. Trafalgar: 15.32, -61.34		
Financial Information			

SSE TE FINAL

PDF/PPG	at approval (US\$M)	at PDF/PPG completion (US\$M)
GEF PDF/PPG grants for project preparation	\$82,192	\$90,000
Co-financing for project preparation	\$0	\$0
Project	at CEO Endorsement (US\$M)	at TE (US\$M)
[1] UNDP contribution:	\$300,000	300,000
[2] Government:	\$7,400,000	3,705,068
[3] Other multi-/bi-laterals:	\$0	\$0
[4] Private Sector:	\$0	\$0
[5] NGOs:	\$0	\$0
[6] Total co-financing [1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5]:	\$7,700,000	\$8,608,762.06
[7] Total GEF funding:	\$1,707,306	\$1,475,563.57
[8] Total Project Funding [6 + 7]	9,407,306.	\$10,384,325.63

- **Project Description (brief)**

Dominica has a national PA system consisting of six (6) terrestrial and one marine park which are the Morne Trois Pitons, Morne Diablotin and Cabrits National Parks; Northern and Central Forest Reserves and Stewart Hall Catchment Area and Soufriere/Scott's Head Marine Reserve Respectively, However, only three (3) of the PAs (Morne Trois Pitons, Morne Diablotin and Cabrits National Parks) are legally constituted¹, while the Stewart Hall Catchment Area and Soufriere/ Scott's Head Marine Reserve two of the noted sites have been partially developed commercially and are no longer considered suitable as national parks.

This PA estate is supported by the The National Parks and Protected Areas (NPPPA) Act No. 16 of 1975, amended by Acts 54 of 1986, Act 12 of 1990, and Act 8 of 2001 is the principal piece of legislation relating to the management of national parks in Dominica. The Act provides for the declaration of both national parks and protected areas, leasing of land for protected areas, the establishment of a System of National Parks and Protected Areas. The Act also makes provisions for the creation of a National Parks Unit to manage a System of National Parks and Protected Areas. Despite the Act, the PA Management system has deficiencies.

This project has used GEF incremental support to build Dominica's national capacity to manage its PA system. This has been executed with emphasis on the Morne Trois Pitons National Park (MTPNP) and its buffer zone to improve management effectiveness, create sustainable livelihood activities and improve biodiversity conservation. It had been envisioned that project implementation would ensure replication and dissemination of lessons learnt at the other sites (Parks, Trails, and nature Sites), and other GEF funded activities locally and regionally. This project has developed a protected areas management system in keeping with recommendations from previous initiatives like the OPAAL project and the National Parks Consortium Studies. Using the GEF funding this project aimed to strengthen the sustainability of Dominica's PA system by: developing a sustainable financial management plan and a site specific management plan for Morne Trois Pitons National Park, ensure the legal establishment of a buffer zone for MTPNP and create community atlases for local communities in and around the buffer zone thus establishing living landscapes. GEF funding was to be used to build capacity at the systemic and community level to effectively manage PAs and their buffer zones.

- **Evaluation Rating Table ⁱⁱ:**

For ease of reference, individual ratings across various areas within the TE report have been consolidated in the table below and is further detailed in the "Findings" section of the report.

Rating descriptions are as follows:

Unable to Assess (U/A): available information does not allow an assessment

1 = Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings

2 = Unsatisfactory (U): substantially below expectations and/or major shortcomings

3 = Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): somewhat below expectations and/or significant shortcomings

4 = Moderately Satisfactory (MS): more or less meets expectations and/or some shortcomings

5 = Satisfactory (S): meets expectations and/or no or minor shortcomings

6 = Highly Satisfactory (HS): exceeds expectations and/or no shortcomings

1. Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating	
M&E design at entry	MS	<p>The project document included a robust plan for monitoring (see page 56); however, this was not implemented as envisioned with a full technical staff . In general, the Monitoring and Evaluation ME was weak, and this was observed by UNDP implementation support, the government’s technical monitoring of the outputs, and the issues flagged during the process of implementation. This is a lesson learned. Per ProDoc, this project was about delivering technical assistance on the PA system to Dominica and showcasing a good practice by doing. The project anticipated provision of technical staff and/or consultants to ensure the integrity of the work and to ensure value-added technical assistance provided by the UNDP and partners. This work was to be managed by the IP with the support of UNDP on request. A key findings at TE is that the actual work completed by March 2021, still needs to be technically vetted by a technical officer at the ministry and the UNDP RTA based on the adapted strategy. These products need to be further consolidated with synergies made between them before finalizing the project.</p>
M&E Plan Implementation	MU	
Overall Quality of M&E	MU	
2. Implementing Agency (IA) Implementation & Executing Agency (EA) Execution	Rating	
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	MU	<p>As discussed under the strategy /design section and in alignment with the project document, project implementation (inclusive work planning) suffered serious setbacks prior to and following Hurricane Maria in 2017. The disaster partly explained the low cumulative disbursement rate in 2017.</p>
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	MU	<p>According to the PIRs reviewed, the project’s cumulative expenditure rate in 2018 was 33%. The results were related to earlier flagged setbacks in implementation. There were financial irregularities that led to a financial assessment and a change in the IP. It was also uncovered that there were delays in administrative processes due to the government’s focus on the elections (December 6, 2019).</p> <p>Moreover, stakeholders interviewed said the transition to a new IP through the establishment of the Ministry of Environment, Climate Resilience, Disaster Management and Urban Renewal in 2019 and a further change in 2020 to the Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment, staff at UNDP and government, took most of the efforts to regain traction in implementation during that period. The Project Coordinator also resigned in March 2020, creating further setbacks. The project has thus been fully staffed only since April 2020. The PMU reported not receiving a clear procurement plan for key consultancies and spent most of the reporting period updating the plan</p>
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	MU	

	<p>through the PIR process. Interviewees reported that limited government support due to inadequate staff capacity, compounded the inability of the PMU to effectively implement project activities within the limited timeframe. To catch up, key procurement of international and national consultants was planned for the second half of 2019, which was expected to raise the delivery to approximately 63% by January 31, 2020. This plan was again disrupted by COVID-19.</p> <p>Hurricane Maria somewhat derailed the co-management demonstration and the community plan for intensive women's, youth's, and community education and economic support work. A livelihood grant was provided post disaster, for livelihood post-disaster. The grants provided, while viewed as all around good initiative had limited linkage to the strategic policy and learning targets in the original plan. For many implementing stakeholders, this was viewed as an opportunity to revisit the strategy and build on the policy momentum and activities in the disaster plans especially as UNDP was involved in recovery efforts through activities from the Recovery and Resilience Cluster (outside of the work of the project) However, it must be noted that UNDP's recovery work was not directly linked to the policy related activities and implementation required for this project.</p> <p>After the UNDP spot check intervention in 2018 and the transition in IP, a risk management and acceleration plan was designed (December 2019) in consultation with the IP. This plan called for a reduction in scope- less activity downstream and more focus on upstream activities including the financial assessment, the institutional assessment and the PA system legal review. This plan was disrupted by COVID-19 in March 20 (restrictions in mobility, Remote work conditions, deemed it not possible to bring in international consultants to finalize their work i.e. institutional specialist), and the risk plan and adapted strategy (focus on upstream deliverable by end) was conducted with online inputs with the exception of the international financial consultant was on island (institutional development consultant work was completed remotely). It was reported impossible to schedule the inputs in sequence during the time remaining. The results were coordinated by the project coordinator PC, but the legal national consultant's products still needed synergies and integration with the international work.</p> <p>Key stakeholders said there was a misunderstanding of the unique UNDP dual role in the project oversight and implementation. UNDP plays an important GEF oversight role as well in a distinct national execution support role, NIM plus. The project assurance role is to perform objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions, independent of the Project Manager (PACU), ensuring that appropriate project management milestones are managed and completed. The regular operational (NIM plus) oversight was to be ensured by UNDP through the UNDP-CO in Barbados, and the strategic oversight was to be ensured by the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor (RTA). The "oversight" role i.e., was not expressed early in implementation, because the inception was</p>
--	---

		<p>lacking RTA involvement. Additionally, ongoing technical oversight by UNDP was included to ensure that the project practices due diligence with UNDP’s Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and GEF technical guidance and procedures.</p> <p>Slow procurement was flagged by stakeholders interviewed as being a major factor affecting implementation and this was attributed to both UNDP and government procurement and related processes. For instance, cabinet decisions were needed on every consultancy approached. This process was said to be overly time-consuming and might have been avoided if the agreed consultancies were approached based on one procurement plan approved early. UNDP also reported that for a technical project, it should have had a plan upfront to enable the technical recruitments in a timely way.</p> <p>Generally, the key critic was about the need for much greater communication between the project management and the implementing unit. This is a lesson learned and is covered in detail on page.</p>
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating	
Relevance	HS	<p>This project was highly relevant to the current context. Dominica’s current political agenda is well known to be a sustainable, and promotes it as a resilient “nature island”. Additionally, the project is aligned with GEF Biodiversity Strategic Objective 1. Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems, specifically the BD1 Focal area Outcome 1.1, “Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas” and Strategic Objective 2, Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes, and Sectors, specifically the BD 2 Focal area Outcome 2.1 “Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.”</p> <p>The project was linked to UNDAF Outcome(s): Improved governance and regulation of environmental and energy issues for more resilient economies by 2016. It was designed in the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014–2017 against the Primary Outcome: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded; and Output(s): 1.3. Solutions developed at the national and subnational level for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals, and waste. It was also linked to the UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome: (UNDP’s Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Framework 2012–2020) Signature Programme #2: Unlocking the potential of protected areas (PAs), including including and community conserved areas, to conserve biodiversity while contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Nationally, Dominica has been pursuing a “green” development path in keeping with the government’s pronouncement declaring Dominica the “Nature Isle.” This was confirmed a central policy objective with</p>

		<p>interviewees. Consequent to this aspiration, Dominica is committed to aligning its development agenda and biodiversity conservation strategy with the global biodiversity objectives. All the goals and targets of the 2011–2020 Strategic Plan are relevant. The country has selected five targets as national priorities. It was hoped that these priorities, articulated in the NBSAP, would be realized by 2020. Among the original five targets selected were these:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 2020, at least 15% of terrestrial and inland water and 15% of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem service, are conserved through comprehensive ecologically representative and well-connected systems of effectively managed PAs and other means which are integrated into the wider land and seascape; • By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stock have been enhanced through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15% of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and combating desertification. <p>The above mentioned remain salient objectives.</p> <p>Also, Dominica signed on to the UNEP-led Caribbean Challenge Initiative (CCI) that calls for the protection of 20% of terrestrial and near-shore marine and coastal resources by 2020. This national effort was supported by this project. Further, this project assisted Dominica in achieving CBD Pow PA goals: 1.2: to integrate protected areas into broader land- and seascapes and sectors to maintain ecological structure and function; 1.5: to prevent and mitigate the negative impacts of key threats to protected areas; 2.2: to enhance and secure involvement of indigenous and local communities and relevant stakeholders; 3.1: to provide an enabling policy, institutional, and socioeconomic environment for protected areas; 3.2: to build capacity for the planning, establishment, and management of protected areas. Dominica’s NBSAP included this project as a first step to achieving these targets because of the emphasis on the development of a PA system management plan that strengthens national institutional and systemic structures, promoting PA coordination and improved civil society participation in biodiversity management.</p>
Effectiveness	MU	<p>The TE <i>consultant has studied the expected results and indicator plan to measure this project’s results but also took into account the dynamic operating context and the bottlenecks experienced with these elements.</i></p> <p>The extent to which the project’s objectives were achieved is provided by the evaluation in a full assessment of the project results and indicator framework (See explanation of overall assessment of stated indicators on page 61). It is comprehensive and color coded and tells whether the project met or partially met or not met its stated success indicators. In general, the project has experienced two distinct operating contexts / phases with three coordinators, three RTAs, and two counterparts. The project did not hold a Mid Term Evaluation MTE. The operating context was irregular at the start. Under a changed IP (see explanation in report section on adaptive</p>

	<p>management), the original plan was adapted to take into consideration the new context and the low delivery rate (2018).</p> <p>In terms of the adaptation plan, the project team had adapted the plan and refocused work upstream but it was nearing the project closure date (March 2021) and then COVID 19 impacted on the ability to bring in the international consultants who were key to the adapted plan and technical support envisioned. The time to catch up and implement these activities in an integrated synergetic way was not there.</p> <p>By the end of project, while the project has created some readiness to move toward the relevant objectives it has provided only limited contribution to the expected outcome.</p> <p>As highlighted by the analysis of expected outcomes the project did not fulfil its first outcome result which as to showcase a national model park with a demonstration of co management in the buffer. Despite all the obstacles experienced, the final result includes useful stakeholder engagement. The financial policy review and PA system institutional review and the PA systems draft law review exercises have set the stage for continued work.</p> <p>Major achievements as perceived by the principle implementing stakeholders interviewed include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Although the full adapted plan was incomplete by TE, the PC and UNDP teams had accomplished most of the accelerated plans work since 2019 when the last PC was on boarded. The scope of work to accomplish during that remaining period was reported as vast; o The project had engaged stakeholders around its upstream outputs (financial plans for four PAs and for the National Model Park) and provided assessment of the institutional arrangement to guide the government officials in terms of the holistic PA management system. o The final financial planning and financial streams, as well as gaps in the related institutional arrangement, were provided ; o The development of four Co-management plans have begun a process of awareness with the community, private sector and government. o Tangible community benefits have been provided to farmers including small weeding/sowing tools and training. o Important baseline data for policy level decision-making was collected i.e. biodiversity survey but late-due June 2021; o The training complement helped changing of practices and learning around conservation. This was provided to farmers and government technical staff. o Brokering work with the small grants to continue training SGP was an achievement; o Education work was provided to primary schools close to the buffer zone; o Training with wardens on biodiversity assessment and conservation was completed;
--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o An awareness consultant did project training in March 2021; o Subsequent to the passage of Hurricane Maria, capacity for monitoring was built with forestry including providing drones for assessments of flora and fauna for ecological changes. This was necessary due to the inaccessibility of the area. Stakeholders were trained in June 2021 in the use of drone data. o An adventure club and biodiversity clubs of the Dominica State College were engaged.
Efficiency	MU	<p>When considering efficiency, the TE looked at the structural change expected. The ProDoc states, under the “business as usual” scenario, that Dominica faces the possibility of little advancement in the realization of an effectively managed and financially sustainable PA estate. If not addressed in a significant way, gaps in PA financing and management will continue to threaten the integrity of the PAs, limiting the operational effectiveness (i.e., its ability to provide for biodiversity conservation, ecosystem support, and its ability to support national development goals). The project had expected to establish an enabling environment through legal, institutional, and operational reforms supporting PA management effectiveness and financial sustainability. The project was expected to work with proposed and ongoing conservation initiatives. The project was designed to achieve the proposed outcomes while incurring only essential incremental expenses. To accomplish this, it was thus expended to build upon the existing baseline activities and national and local capacities as well as available infrastructure and will target increased co-financing commitments during project design and implementation.</p> <p>Such ambition was not possible given the operating and contextual issues impacting on the implementation (see adaptive management, implementation context, and execution issues). Additionally, inclusive work planning and strategic scheduling of human and resource inputs was needed. The inception period is central to the design of the implementation plan including the multiyear work planning. GEF-related guidance and support inputs at that stage was missing. While the UNDP CO was involved, the inception period and meeting was not substantively guided by a UNDP RTA.</p> <p>The project did not meet its envisioned structural “reform” changes expected including new policy and legal framework by end. It did however make a limited contribution to the enabling work with good technical support of the financial analysis, the institutional technical design work and stakeholder engagement needed in these processes.</p> <p>The implementation oversight support to this project was not strong. The government and UNDP monitoring of the early issues and providing timely technical input on products was weak, and this was a lesson learned.</p>
Overall Project Outcome Rating	MU	<p>As mentioned, significant setbacks happened to implementation including financial irregularities in the IP which led to a change in the IP; and the delays in administrative processes due to the government focusing on the elections December 6, 2019 and further transition and changes in operating</p>

		<p>context. When the project finally begun implementation, the third PC had prioritized and targeted key sectors for stakeholder’s engagement including forestry, fisheries and lands for a biodiversity survey, financial feasibility study, legal review of the national PA act and PA institutional management review. For example, follow through with training of foresters was a key output. By the end of the project, the cost benefits analyses had been done, although a CBA was not an expected output of the project – all the PAs have been studied and grouped according to the PC. This classification has been based on specific characteristics. .</p> <p>Key results by end of project: The actual achieved results with supporting justifications are shown in the logical framework assessment on page 61 and in a general assessment of the key indicators under the outcome areas in the table below. Evaluator suggests the reader review the full scope of the project results on page 61 (review of project indicator framework).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notably the scope of work in last two years was intense, due to the implementation of the acceleration strategy which even if not fulfilled completely, resulted in strong UNDP and Government involvement to ensure adequate structures were in place for implementation and to facilitate stakeholder engagement. There will be recommendations and products completed that will guide the government officials in terms of where in establishing a PA system. • The financial streams are worked out as well are as the gaps and opportunities in the institutional arrangement. • In terms of the co-management plans – the project has started a process with communities. For this project's resources, some benefits went to farmers post disaster. The hurricane affected the project in a major way as did COVID. • The project has established the collection of important baseline data and a data portal for future decision making. • The project also had a training complement, and this has to a degree supported farmer in terms of changing some limited practices. • The brokering of the training plan and education work with SGP was notable as a significant synergy and achievement. • The project has started important behavior change work with the primary schools close to the buffer zone. The communication included an end of project video. There has been work completed with adventure and biodiversity clubs of the Dominica State College. • There has been public awareness component which included community and public training. The project did support training with wardens i.e. biodiversity assessment and conservation. To a degree there was some capacity for monitoring built with forestry for monitoring and had included bringing in new technologies i.e. drones.
4. Sustainability	Rating	
Financial sustainability	ML	The UNDP Financial Sustainability Scorecard indicates that the combined PA estate operates below acceptable levels (i.e., finances currently injected in the system are inadequate to completely support the basic required structures for effective PA management). These levels did not improve a lot through this project.

Socio-political sustainability	ML	<p>The potential for sociopolitical sustainability is linked to enabling work for a system approach and agreements on co-management including those legally established. The projects unrealized potential was to effect a systematized and decentralized approach to management and ownership including the community stewardships. While the project failed to demonstrate the value of the co-management approach, there was stakeholder engagement. The baseline work was never conducted to be able to envision or monitor these results. Based on the original plan, a carrying capacity assessment would be done for each site during year one of the project. Stakeholders involved in livelihood operations around the PAs (vendors, tour operators, tour guides, park personnel, taxi drivers, fishermen, and farmers) and the various public sector agencies involved in systemic planning and management would participate in the development of zoning plans that would include appropriate activities permitted at each site. This was not conducted. The participatory approach, if conducted properly, would have allowed for the inclusion of differentially challenged persons, vulnerable groups, or minorities like the Kalinago people and the promotion of gender equity. This collective engagement of Dominica’s population was expected to deepen ownership of the project and ensure social sustainability. Dominica National Council of Women (DNCW) in partnership with the government’s Department of Gender was to work with Dominica Organic Agriculture Movement (DOAM) to ensure gender equity during project implementation (recruitment of staff and consultants) as well as monitor woman’s participation in training, community consultation, and other capacity-building initiatives. Giraudel Flower growers would also receive technical support under this project. These were missed opportunities.</p>
Institutional framework and governance sustainability	ML	<p>For a capacity building project looking critically at the financial aspects of a PA system, generally, there is “enabling capacity” to build such project work upon. The abrupt changes in the operating context – The disbanding of the Environmental Coordination Unit (ECU) in 2018, Hurricane Maria in 2017; the pandemic in 2020; and other staff transitions- all affected institutional sustainability. A key observation was that while the PCs engaged to support the project, staff who were involved in supporting project activities were often doing tasks related to urgent government work, due to lack of institutional capacity also resulted in task sharing to execute project deliverables. The project coordinator being pulled into other work remains a constant issue and not a sustainable model for implementing GEF projects.</p> <p>In this context, sustained HR for coordination of donor projects in the ministry is a considerable problem. If the government wants the most climate-resilient country, it needs a strong plan to support coordination institutions. Such an institutional setup for this vision will need a plan and resources outside of the GEF funding. Ultimately the government must take ownership that even after multiple donor-funded projects, institutional capacity for resilience and conservation as a part is still a bottleneck for climate and environment action. This is an opportunity for</p>

		UNDP, positioned for institutional development work and for coordination of donors to get a massive influx of capacity rather than small GEF projects. UNDP could support the government with a donor's scanning to come up with a good plan for building institutional capacity for resilience and protected areas and climate change.
Environmental sustainability	ML	This project's goals support the implementation of national environmental sustainability priorities identified in the UNDAF, the Multi-Country Program Action Plan, and the country's obligations to the Rio conventions' Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). The project was designed to take cognizance of the country's NBSAP and specifically supports the Aichi Targets set by Dominica. The project's title and objective speak to strengthening environmental sustainability and improving management effectiveness at the institutional and systemic levels. The idea has been to apply precautionary approaches to natural resource conservation involving the stakeholders as both beneficiaries and custodians of the resource. In this way, the project forges linkages between environmental dimensions, disaster prevention, and improving risk resilience.
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	ML	The lack of the institutional framework to support the coordination capacity showcased by this project is a major finding during and is highlighted as a key lesson learned. The kind of resources needed to build sustained human capacity for coordination and to support the government vision for protected areas systems, nature-based solutions and resilience and will require more resources.

Design Summary	TE highlighted findings
Project Strategy	The project design was overambitious and unrealistic for the national context. It was starting from a limited baseline knowledge in terms of establishing a protected areas system including institutional arrangement and understanding of the needs for a fully functioning system with co-management and financial feasibility.. The project had two interlinked components (expected results –work areas) each with three key areas of supportive activity. The first component aimed to demonstrate biodiversity mainstreaming, co management, improved financial management and functioning management system at the Morne Trois Pitons National Park and scale it as a demonstration to other PAs. The second component is aimed to provide the supportive enabling environment for improved PA management system including setting up the institutional arrangement, improve EIAs standard and provide the legal work for improved core and buffer zone. The project aimed to increase the protected areas by 25%. The design was generally flexible but needed adapting and work plan scheduling at inception. The project work plan was not adequately scheduled for cumulative expected results at inception (or adapted to the context and stakeholders' roles). For example, the biodiversity baselines in the protected areas needed to be established as an area of priority. The project lacked the the institutional arrangement for coordination and sustainability in place which resulted in the ECU being dissolved. The PMU did not receive or elaborate a clear procurement plan for key consultancies. The minimal government support due to transitions and staff capacity compounded this situation. Key procurement (namely of international and national consultants) was planned for the second half of 2019, which intended to raise the delivery to approximately 63% by January 31, 2020. A risk mitigation plan and new team (second PC resigned) were adapted to focus on the enabling work (financial feasibility, legal and PA institutional elements. While this was optimistic and shows readiness, the TE found the scheduling was not organized effectively with limited time for execution i.e. the baseline biodiversity survey is currently being conducted. The legal consultancy

Design Summary	TE highlighted findings
	needs requires further input from the two international consultants. The Land and Survey activity will only be finalized after the project ends.
Components	
<p>Outcome 1: Strengthening the core zone management of Protected Areas at systemic level and scale up innovative interventions at core zone of selected PAs to improve Sustainability</p> <p>Outcome 1. Biodiversity Assessment, monitoring and conservation. Develop approve and operationalize management plan for MTPNP</p> <p>2. Resource MTPNP management. Develop Operational Capacity. Develop and implement surveillance plan to control hunting, and harvesting of wild plants and animals, land clearing and tilling on slopes >15%, and land development.</p> <p>3. Establish PA coordinating Unit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen PA policy. • Develop PA legislation. • Improve financial stability of PA. • Develop PA system plan. • Consolidate PA information system. • Develop financial sustainability strategy. • Standardized administrative and financial processes in co-management arrangement 	<p>The Outcome aimed at establishing a model national park completed with enabling work: biodiversity survey, financial feasibility, PA institutions and management plan, and demonstration of co-management. The work to be effective however, needed precise scheduling to achieve the expected outcome level results. The biodiversity assessment for example, should have been scheduled in the annual work plan at the start of project (2016) together with the HR plan. This baseline work did not start until the final year and the results of it are currently available. Most of the work completed has not yet been formally vetted by the government and or UNDP. In terms of work planning, this process at inception from the beginning was out of sequence (Main finding).</p> <p>One key problem noted by technical consultants (financial, institutional and legal) involved was that system-wide, not all the targeted PAs were legal entities. For instance, there was one cluster of PAs (Morne Trois Pitons and Morne Diablotin National Parks) that existed for terrestrial considerations and another for marine (Soufriere/Scott's Head Marine Reserve) and one for both, Cabrits National Park. All the project supported PAs came under the mandate of the Ministry of Blue and Green Economy, Agriculture and National Food Security (marine) and the Minister of the Environment, Rural Modernisation and Kalinago Upliftment (terrestrial) but the arrangement needs guidance and work on co-management with other sectors and communities. The PA management as a system was thus fragmented and inefficient. The project aimed to model the national park as a good practice including all these elements—biodiversity surveys, a national financial feasibility plan, and strengthened institutional capacity for management —, but these were not achieved. Of note, the protected areas financial feasibility specialist carried out her duties in the absence of a PA Systems Management Plan which proposes a uniformed criteria for PA management and PA Bill which includes a policy framework to support a flexible approach to revenue generating mechanisms which ideally should have preceded her activities. However, the activities of the specialist were carried out prior to the administering of the surveys focused on PA knowledge, and separate from that of the PA systems management specialist, who was responsible for examining gaps in laws and capacities with stakeholders. As an example of the need for more current examination of potential gaps and capacities, the National Parks and Protected Areas Act (1975) with stipulation for PA system management for nature protection and conservation was also amended in 1986 and 1990.</p> <p>The co management of the Cabrits PA where its management is shared by more than one institution was most interesting as, while it is legally established, it needs management-level support for the terrestrial area. The fisheries need technical assistance to gain legal status in that area and for the limits of acceptable change i.e., carrying capacities. Also, for the institutional plan, the idea was a management authority. This was relevant for financing as currently; the user fees go into a central fund at MOF. The idea for the change would be that the collected fees could be used for maintenance of the systems. These collected fees need to be accounted for and accessible. Also concerning these efforts, transformative work is required on education as Dominica would like to be a climate resilient nation but there is still a lot of work needed as it related to instituting policies to guide biodiversity resources protection and conservation. The financial consultant's key task was to help and encourage Dominica to prepare a road map for a trust fund. Here she had progressed as the commonwealth of Dominica has retained observer status as a first step in establishing a National Conservation Trust, under the umbrella of the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund. The Caribbean Biodiversity Fund has eight member countries and the country of Dominica is ideally suited for an NTF with 75,000 km and one of three UNESCO sites in the Caribbean region. The efforts of the financial consultant were well received by the government officials interviewed. The project support to institutional, financial and legal work will need to be consolidated to identify synergies and vetting for international standards. The legal work, when drafted, requires public inputs presentation before it goes through the cabinet as it contains aspects of co-management.</p>

Design Summary	TE highlighted findings
<p>Outcome 2: Establish and manage Buffer Zone as a key component of National Protected Area System and select experiences to be scaled up beyond the buffer zone</p> <p>Outcome 2</p> <p>1. Establish an Inter-sectoral committee for the management of integrated PA landscapes (2,030 ha buffer zone).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and define boundaries of buffer zone • Legally establish buffer zone as managed landscape with restrictions on hunting, charcoal burning, tilling on slopes > 15% and infrastructure development • Demark sites in the buffer zone with signpost <p>2. Support CRMP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop land tenure and compensation review process • Expand the scope of current outreach program for farmers <p>3. Develop 4 Community resource management plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engage local residents within buffer zone in livelihood activities • Strengthen Community 	<p>The second outcome was focused on contributing to the overall enabling environment for a PA management and systems approach. It comprised three activities aimed to improve the operating and legal environment for PAs. These included all the conditions for a cross sectoral - system wide approach: buffer zone establishment, committees established, financial, legal and operational establishment of a buffer zone and core zone. The project would review the financial, legal and institutional aspects, and operationalize them.</p> <p>Based on the acceleration plan in 2018, the project team had aimed to finalize these enabling inputs towards a direction forward for a functioning system by project end (accelerate and adapted strategy). This aspirational result area posited the need for a single well-planned national PA management unit with cross sectoral and multi-stakeholder institutional arrangements. However, these structural level results were not achieved by end and the factors influencing implementation were significant and discussed throughout this report.</p> <p>The Ministry of the Environment, Rural Modernisation and Kalinago Upliftment is currently in the process of organizational restructuring (both the Minister and the PS of the Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment were appointed in January 2020) and the enabling conditions for work on biodiversity conservation and PA system management were met (linked to resilience – DRR and climate change adaptation) on the political agenda. The expert engaged to develop a Protected Areas Bill has been engaged since September 2020 and is revising all PA policies and regulations. The responsibility of the legal specialist on the project was to develop PA legislation and to establish an effective management structure, improve financial sustainability, legally establish the buffer zone of Morne Trois Pitons National Park, in addition to other matters. However, the TE found the development of PA legislation and the establishment of an effective management structure (final steps in creating the enabling environment) remain to be completed and will require inputs and synergies with the other consultant’s final products before these are results.</p> <p>The evaluation determined that while the management and community-based resource plans, finance and a draft institutional plan for PAs have been developed (discussed above), due to the timeframe of activity completion, there was no time to implement or to test the recommendations. The PA institutions and systems plan has been developed and submitted to the Ministry of Blue and Green Economy, Agriculture, and National Food Security & the Ministry of the Environment as well as the Ministry of Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment for review and approval. However, as mentioned, stakeholders suggest this needs also to be further consolidated with the legal work and tested or operationalized in communities. The co-management plans have been developed for PAs and have been designed according to the management structure of Dominica’s seven PAs, but due to the limited time frame since the plans were proposed, the functionality cannot be measured. These plans were developed with community consultation. The Evaluator interviewed the NGO LAMA involved in managing independently managed MPA estates and learned that there is expressed value in having a systematic approach with a government-supported management authority because it will support their profile and give affiliation. This will support them better manage the PA’s, accountability and resource mobilization. This evaluation recognizes the difficult financial situation for managing these PAs especially in emergency.</p>

Design Summary	TE highlighted findings
organization capacity to effectively manage the buffer zone. • Community based education program	

- **Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons**

Conclusions

Design

The project design was found to be aspirational as there was limited baseline data on protected areas to facilitate a system wide approach. Assumptions were made in the design about institutional readiness for coordination. Evidence of coordination gaps was observed. The differentiation between the UNDP oversight and program management support roles was not well implemented and reported as requiring further clarification i.e. the support to execution role of UNDP Barbados multi-Country Office and the need for higher technical vetting role by government. There were changes in the UNDP GEF Regional Technical advisor (RTA), twice during the implementation of the project. The current RTA only was assigned in 2020, late in the implementation and after which the UNDP had commissioned a spot check and changed the IP. Also, the RTA was absent during the inception period, and this was likely a cause of the early design interpretation problems.

Implementation and Adaptive Management

Project implementation effectively began when a new IP was identified in 2019.

At the inception phase of the project, a key area highlighted at the outset was the importance of utilizing a step by step approach in the first year of project implementation. However, the approach utilized did not take into consideration a need for sequencing i.e. establishing baselines then planning actions.

This resulted in a very poor inception and work planning process with limited information on biodiversity or biodiversity value.

The project operating context changed post disaster and post UNDP spot check of the original IP and ECU. Shortly after the acceleration plan was put in place, the COVID 19 pandemic occurred. A new coordinator was engaged in 2018, who then left the project, until a new coordinator on-boarded in March 2020. The delayed activities and procurement were scheduled to be streamlined focused on upstream work and accelerated in the final one and half year (and during the pandemic) by a newly- appointed coordinator. However, the operating institutional arrangement for the project had weakened post disaster and post-ECU. The IP changed due to irregularities found in the ECU financing and post UNDP spot check (dissolution of the ECU in 2018). The project continued after the risk management phase, with a new IP under enabling conditions between 2019 and 2021.

The project experienced delays due to procurement backlogs. At MTR period late 2018, only 33 percent of the budget had been realized. This was compounded by a change in project management (twice, after the MTR) and the start of a global pandemic (COVID 19). While the project did not achieve all planned results, it managed to conduct some groundwork including stakeholder engagement mechanisms, for future government efforts to build a systems approach to biodiversity and protected areas.

UNDP's comparative advantage can be tapped for scanning resources for building the institutional human capacity to operationalize and sustain the readiness work linked to resilience agenda. The current work has been a stepping-stone for the project to be where it should have been in the start in terms of the enabling environment for environment, energy and resilience coordination work. The systemic coordination issues that arose are primarily concerned the government's readiness for support for coordination and the

environment to link and monitor the work. GEF resources cannot fulfil these goals; therefore strategic discussions on next steps require further discussion.

In terms of the operational point of view, the government experienced challenges with procurement when implementing this project. A gap was observed in the capacity of government to facilitate goods and services during project implementation. While the donor community may provide funds and technical assistance, organizational and institutional standards should be established for effective implementation of donor-funded projects, including ways to streamline procurement processes, to improve efficiency of delivery. Regardless of a protracted cabinet approval process, the government has an interest in determining the progress of each contract and should have the means to do so efficiently. It must be mentioned, however, that this cannot be solved through donor funded projects under tight time limits. For future projects, UNDP might ensure the original project agreement has the procurement requirements integrated within an approved plan to overcome potential hurdles and reduce inefficient procedures that slow the delivery.

Vehicle procurement is a case in point, where there was inefficient dialogue between the ECU and the UNDP on to the utilization of resources. For instance, UNDP was asked to procure the vehicles from local suppliers. There were two bids, one was for a truck for mountainous terrain and the other for an urban office work setting. There never should have been an altercation as to the type of technical truck that was needed for mountain project monitoring. If this procurement plan were clear from the beginning, the delays would have been avoided.

This project was at its essence about transmitting technical knowhow, providing public education, training to farmer and users and awareness and instilling new behaviors: building mindset and systems that consider conservation of biodiversity and the value of natural resources to the public and sustainable development pathways.

Major achievements include the following:

Although the full adapted plan was incomplete by TE, the PC and UNDP teams had accomplished a lot of the groundwork in the last push from 2019. The scope of work was reported as being vast;

1.3.5. Develop a Protected Area System Plan that includes an overall management strategy for the National PA system - The project has started engagement (readiness) and made recommendations to guide the government officials in terms of the holistic PA system. 1.3.4. Improve financial stability of Protected Area System - The final financial planning and financial streams, as well as gaps in the related institutional arrangement and opportunities, were worked out on paper;

1.3.8. Standardize administrative and financial processes in co-management agreements - Co-management plans were completed and operationalization started.

2.3.2. Engage local residents within the buffer zone in livelihood activities - Some community benefits have been provided to farmers. The hurricane affected the project in a major way, as did COVID;

Important baseline data for decision-making was collected;

2.3.3. Strengthen community/organization capacities to effectively manage the buffer zone - The training complement gave much support in terms of changing practices;

Brokering work with SGP was an achievement;

2.3.4. Community based education programme - Education work was provided to primary schools close to the buffer zone;

1.1.1. Biodiversity assessment, monitoring and conservation - Training with 17 (2 females, 15 males) wardens on biodiversity assessment and conservation was completed;

2.2.3. Conduct outreach and education programmes in MTPNP buffer zone - An awareness consultant did project training in March 2021;

1.2.1. Provide sufficient resources (equipment and materials) for effective management of MTPNP - Capacity for monitoring was built with forestry officers for monitoring including providing drones;

1.2.2. Communication, including an end-of-project video, was produced;

2.3.4. Community based education programme - An adventure club and biodiversity clubs of the Dominica State College were engaged through education sessions with students on the Morne Trois Pitons National Park. A poster competition was also held.

Lesson Learned

Criteria		
DESIGN		
Priorities of Country		The current priorities of the country are resilience and disaster reduction as well as poverty alleviation. The project was aimed to support Dominica to meet its international goals and obligations i.e. Convention on Biodiversity CBD, the 2015 Paris Climate change Agreement and the Sendai global agreement on Disaster risk reduction. Ecosystem adaptation (the key component of this project), was a highly relevant topic linked to problem solving for resilience. However, further integration of X, including policy advocacy would have been a strategic adaptation, especially given the onset of natural disasters during the project.
Learning Approach and UNDP support to implementation NIM plus.		Careful decisions on cost-effectiveness need to be made upfront, i.e., regarding the value-added UNDP brings to the table. UNDP has been supporting and operating at a loss on filling capacity to implement gaps.
Cross-cutting areas needed in the Results Plan and Indicator framework.		For work planning and logical progression, the inception period was instrumental for refining the logical framework and adapting it to the current context. This period was also crucial for developing cross cutting support strategies and providing stakeholder inputs and refinements in the performance framework. A considerable amount of work planning and strategic discussions compared with the theory of change is also usually done during the inception period. This also includes developing a work plan in logical succession and determining the HR and procurement loads (with strategies). However, it was determined that this period of time could have been more effectively utilized as there was a need for defining how the sectoral inputs and components linked together for results. Incorporation of gender considerations also required a strong implementation strategy and targeting linked to the project plan. Public and private stakeholder engagement is critical as a pathway towards results. These strategies should have been developed at the start of the project implementation for monitoring purposes.

IMPLEMENTATION		
	Implementation and Delivery including Monitoring	<p>Due to the complex technical components of the project, robust monitoring was required. The MTR is an adaptive management mechanism for the project that can help identify problematic components of the project as well as facilitate course correction. An example of the need for an MTR was the finding that UNDP received key documents prior to their review and approval by government experts locally. The absence of this key step resulted in gaps in implementation and project monitoring.</p> <p>To ensure this is avoided in future implementation, in cases where UNDP provided this support, the monitoring should be costed and submitted with robust planning during the project design and followed through during implementation. The KPIs and milestones should be Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely (SMART) and refined to the context. The lesson learned is to develop protocols (possibly SOPs) for the various stages and possibilities for monitoring, procurement, and evaluation or adaptive management.</p>
	Stakeholder engagement	<p>For a biodiversity and protected areas project, the key element towards transformative results is education of key stakeholders about the value of biodiversity to the individuals and land users, to the public and to the private sector. The stakeholder engagement strategy from this perspective is a central tool for results and requires a strong strategy to support outcome level ‘transformative results’. Upstream work is important, however, instilling biodiversity value is central to outcome level results. – Education and awareness with the public and private sector is critical work as well as with authorities.</p>
	UNDP /Government administration and procurement	<p>The Government would benefit from adopting a streamlined approach for procuring goods and services for projects. Additionally, the Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment should ensure technical quality assurance and also design benchmarks for effective monitoring and evaluation. To ensure effective implementation of GEF projects through the government, clarity is imperative in the design stage to recognize gaps in procurement and human capacities which will avoid delivery constraints. Checks and balances must be placed in the project design. For instance, the use of a letter of agreement that outlining the responsibilities of UNDP would aid in the efficiency of the process. Government can also streamline its recruitment, technical vetting benchmarks (for the upstream work) and procurement process to buy goods and services. Given the vision to build capacity for a resilient nature-protected island, the minister will be constrained due to issues caused by policies related to procurement and weak environmental coordination of human resources.</p>
RESULTS		
	Institutional capacity building for PA system management at the national and regional level	<p>Capacity building for coordination requires the development of local capacity to build on. This project was there to ensure continuity of the coordination role in achieving cross sectoral inputs within the context of an improved PA system management system. As was shadowing a coordination function that was intended to be sustained at the ECU. When the project was dissolved, the project was lacking an important target for sustaining its capacity building work. When project PCs get pulled into other work, it becomes near impossible to do the project work well. Recognizing that GEF funds cannot be utilized to contract Government staff; a more they must resign from their government positions first. The lack of capacity for building capacity is not a sustainable model for implementing projects should be identified.</p>

Recommendations Table [\[1\]](#)

Rec #	TE Recommendation	Entity Responsible	Time frame
A	Category 1: Policy integration of the Legal, Financial and Institutional Review deliverables [2]	UNDP /PCU/Government	Mid to End 2021
A.1	<p><i>Key recommendation:</i> UNDP can support the final project board meeting by closing up and handing over all the knowledge products including web page and communications, and all the consultancy work completed.</p> <p>A key follow-up recommendation is to guarantee a process whereby there are synergies and joint review of the principle upstream knowledge products and to distill a set of reliable policy recommendations for carrying forward the products including the legal review of the draft PA act and move towards future operationalization.</p>		
B	Category 2: Follow up Sustainability	Government /UNDP	Immediately
B.1	<p><i>Key recommendation:</i> There is a GEF 7 project design mission currently being considered in the country with the World Bank. UNDP might identify proper entry points of this projects contributions with the new project. UNDP might also facilitate documentation and knowledge products handover to the World Bank, if the Government allows and requests this. It is up to the Government to ensure a smooth transition and no duplication of initiatives, for instance, if they fall under the same sector or site.</p> <p>A follow up initiative might focus on operationalizing including a full demonstration of financial systems management including utilizing the trust fund and considering payments and the collection system. It can also demonstrate the buffer zone co-management. The support for a national PA management system should highlight the benefits of biodiversity conservation for all. For instance, the private sector and the community play a big role. The project might focus on showcasing the opportunities created for the investment and the private sector and the community.</p>		

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Purpose of the evaluation

1. The objective of this project was to improve the sustainability of the protected area system in Dominica, strengthen the management of Morne Trois Pitons National Park (MTPNP) and establish a buffer zone.

2. It aimed to enhance the cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management. The establishment of a buffer zone was envisioned to improve the integrity of MTPNP while making it the core conservation area within a functional productive landscape (results provided below).
3. All GEF mid-sized and full-sized project undergo Terminal Evaluations as a legal requirement. The TE is expected to assess the achievement of project results against the established indicator framework. The exercise should draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from the project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP/GEF and government programming.
4. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments. The TE will serve to analyze project results against the indicators that have been outlined in the project document to ensure that project intention has been achieved. This will encompass the impact and the sustainability namely: (financial, environmental and social) of the results and achievement in terms of capacity building and global environmental benefits as defined by GEF. In addition, the effectiveness of the Project's interventions in meeting the Project objectives will be assessed and key findings highlighted.
5. The findings of the TE will serve as an evaluation of UNDP's accountability as to how resources are used, the results achieved and social impact. In addition, UNDP, GEF, the Government of Dominica (IP), stakeholders and the public stand to benefit and act accordingly from the results emanating from the TE as per the evaluation criteria as defined by UNDP which serves to: Design or validate a development strategy Determine improvement in project design and implementation Increase knowledge and understanding of project's as it relates to human development Determine funding decisions by GEF and duplication of projects Determine development partners Improve project design and implementation. The TE results will therefore be used by the Commissioning Unit, Donor, implementing partner and stakeholders to strengthen funding decisions, improve design and implementation practices and maximize positive social impact. The findings will also be used to increase knowledge and understanding of the benefits and challenges of development programmes and projects intended for the enhancement of human development as per the UNDP evaluation criteria and thus fitting in with the Commissioning Unit's Evaluation plan.

1.2. Scope

2. The evaluation specialist was externally recruited to provide technical leadership and objectivity for a useful, balanced, and forward-oriented terminal evaluation. The evaluation specialist was responsible for the conduct and the overall implementation across five phases: inception report writing/framework development, research, data collection, data analysis, and then a final report writing process.
3. The evaluation was theory- and principle-based, following the GEF and UNDP guidelines as well as international standards and criteria and guidelines of the OECD-DAC: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and lessons learned (guidelines/standards for evaluating development and humanitarian projects).¹ The evaluation has employed a range of qualitative and quantitative methodologies and was participatory, ensuring the inclusion of all relevant stakeholders' perspectives. The evaluator aimed to make an unbiased, objective, evidence-based assessment of the project's stated achievements/results.
4. The standard GEF criteria and evaluation matrix was used for questionnaires (Annex 4), consultation and for obtaining data for assessing the project results and performance (see the full evaluation matrix in inception report). The partnership efficacy and project performance assessment were based on actual project success indicators and expected results.

¹ Terminal Evaluations Guidelines attached.

The initial phase (February to March 2021) included an inception period to confirm the client's and the consultant's understanding of the TOR and the main task which was to undertake an in-depth desk study of the results framework, and to develop a set of core evaluation questions and tools for gathering data.² This step included obtaining expert and evaluation stakeholder agreement on methods and drafting the appropriate evaluation framework and matrix (questions to guide implementation). The standard OECD DAC criteria of efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, and sustainability was used. The evaluation considered whether the targets and indicators were SMART and logical and sought an assessment of the capacity development and the TA delivery mode including scrutinizing relevant baseline data and targets.

The evaluation also considered whether a capacity assessment and baseline had been adequately established. The consultant developed a survey tool in line with the GEF evaluation question matrix (annex 4). A dropbox folder for key documentation was also created and shared. This phase included scrutiny of the theory of change and included a critique of the design indicators and targets.

Strategic Evaluation Question Topics:

- How had the project been technically and financially monitored and supported by UNDP and the government counterpart?
- How well did the project activate and demonstrate a working management model including financial plan, control plan, co-management plan?
- Did the project establish the biodiversity baseline and delineation of a buffer zone and account for the biodiversity assets as expected in the project strategy?
- What was the actual modelling approach?
- Did the project achieve rigorous community participation during the implementation of the buffer zone?
- Was there any need to establish cooperation using the governments planning authority? What are the lessons learned?
- Did the issue of geothermal exploration and work affect the management model ideals or interfere in implementation in any way?
- What did the attorney general do to establish the legal changes required by this project work?
- Did planning make changes to the EIA protocols? How?
- What other legal or policy changes are enacted due to this project's work.
- Has an inter-sectoral committee been established?
- Has the project operationalized work on co- management and improved governance i.e., training of wardens?
- Were roles for monitoring and controls established and did this work play out during implementation?
- Did the PACC committee advise on information dissemination and capacity development work/?
- Will the PACC committee be sustained post project?
- Did the other institutional arrangement showcased by the project set up work i.e., PAAC and PACC? How?

² The phase involves confirming the key evaluation questions (see a draft sample matrix attached) with the evaluation managers.

1.3. Methodology

A. Evaluation Phases

• Data Collection

The first phase (February 2021) was slightly impacted due to the COVID-19 pandemic which restricted travel to the country. For this evaluation, the data collection was conducted virtually. Information gathering included interviews with UNDP, national government stakeholders, project beneficiaries, implementing partners, and others online.³

As the project experienced government transitions and staff turnover including three RTAs and a change in the MCO Cluster Head for Sustainable Solutions and Energy in the final year of implementation, there was a challenge to identify all key informants. As a mitigation measure, “snowballing” (identifying key informants from others involved in the interview process) was used. A survey was sent with the initial request for interviews to high-level officials who delegated the interviews to those who were more actively participating in implementation across sectors and levels. The questionnaire was disseminated to those involved in the implementation and aimed to collect data on the program-level implementation goals and to solicit key insights as a forward-looking process.

The second phase (March 2021) included conducting virtual interviews (see a list in Annex 2) and disseminating a questionnaire/survey (see Annex 6 tools). The evaluation collected primary and secondary data from a representative group of stakeholders including Regional and National Project Management and support Units, other participating agencies, government agencies, and financing partners. Groups interviewed were from the private sector, NGO/CSOs, civil society, and other implementing partners.

Generally, targeting and snowballing was applied to select key informants and interviewees. One to one interviews was conducted by zoom or telephone, skype with key government stakeholders as well as UNDP support to national implementing staff. A summary of discussions and field site cases is provided in Annex 6. The evaluator transcribed and coded all notes throughout the process.

The data collection phase (online March 7- 20, 2021) confirmed whether the project had met its expected results and indicators. It also gathered lessons from stakeholders involved in the implementation for future planning. The online consultations were mixed, as information was collected through a survey, focus groups, questionnaires, Skype, and a review of the reports and case studies. The orientation of questions tested the reconstructed theory of change.

Analysis and Synthesis Phase

The analysis included validation of the data collected against the project’s stated success indicators and theory of change. This included a study of the trends and perceptions of expected results based on experiences and all aspects of evaluation data collected, reporting on findings, and incorporating comments. A draft evaluation report was provided to the reference group and key partners to gather feedback. Finally, the evaluation results were presented to governments, donors, and other stakeholders.

Dissemination Phase

The final stage (March 2021) included efforts to finalize the data collection and analysis after receiving inputs. It further required incorporating the comments received from those surveyed or submitted information by paper questionnaire. The evaluator shared the draft findings report with the client and then

³ The TOR is the starting point.

incorporated all final comments and results.

B. Ethics

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations. The evaluation specialist signed the required ethics statement attached as Annex 7 to this report.

C. Limitations

The evaluation process was limited by the travel restrictions, which resulted in no missions being conducted (from March 2020 onwards) to the sites by the UNDP regional advisor, multi-country office in Barbados, and the Evaluator. Therefore, all data gathering and interviews were conducted remotely. Normally, in-person meetings take place with the PCU office, stakeholders and beneficiaries in order to validate the results. However, this evaluation was conducted virtually through digital surveys and discussions with key resource persons (see list below and in Annex 2). The process was heavily supported by UNDP. The evaluator employed a longer desk study and close work with the UNDP teams to offset these limitations. As the evaluation progressed, the evaluator maintained the flexibility of whom to interview by using other knowledgeable informants to identify key informants.

1.4. Structure of the evaluation report

The report has five main sections separated into three distinct areas: basic project and evaluation information (sections 1 and 2), implementation and management (sections 3, 4 and Section 5), main findings conclusions, lesson learned and recommendations.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

2.1. Project Start and Duration

The project started in 2016 and ended in 2021. The project received one extension from a scheduled end date of 14 April 2020 to 14 April 2021.

2.2. Development Context

Dominica's Protected Areas Estate: Establishment of Forest Reserves, National Parks and Proposed Buffer Zones, Forest Reserves and National Parks

1. Since 1975, Dominica has established several protected areas (PAs) with varying designations, covering 203.8 km², approximately 27% of the island's 751 sq. km. In addition to the island's three (3) national parks (Morne Diablotin, Cabrits, and the Morne Trois Pitons National Parks), there are the Northern and Central Forest Reserves, Stewart Hall Water Catchment, and Soufriere/Scott's Head Marine Reserve (SSMR). Additional terrestrial and marine sites are proposed for protection but are not formally designated. PAs fall primarily under the responsibility of the Division of Forestry, Wildlife, and National Parks (DFWNP) and the Fisheries Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MoAF). Each of the marine reserves, the responsibility of the Fisheries Division, are managed by a Local Area

Management Authority (LAMA).

2. There are seven (7) legally established PAs of Dominica, both marine and terrestrial, that would constitute a System of Protected Areas (Table 1). The list includes an additional three (3) proposed sites that would also fall under a System of Protected Areas if/when *legal designation* is obtained. Draft management plans have for been prepared for Morne Trois Pitons, Morne Diablotin and Cabrits National Parks as well as for Soufriere Sulphur Springs, but *none have been approved* by Cabinet nor implemented. Cabrits National Park (CNP) includes both a marine and terrestrial portion. The DFWNP and the Fisheries Division *were unable to agree on a single management plan for the CNP due to different management philosophies (promoting non-consumptive vs. consumptive uses, respectively)*, resulting in 2 discrete plans. A 2011 draft *Buffer Zone Plan for the Morne Trois Pitons National Park (MTPNP)* was developed though not yet approved nor implemented.
3. The Central Forest Reserve covers an area of 410 ha (1013 acres) and the Northern Forest Reserve 5,560 ha (13,733 acres). Until 2000, the Northern Forest Reserve was 8,814 ha (21,770 acres); approximately 3450 ha (8525 acres) of this site was re-designated as the Morne Diablotin National Park (MDNP) in January 2000 in order to provide increased protection to the habitat of the 2 single island and globally threatened parrot species.
4. Dominica’s National Park System comprises **three (3) legally established national parks**: Cabrits National Park and Morne Diablotin National Park and MTPNP established in July 1975. MTPNP was designated World Heritage Site in 1997 under Natural **Criteria viii4** - “” and **criteria x**. “To contain the most important and significant natural habitats for in-situ conservation of biological diversity, including those containing threatened species of outstanding universal value from the point of view of science or conservation”.

Table 1: Protected Areas in Dominica

Designation Type/ Name of Protected Areas	Status	Year of designation	Area (ha)	IUCN category
International (World Heritage Site)				
Morne Trois Pitons National Park	Designated	1997	6875	Not Applicable
National				
Forest Reserve				
Central	Designated	1952	410	VI
Northern	Designated	1977	8814	VI
Marine Reserve				
Soufriere/Scott's Head	Designated	1998	0.00	V
National Park				

1. 4 To be outstanding examples representing major stages of the earth’s history, including the record of life, significant ongoing geological processes in the development of landforms or significant geomorphic or physiographic features. THIS LOOKS LIKE A FOOTNOTE, but can’t find the reference to the text above (?)

Cabrits	Designated	1987	531 (421 marine)	II
Morne Trois Pitons	Designated	1975	6875	II
Morne Diablotin	Designated	2000	3450	II
Protected Forest				
Stewart Hall Water Catchment	ated	1975	318	VI
Total Area (Designated)			20,380 ha	
Other				
Indian River	Proposed	1995	79	Not Reported
Soufriere Sulphur Springs	Proposed	1995	102	Not Reported
Primeval Reserve				
Syndicate Parrot	Proposed	1989	083	Not Reported
Total area (ha) (Proposed)				

2.3. Immediate objectives

Project Objective: To demonstrate a model for effective integrated landscape management encompassing the strengthening of an existing PA (Morne Trois Pitons National Park) and establishment of its buffer zone to reduce threats to biodiversity and ecological functioning.

Expected Outputs

Component 1: Strengthening the core zone management of Protected Areas at systemic level and scale up innovative interventions at core zone of selected PAs to improve Sustainability.

Output 1.1 Develop and implement resource management strategies for Morne Trois Pitons National Park (MTPNP), including: guidelines and restrictions on productive activities within PA boundaries; resource management and business plan; and strategy for reducing threats to BD from within and outside the PA.

1.1.1. Biodiversity assessment, monitoring and conservation.

1.1.2 Develop new and/or update draft management plan; approve and initiate implementation of Management Plan for the MTPNP.

Output 1.2 Operational and functional capacity established for management of Morne Trois Pitons National Park to ensure that National Parks Unit capacity is increased.

1.2.1. Provide sufficient resources (equipment and materials) for effective management of MTPNP.

1.2.2. Operational capacity for MTPNP

1.2.3. Develop and implement a surveillance plan.

Output 1.3 officially establish a Protected Area Coordinating Unit to actively implement a PA system across functional managing agencies for improved management effectiveness.

- 1.3.1. Establish Protected Areas Coordinating Unit (PACU).
- 1.3.2. Strengthen protected areas policies:
- 1.3.3. Develop protected area legislation or update and amend existing protected area legislation
- 1.3.4. Improve financial stability of Protected Area System
- 1.3.5. Develop a Protected Area System Plan that includes an overall management strategy for the National PA system
- 1.3.6. Develop evidence-based management plans.
- 1.3.7. Consolidated protected areas information system supporting PA management objectives.
- 1.3.8. Standardize administrative and financial processes in co-management agreements.

Component 2: Establish and manage Buffer Zone as a key component of National Protected Area System and select experiences to be scaled up beyond the buffer zone

Output 2.1 Buffer zone for Morne Trois Pitons National Park legally established and demarcated, with inter sectorial committee for the management of integrated PA landscapes (core and buffer zone) established and functioning within legal framework.

- 2.1.1. Establish inter sectorial Committee for the management of integrated landscapes (core and buffer zone)
- 2.1.2. Identify and define the boundaries of the buffer zone
- 2.1.3. Legally establish buffer zone as a managed landscape
- 2.1.4. Demarcate the buffer zone with signposts.

Output 2.2 Codification of higher minimum standards in environmental impact assessment (EIA) requirements for new developments in the buffer zone.

- 2.2.1. Codify stronger development standards into the EIA process
- 2.2.2. Develop a land tenure and compensation review process
- 2.2.3. Conduct outreach and education programmes in MTPNP buffer zone.

Output 2.3 Identify physical threats and reduce vulnerabilities in the MTPNP using community-based land management activities to improve livelihood viability and associated socioeconomic conditions.

- 2.3.1. Develop four (4) Community Resource Management Plans (CRMP)
- 2.3.2. Engage local residents within the buffer zone in livelihood activities
- 2.3.3. Strengthen community/organization capacities to effectively manage the buffer zone
- 2.3.4. Community based education programme.

2.4. Development objectives (Threats and Barriers)

Per the project document, under the “business as usual” scenario, Dominica faced the possibility of little advancement in the realization of an effectively managed and financially sustainable PA estate. The project document posited that if not addressed in a significant way, the gaps in PA financing and management would continue to threaten the integrity of the PAs, limiting the operational effectiveness (i.e., its ability to provide for biodiversity conservation, ecosystem support, and its ability to support national development goals). The proposed project is expected to establish an enabling environment through legal, institutional, and operational reforms supporting PA management effectiveness and financial sustainability.

Even with the existence of a cohesive protected areas system (PAS), the current problematic situation identified above will remain. Although all management efforts of Dominica’s national system should be aligned, administrative structures and processes do not fully support the operationalization. PAS sustainability continues to be negatively impacted by current practices of “silo” management. An evaluation

of the PA estate carried out by the Protected Areas System Management Specialist in 2020, indicated the absence of crucial national legal and institutional elements. These deficiencies limit the success of any national attempt at advancing the PAS recommendations and manage to maintain the barriers to effective and efficient management of the PAS. A lack of coordination among PA management authorities and institutions has resulted in what now can only be described as ad hoc actions resulting in ineffectual management with very little realized benefits. The Project document surmises that without GEF increment it is expected that the management of PAS sites will continue following the status quo, which has contributed to its deficiency to date and reduced its ability of realizing true financial and ecological sustainability.

The major threats and barriers which were addressed by the project intervention were identified in the project situational analysis as follows:

From Project Document.

In the absence of this project, the project document stipulates that it is likely that the integrity of PAs in Dominica, including MTPNP, would continue to decline, possibly to the point where MTPNP loses its world heritage site designation and its economic significance to Dominica. The long-term solution envisioned under this project is the effective management of the National Protected Areas System and *in-situ* conservation of biodiversity through innovative Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) interventions that reduce conflicts on land use and biodiversity threats by strengthening PA core zones, developing a buffer zone around MTPNP and instituting a management system to support the legal and technical interventions. This management system will include a financial component that fosters prudent and effective management and use of resources generated by the PAs to sustain the structure and operations of the PA estate. The goal was to increase the effective protection by 20% of Dominica's terrestrial resources which are currently under pressure caused by encroachment, agriculture expansion, infrastructure development, deforestation and fires. By replication, the skills and competences developed at MTPNP and the lessons learnt will be used at other PAs including MPAs areas which are facing threats from invasive species, overfishing and land based marine pollution.

The barriers are:

Barrier 1: Absence of clear institutional structures and mandates for natural resource management:

Currently, Dominica does not have a central coordinating body or administrative agency responsible for effective management of a protected areas system, or biodiversity conservation in general. The DFWNP, which has nominal responsibility for PAs in Dominica, does not maintain a dedicated staff for PA management and instead assigns staff on an ad hoc basis to respond to PA management needs as they develop. One result of this is that coordination with the Ministry of Tourism on the management of ecotourism sites within National Parks is very weak. This weak institutional structure further manifests itself in the loss of revenue from park services. The fees charged and the system of collection is not consistent at all PAs and results in significant loss of resources. Additionally, fluctuation in currency value can pose economic challenges where the cost of tickets/passes is included in cruise passenger travel package cost. This loss of resources is manifested in staff shortage, inadequate site maintenance and a weak or absent monitoring systems for PAs. In addition, a lack of a clear mandate, overlapping jurisdiction and limited enforcement allows livelihood efforts to become challenges.

Encroachment into PAs in Dominica continues due to the lack of effective surveillance by forest rangers, as well as the inadequate legal and regulatory framework governing PAs, which prevents quick action to address land clearance and squatting, land ownership disputes, and activities such as charcoal production. Weaknesses in the legal framework for PA management are exacerbated by the fact that each of the PAs in Dominica was established under a separate Act or Standing Order, each of which frequently bears little resemblance to the previous designations. Regulations and enforcement regarding exploitation of wildlife

are extremely limited. Effective management of PA units is constrained by the lack of formally adopted PA management plans.

Limited involvement and participation of on-site management by the private sector and civil society due to absence of an appropriate institutional structure and mandate, deprive management of much needed human resources and revenue generation strategies that involve private sector. Local communities in the landscapes surrounding Morne Trois Pitons and other PAs have no involvement in priority setting or planning for conservation and sustainable development activities within the PA core areas or buffer zones despite the fact that some lands in the proposed buffer zone are privately owned. Additionally, these areas are the only sources of livelihood for some. This is compounded by the lack of integration between nationally funded initiatives and internationally or donor funded projects. Most foreign funded initiatives require the establishment of a specific type of institutional architecture which is often incompatible with national structures. Therefore, when the funding period ends, the institution is disbanded leaving no sustainable management or without strengthening of the existing local institution often due to financial shortfall resulting from currency fluctuation.

Absence of information sharing and limited knowledge of the biological functions (lifecycle, species interdependence, etc.) of endangered and threatened species as well as ecosystem functions / services, preclude informed priority setting for the use of limited PA resources. PA management is also limited by a lack of financial resources and the failure to generate any economic returns from PA units. Furthermore, there are no legal instruments for the establishment of PAs buffer zones.

Barrier 2: Absence of integrated approaches to PA management: Several factors constrain efforts to integrate the management of protected landscapes and surrounding territories in Dominica. Current institutional arrangements for natural resource management are highly fragmented. For example, management of forest resources is split between the DFWNP (forest reserves and national parks), the Division of Lands and Surveys (unallocated state lands) and the Physical Planning Division (private forest lands), but there are no formal mechanisms for coordination and very few instances of consultations regarding development activities, regulations or zoning among these agencies.

More generally, environmental planning and management issues are handled in a fragmented manner and there are no official coordinating mechanisms among ministries and agencies responsible for the natural environment. This greatly reduces coordinated actions and even information sharing on management of specific sites, watersheds and landscapes (for example, only major developments may require an interagency EIA review process). Land management planning processes are sector-driven and do not take into consideration the maintenance of ecosystem services (water, soil productivity, biodiversity, buffers to natural hazards, etc.) that are of benefit to the widest range of stakeholders and the natural environment.

While Dominica has an extensive range of environmental laws and regulations, there is no specific legislation to address land degradation in a holistic manner, and regulations to operationalize sustainable land management principles are often not elaborated. Human resource capacity in specialized areas of land management is weak, including for example the capacity to use natural resource economics to integrate the value of ecosystem services into policy and decision-making towards land and resource development options. The MoAF has outreach programs to farmers and communities, but these are directed at crop and livestock production, with little emphasis on sustainable land management practices. More generally, many of the agencies charged with responsibility for environmental matters are understaffed and lack the necessary tools and budgets to effectively implement community empowerment and training workshops.

There is a shortage of and inaccessibility to scientific data on fast growing species that can be encouraged in the buffer zone to support livelihood activities without impacting the forests in the core areas of PAs; similarly, a better understanding of plant pathogens likely to attack important forest species is needed in order to reduce pressures on forests that are already stressed by the effects of climate change and hurricanes. Local residents in areas bordering PAs have limited awareness of the benefits generated by the PAs

(ecosystem services such as water provision and soil retention, as well as potential tourism revenues) or of sustainable land management, agricultural and animal husbandry practices which can mitigate land degradation and reduce pressures on resources within the PAs.

Land use planning and land zoning are critical tools in the PA management, however, there is no comprehensive land use plan for Dominica. Under the Physical Planning Act of 2002, the planning authority may prepare, or cause to be prepared a National Physical Development Plan to guide land use planning decisions in the country. In the absence of a national Physical Development Plan, the National Land Use Policy provides direction for issues related to land use planning in the Commonwealth of Dominica, sets the foundation for all land use decisions and describes how best to manage development to improve quality of life for Dominicans. This is facilitated through economic and social development, protecting human health and safety, and conserving the natural environment, however, its application is site and case specific. There is no provision in the National Land Use Policy for zoning of MPAs, the only reference made to the marine environment is for National Physical Development Plan to make provision for the control of resource extraction that causes major erosion, degradation, or pollution harmful to the health of fisheries, coral reefs, seagrass beds, coastal zones, or beaches.

Barrier 3: Inadequate Policy Instruments to Support Efficient and Effective Financial Management:

There is little coordination among the varied management arrangements and agencies at the various PAs and jurisdiction and management responsibilities are not always clear. What exists is an ineffective financial system that fails to address PA management needs. The PA estate is not financially sustainable; instead, it is overly reliant on direct central government funding. The system lacks any framework for cost-effective landscape level approaches. The weak legal structure leaves PAs vulnerable to development projects both within and near their boundaries. Protocols for exchanging information do not exist, and there are deficiencies in implementation even when information is available. This magnifies inconsistencies and commensurate financial challenges. There are no formal policies to facilitate mutually beneficial opportunities between conservation and tourism.

The financial sustainability of the PAS is hindered by its limited income sources. The system's financial inadequacies were strongly noted in the Financial Scorecard completed during project preparation. The scorecard and the associated assessment revealed a large gap between existing and needed funding as well as system wide challenges related to strategic financial generation and allocation. PA institutions annually request government budgets commensurate with required conservation tasks, but approvals rarely meet requirements.

Barrier 4: Limited Public Support for PA's and Little Understanding of their Benefits: Adequate public concern and understanding for PA conservation is a large barrier to achieving necessary financial support. There is limited understanding, particularly amongst key decision-makers, of the social and economic contributions made by the PA estate. For instance, few recognize the financial importance of ecosystem services and/or how much key economic sectors such as tourism depend upon the existence of a vibrant and healthy PA estate. Without greater conservation enthusiasm and understanding by decision-makers, the probability of increased and stable financial support by citizens, businesses, and government entities is limited.

In summary, economic shortfalls puts pressure on the natural resource, the institutional framework is weak and management and related biodiversity, specifically, protected areas capacity is a constant issue for the country that required serious intervention with a short-, mid- and long-term human resources strategy.

Economic Shortfalls put pressure on Natural Resources

Firstly, the project document noted that threats to biodiversity continue to grow due to increased demands on Dominica's natural resource base as a means of counteracting national economic shortfalls. The capacity of managers to address these threats was expected to remain the same as management entities are unable to capitalize on alternative financing options to support human and institutional capacity building. The UNDP

Financial Sustainability Scorecard (to be used in the project monitoring) indicates varying levels of understaffing in most PAs.

Institutional frameworks

Institutional arrangements for development and management of a system of PAs come from legal and policy frameworks, both of which are lacking in Dominica. Management of sites and systems of PAs has added complexity due to the obligations under the relevant multilateral environmental agreements as well as donor requirements and regional commitments. MEAs and donor-funded projects require increasing amounts of reporting and measurement of achievements, both site specific and system-wide, such as was required under the CBD PoWPA. The overarching institutional framework for PA management must therefore be strong enough to deal with these various demands, ideally without the existing budgetary constraints and limited institutional capacity. However, there is no institutional coordinating mechanism for PA management.

In addition to the lack of integrated legislation, the management of these areas is shared by a wide array of agencies. Existing legislation does not support a coordinating mechanism for national parks and PAs management in Dominica and does not provide the needed integrated management. The DFWNP is responsible for forestry, forest, watershed and wildlife conservation, forest reserves, national parks and other PAs in Dominica. Under this Division falls the NPU, responsible for management of recreation/nature sites both within and outside the country's three (3) national parks. Site-specific co-management arrangements exist between the NPU with the Ministry of Tourism, primarily due to a lack of adequate available dedicated staff within the NPU and lack of financial resources. For example, the Ministry of Tourism provides site interpretive staff and pays for some infrastructure costs at nature / recreation sites, including at those outside the park that still fall under the responsibility of the NPU but for which NPU lacks adequate financial resources.

Though co-management arrangements are evolving at some sites, an agreed mechanism to be used for PAs development and management across the system has not been established. In addition to a lack of an integrated approach and coordinating mechanism for managing national parks and PAs, numerous agencies have the responsibility for management of the landscape surrounding PAs, including potential buffer zones being addressed through this project. These Government Departments include primarily, but are not limited to, the Divisions for Physical Planning, Agriculture, and Lands & Surveys. For both PAs and surrounding landscapes mentioned above, the ministries and divisions must also work in conjunction with the ECU, which is responsible for developing action plans and targets, submitting relevant reporting, and ensuring that Dominica meets its obligations to multiple MEAs, including but not limited to CBD, UNFCCC and the UNCCD. There was no coordinating inter-institutional committee or agency with responsibility for ensuring harmonization of the landscape level approaches and activities for PAs and their buffer zones, ensuring integrated planning, coordinated budgetary allocations and/or the development of MOUs between agencies with joint responsibility for activity/project implementation.

The *Draft Climate Change, Environment and Natural Resource Management Bill (2013)* includes the establishment of a Council on Environment, Climate Change and Development, with an interagency composition and responsibilities for implementation of international and regional environmental treaties and agreements. This proposed Council on Environment, Climate Change and Development will not focus *per se* on PAs and their buffer zones, though aspects of natural resource management and biodiversity will be incorporated into its responsibilities under the treaties within its mandate.

Management capacity weak

There was and still is inadequate institutional capacity for the design, development and management of a system of PAs.⁵ This is reflected in for example, inadequate levels of manpower and financial resources as

⁵ Gardner, Lloyd. 2006.

well as insufficient technical expertise. There is a heavy burden for technical assistance on related agencies, in particular, the DFWNP and the Fisheries Division. Such demands place further pressure on the already limited institutional capacities of these agencies. The Capacity Scorecard (reviewed at end in Annex 10) indicated low scores in the ability to implement. Respondents acknowledged that there are largely insufficient quantities of skills to guarantee effective planning and management. Human resources are poorly qualified and unmotivated and PA institutions typically are severely underfunded and have no capacity to mobilize sufficient resources. There are some mechanisms in place to facilitate the appropriate systems of training, mentoring, and learning to maintain a continuous flow of new staff. However, the mechanisms that do exist are insufficiently developed and therefore are unable to provide the full range of skills needed.

2.5. Expected Results (Baseline Indicators established)

Indicator Framework

<p>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP # 1: Enhanced capacity of national, sub-regional and regional institutions and stakeholders to: effectively manage natural resources; build resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change and natural and anthropogenic hazards; improved energy efficiency and use of renewable energy; improved policy, legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks for environmental and energy governance.</p>
<p>Country Programme Outcome 1 Indicators: Percent of budget allocated to environmental protection; hectares of forest cover; greenhouse gas emissions per capita; number of updated and tested contingency plans; volume of savings from reduced fossil fuel imports; multilateral environmental agreements incorporated into national legislation; energy efficiency and renewable energy policies.</p>
<p>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area (same as that on the cover page, circle one):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Solutions at local level for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystems and environmental services, for expanded jobs and livelihoods; and 3.5. Transparent and nondiscriminatory legal and regulatory frameworks and policies enabled for sustainable management of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems (in line with international conventions and national legislation) 2. Unlocking the potential of PAs, including indigenous and community conserved areas, to conserve biodiversity while contributing to sustainable development
<p>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program: BD 1 Improve the sustainability of Protected Area Systems</p>
<p>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas</p>
<p>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators: Buffer zone developed around protected area improving protected area by 2,030 ha.</p>

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project
Project Objective: To demonstrate a model for effective integrated landscape management encompassing the strengthening of an existing protected area (Morne Trois Pitons National Park) and establishment of its buffer zone in order to reduce threats to biodiversity and ecological functioning			
Component 1: Strengthening the core zone management of Protected Areas at systemic level and scale up innovative interventions at core zone of selected PAs to improve Sustainability			
Outcome 1. (Activity in Atlas) Biodiversity Assessment, monitoring and conservation. Develop approve and operationalize management plan for MTPNP	Monitoring and assessment plan. Persons trained to carry out assessment Improve METT scores of MTPNP and other targeted PAs A legally recognized management structure with guidelines;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised National Biodiversity Assessment and 5th National Report on Biodiversity available. Current METT score for MTP is 59 Draft management plan available but not in use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual biodiversity reports used in decision making in Agriculture and planning. Conservation strategies being implemented. Target METT score at end of project 75 Implementation of approved management plan; 75% of staff (recommended in plan) hired. Improved financial and technical management.
2. Resource MTPNP management. Develop Operational Capacity. Develop and implement surveillance plan to control hunting, and harvesting of wild plants and animals, land clearing and tilling on slopes >15%, and land development.	A financial plan and trained staff to implement the plan. Increased financing in place to address the sustainability of the NP as measured by the UNDP Financial Scorecard. Increased area of MTP NP from 6,342 ha to 8,372 ha including buffer zone (530 ha within and 1500 ha outside). Trained staff managing 8,372 ha of integrated land scape (MTPNP core and buffer zone) No of MTP NP staff with specialized training in surveillance techniques resulting in reduced incidences of fires, hunting and tilling on slopes >15% in buffer zone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing management plan lack resource component; need to be revised and updated. Core zone legally recognized and protected. A 200 m Buffer zone around MTP NP proposed To be developed during first year of project cycle Park wardens currently perform spot checks, no systematic monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dedicated financing for MTP NP identified and applied. At least 530 ha added as buffer zone within existing park. Staff adequately trained by the end of year two. BD threat minimized and illegal actions reduced by 70 % by year 4. Surveillance, monitoring and fire management programme developed and implemented. Reduced erosion
3. Establish PA coordinating Unit.	PA management Unit staffed with trained staff. PA Management capacity strengthened PA controls established	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PA managed by staff of Forestry that will be upgraded to PA unit PA management scorecard rating at 67% Draft policies with no regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PA Unit in place with adequate staff and finance. PA management scorecard rating improved to 85% PA policies with regulations approved and enforced.

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project
<p>Strengthen PA policy.</p> <p>Develop PA legislation.</p> <p>Improve financial stability of PA.</p> <p>Develop PA system plan.</p> <p>Consolidate PA information system.</p> <p>Develop financial sustainability strategy.</p> <p>Standardized administrative and financial processes in co-management arrangement</p>	<p>PA legislation approved and registered PA management adequately financed</p> <p>Improved coordination among PA sites</p> <p>A single database and information system for Dominica's PA</p> <p>PA financial plan</p> <p>Functional Co-management arrangement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA designation legislation in place but management issues missing • User fees are in place but management very weak • PA units are independently managed with different standards • Ministry of Tourism provides site specific information. • PA sites generate finance but unsustainable • Community organizations have an umbrella organization but no connection to existing PA management authorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA legislation registered and enforced • Sustainable Finance plan. PA generating 100% of its financial needs. • A coordinate PA systems plan with legal and financial considerations • A unified information system and database • PA financing strategically managed; funds collection and used efficiently. • A functional co-management arrangement between stakeholders
<p>Outcome 2 (Activity in Atlas)</p> <p>1. Establish an Inter-sectoral committee for the management of integrated PA landscapes (2,030 ha buffer zone).</p> <p>Identify and define boundaries of buffer zone</p> <p>Legally establish buffer zone as managed landscape with restrictions on hunting, charcoal burning, tilling on slopes > 15% and infrastructure development</p>	<p>A legally constituted inter-sectoral committee with mandate and authority for Pa management.</p> <p>2,030 ha of buffer zone marked on maps Approved Buffer zone Legislation supports zero hunting, charcoal burning and road development.</p> <p>Signposts in place around buffer</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible agencies exist but no coordination practiced. • Preliminary buffer zone identified in studies but not established or approved • Landscape around buffer-zone managed in an ad hoc way with some charcoal burning, hunting, land tilling on slopes and building construction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee established and functioning using management plan (Component 1) • 1,500 ha of buffer zones outside the existing PA boundary identified, demarcated and mapped. • Legislation governing buffer drafted and approved. 2,030 ha of buffer zone under active management; greater limits on hunting and development, prohibition of charcoal burning and tilling on slopes > 15%. • Buffer zone legally established and demarcated

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project
Demarcate sites in the buffer zone with signpost		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptual boundary advanced but not approved or marked 	
<p>2. Support CRMP</p> <p>Develop land tenure and compensation review process</p> <p>Expand the scope of current outreach program for farmers</p>	<p>Environmental and land use standards for development in buffer zones.</p> <p>Land tenure review process in place.</p> <p>Number of farmers helped by outreach program increased, disaggregated by age and gender</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EIA for select development activities required by Physical Planning Department Least arrangement exists for use of state lands. Ministry of Agriculture has an outreach to farmers (extension program) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operating standards and guidelines in place for development of livelihood activities in buffer zone. Clear and acceptable review process for land tenure 100% of persons farming in and around buffer zone supported by outreach program and adhere to land use restrictions – no charcoal burning, no tilling on slopes >15 %, no land conversion to road.
<p>3. Develop 4 Community resource management plans</p> <p>Engage local residents within buffer zone in livelihood activities</p> <p>Strengthen Community organization capacity to effectively manage the buffer zone.</p> <p>Community based education program</p>	<p>Vulnerability Atlases for 4 communities listed</p> <p>Livelihoods activities in buffer zone confirms to land use restrictions: no hunting, no tilling on slopes > 15%, no clear cutting and no charcoal burning policy.</p> <p>Number of persons trained in BD friendly agriculture and land management practices, disaggregated by age and gender</p> <p>Stakeholder awareness of project progress and PA management strategy. Information on management controls –</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Vulnerability Atlas for 10 communities exists. Unregulated farming in parts of the buffer zone. Agriculture practice in proposed buffer zone is unsustainable (include clear cutting and burning) ECU has ongoing environmental education in schools and community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Four community resource management plans developed and 50% implementation. All farmer in buffer zone practice BD friendly agriculture All Stakeholders in buffer zone involve in management (co-management) 100% Buffer zone effectively managed- no charcoal burning, no road construction or tilling on slopes > 15% 70% of Dominicans supporting PA agenda <p>All Dominicans knowledgeable about and practice controls on charcoal burning, harvesting and hunting restriction.</p>

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project
	no burning of charcoal, no tilling on slopes >15%, zero land conversion to road disseminated on all media.		

GEF Global Biodiversity Indicators

These are the global indicators standard to the GEF funding agreement i.e. focus area indicators developed. These cannot be changed – only reduced ten percent in scope with agreed revision during adaptive management, inception or MTR.

GEF V Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Project Contribution To Focal Area Objective
BD-1	Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new Pas	Output 1: New protected area (0) and coverage (6,752 hectares) of unprotected ecosystems.	METT scores for Morne Trois Piton National Park improve from 59 to 75. Overall PA management scores would improve proportionately. PA area coverage increase by 1,500 ha
BD-2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.	Output 2.2: National and sub-national land-use plans (4) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation.	Improved management of PA landscape and seascape providing sustainable livelihoods for more Dominicans

2.6. Theory of Change

According to the project document, the theory of change and reasoning for the GEF/UNDP catalytic intervention was to improve the sustainability of PAs in Dominica using the MTPNP as a model for replication across other PAs in Dominica. The project model largely contained in component one and much of the scale up and enabling work in component two, would address both local and systemic challenges specific to MTPNP and generally to all PAs in the Commonwealth of Dominica. The project was designed with intention to demarcate and legally establish a buffer zone around Dominica's World heritage Site MTPNP and develop a management plan for the MTPNP inclusive of the buffer zone. In addition, site specific management plans were to be developed for all PAs in Dominica with supporting staff (four community-based management plans were developed and supported by an external consultant and not operationalized). It is envisioned that the management and operations of these PAs will be harmonized and coordinated giving rise to a National PA management system. This PA management system would improve management effectiveness by sharing responsibility among PA staff, increase revenue generation and collection through rationalization of site fees and adherence to the PA business plan.

The project would reduce threats to biodiversity caused by encroachment, habitat destruction, and change of land use (from forest to agriculture, housing, roads) through a livelihood initiative that seeks to create productive landscapes. Control measures will be implemented by trained wardens in the buffer zone to regulate land use further supporting biodiversity conservation while increasing stewardship and revenue generation and building the adaptive capacity of the communities to the impacts of Climate Change. The conservation effort by the communities adjacent to the PA will reduce land degradation, coastal sedimentation and ultimately improve the health of the coral reefs that protect the coastal communities.

The demarcation and legal establishment of the buffer zone around MTPNP will significantly improve the management of the park and set the stage for the protection of all other PAs in Dominica. It will improve the management of PAs by including civil society participation in PA management and create productive landscapes and seascapes that will enhance economic growth development in Dominica.

It was noted that key elements of the TOC were not included in its initial design, examples:

1. Social and environmental context
2. A visual depiction of the causal pathway with a clear link between the outputs required for the achievement of key outcomes and as a result the project goal

2.7. Main stakeholdersⁱⁱⁱ

During the project development workshop (2014), a stakeholder analysis was conducted to determine ownership of the project, the level of buy-in, the anticipated roles of the various stakeholders in the project implementation and to better design the management structure needed to ensure effectiveness of project implementation and the sustainability of the impact. The following table identifies the major categories of stakeholders and the individual organizations within those groups as well as the proposed role(s) of each stakeholder group. These perceived roles and the importance of stakeholder engagement is assessed in this section of the report.

Original Stakeholder analysis

Stakeholder	Overall Roles and Responsibilities	Interest / Role in Project
National Government		
The Ministry of Health and the Environment including the ECU	The Ministry of Health and the Environment will function as the lead implementing agency. The Ministry will coordinate the inputs of government agencies and other stakeholders in strengthening the legal, policy, financial and institutional capacity necessary for the implementation of the project and the establishment of a PA management system.	The ECU will collaborate and interact with private, public and civil society stakeholders and stakeholder organizations, external research organizations and inter-governmental institutions to monitor and report to government and relevant agencies in accordance with the requirements of this project and the relevant Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs)

Stakeholder	Overall Roles and Responsibilities	Interest / Role in Project
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, including Forestry, Wildlife and Parks Division, the Agriculture Division, and Agricultural Investment Unit	The Forestry, Wildlife and Parks Division within the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MoAF) will take the leading role in establishing priorities and strategies for improved site-level PA management.	The DFWNP will be responsible for forest management including conservation, sustainable resource use of all Forest Reserves and National Parks in Dominica, as well as soil and water conservation, enforcement of forestry, wildlife, and national parks legislation. The ECU will support the Forestry, Wildlife, and Parks Division in research and monitoring, public relations, environmental education, institutional capacity building, and resource mobilization.
Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Fisheries Division	The Fisheries Division will lead in all activities associated with the improvement of the marine environment and resources. The Dominica Marine Reserve Service will support the Fisheries Division in the monitoring and conservation of marine resources to ensure the achievement of the project outputs.	The Fisheries Division will contribute to the updating/strengthening of laws, regulations, and policies related to the management of Dominica's marine PAs namely the Soufriere Scott's Head Marine Reserve (SSMR) the Cabrits Marine Reserve (CMR) and the proposed Salisbury Marine Reserve (SMR).
SSMR Local Area Management Authority (LAMA)	The LAMA serves as the community-based manager for SSMR	Improving the LAMAs capacities and coordinating its activities with the terrestrial Pas
Ministry of Finance	The Ministry of Finance has a National Authorizing Officer who signs on behalf of government for all external funding. Internal fund (from the consolidated fund) is also managed via Ministry of Finance.	The Ministry of Finance will therefore authorize the use of funds by this project. The ministry will also play a key role in the development of additional revenue mechanisms for the Pas
Ministry of Housing, Lands and Water Resource Management	The Department of Lands and Surveys will be responsible for demarcation of boundaries and delimitation of zones while the Department of Housing will regulate housing development in the buffer zone.	Responsible for implementing the buffer zones identified as part of this Project and for regulating land uses within these areas based on the Project outcomes

Stakeholder	Overall Roles and Responsibilities	Interest / Role in Project
Ministry of Justice, Immigration and National Security	This ministry is responsible for the drafting and enforcement of all legislations governing Dominica including environmental protection.	The ministry will be responsible for the establishing the legal status of PAs and the development of comprehensive legislation needed for PA system (PAS).
Ministry of Tourism	The Ministry of Tourism will guide the implementation of project activities within Morne Trois Pitons, in particular for the tourism sites within the park.	The Ministry of Tourism sees PAs as a vital component of the country's tourism strategy
Physical Planning	In the buffer zone outside of Morne Trois Pitons, the Division of Lands and Surveys within MAF, together with the Physical Planning Division within MENRPPF, will both play important roles in developing planning, mapping, and regulatory strategies for the PA buffer zone.	Responsibility for regulating land uses within the buffer zone
Bureau of Gender Affairs	Works with Dominica National Council of Woman to address gender equity.	Will play a key role with DNCW in identifying, ensuring and monitoring women's participation in Project activities
DOWASCO	DOWASCO is responsible for the development of water resource in Dominica, the agency will therefore manage the water resource associated with Morne Trois Pitons through research, data collection, projection and maintenance and development of infrastructure within the park and buffer zone.	Will play a key role in protecting water sources in buffer zones and in development of PAS mechanisms
DOMLEC	Hydroelectric generation from streams emanating from Morne Trois Pitons is the business of DOMLEC.	The agency will be jointly responsible for site protection and development

Stakeholder	Overall Roles and Responsibilities	Interest / Role in Project
NGOs/CBOs	Relevant civil society partners that will participate in the project implementation process include Dominica Organic Agriculture Movement, National Youth Council and National Association of Youth in Agriculture, Community Councils and Community Improvement Groups, Eco-balance – Biodiversity Center for Learning and Training, Bellevue Chopin Organic Farmers, Giraudel Women’s Group.	These organizations will participate in the co-management of the buffer zone of the PAs, in monitoring and evaluation and the implementation of livelihood initiatives, will also play a key role in the Project’s community projects
UNESCO	UNESCO will provide support to policy development for the buffer zone. Additionally, the agency will provide financial and technical support to eligible community groups operating in the buffer zone of Morne Trois Pitons.	UNESCO will also provide technical support to the development of the PAS plan.
Private Landowners	Private landowners will become part of the management structure (the co-management structure that will evolve) and will promote low impact activities by visitors as well as advocating for the conservation and sustainable use of the resource	Play a role in determining land uses and development practices in the buffer zones

The inception workshop was presented with the findings of a stakeholder analysis which was conducted to determine “ownership of the project, the level of buy-in, the anticipated roles of the various stakeholders in the project implementation and to better design the management structure needed to ensure the effectiveness of project implementation and the sustainability of the impact.” A table identifying the major categories of stakeholders and the individual organizations within those groups as well as the proposed role(s) of each stakeholder group was presented.

3. FINDINGS

3.1. PROJECT DESIGN/FORMULATION

3.1.1. Formulation Analysis of Results Framework: Logic and Strategy

The project was designed in a conducive context with an expression of need and priorities linked to the government's development agenda at the time (see the Relevance section for more on this aspect). Based on this assessment, the project remains highly relevant to the context.

As outlined by the project document, there were two main components (and expected results); each had three corresponding outputs. The two main strategies (components) included first a focus on improving the core system with activities involving a model with upgrades to management, financial planning, biodiversity mainstreaming, and showcasing the co-management approach. The second focused on improving the enabling environment for establishing the buffer zone including setting up the institutional arrangement for the PA systems management, working with the community and public to increase biodiversity value/stewardship and create sustainable business opportunities.

The idea also targeted benefits to rural women and youth by including them in project-related decision-making and improving their economic opportunities with small grants. Considering the theory of change outlined above, this design was generally suited to the context. However, several key stakeholders interviewed said the design might have been overambitious for the context and was not prepared for the disruption of multiple disaster events: first, tropical storm Erika in 2015, then, hurricane Maria in 2017, and finally the COVID pandemic in 2020. In this case, a key lesson is to anticipate, prepare, and have a risk mitigation plan in place for natural disasters in disaster-prone countries.

TE found that while the roadmap was generally well outlined (but aspirational) in the project document, it still required refinement and strategies for the “transformational “expected results across the two-component work areas i.e., community knowledge, education, governance, and policy during the early work planning stages.

Stakeholders interviewed agreed that the logical framework, while general and robust for the situation, lacked detailed KPIs, strategies for implementation, and plans for scheduling the inputs. Critical work planning exercises needed to be done from the outset. The project was further disrupted by the non-inclusive work planning process led by the IP NPD (see below). The planning was accelerated in a risk management strategy under enabling conditions in 2019, but by then there was not enough time to build synergies and complete the demonstration of the project as envisioned.

Normally, the logical framework and multiyear work plan would be reviewed at inception. It is during this period that intense strategies for implementation could be adapted and rolled out with a stakeholder engagement strategy. The interviewees reported that while the design was general and robust for the context, it contained many moving parts, including a model showcasing the functional national park with upgrades: management systems, co-management demonstration, a financial plan, and critical baseline work for policy, institutional strengthening, and decision making. The work planning was, however, at the discretion of the NPD.

The NPD-IP conducted the work planning and rather than being strategic and/or based on results, it was more of a sector-by-sector approach. Key sectors reported receiving inputs instead of actively participating in work planning exercises that made the most sense for them and the collective expected results. Also, the early inputs needed to be carefully scheduled and technically monitored from the start. For instance, the model PA included a baseline biodiversity survey, seemingly the logical place to start this exercise. However, the most logical way forward was to establish a full staff team as well as the portfolios for technical monitoring and oversight linked to the results at the onset. In the absence of these, implementation was not as strategic as envisioned.

While activities may have been linked to the general logical framework, they were not clearly connected to the final results i.e., education on biodiversity value, governance, and policy changes. The lesson is to ensure the project design phase is a rigorous one, inclusive of work planning, which includes revisiting the theory of change and developing strategies with key stakeholders to inform results. Establishing a

stakeholder engagement plan at the beginning was central to that vision. While the project had a strong design, the stakeholder engagement plan was not fleshed out with the design and implementation plan as a strategic exercise.

An important example of the importance of having stakeholders' participation in work planning and scheduling at the onset was that once the project was finally under enabling conditions and was underway with the financial consultant's arrival in 2020, the financial feasibility work lacked important biodiversity, institutional, and community-level baselines.

The financial consultant conducted the basic analysis of the institutional arrangement, the stakeholder engagement with the public and communities, to determine how the PA system might function and how the individual PA could manage in the collective system. The consultant, however, struggled with the impossible task, but according to others interviewed, had managed to produce an assessment based on proxy values and product that can be used in informing future project design. The TE learned the consultant engaged in community surveys, and the broader stakeholder consultations needed to extrapolate the results of a financial plan for the PAs and for the system as a whole. This deliverable was used by the other consultants, and it was appreciated by all stakeholders interviewed.

3.1.2. Assumptions and Risks

The 2017-2018 implementation period of the project was impacted by the passage of Hurricane Maria on September 2017. During this time, UNDP also conducted a spot check that raised additional risks related to the IPs management of the project. A second phase, post-2019–2021, was during a government transition, and a third phase was the project implementation under enabling conditions. While the following key assumptions were provided by the project document, disconnected communication related to oversight between the UNDP and the IP led to additional delays and was not accounted for in these risks.

- Decision-makers approve the management plan;
- Private landowners in the proposed buffer zone agree to the terms of the project as it pertains to land-use and management;
- Private landowners agree to function within a buffer zone context;
- The degree of restriction to which private landowners will agree is uncertain;
- Approval is given for the PA system to manage its finance with supervision from the Ministry of Finance;
- A stakeholder agreement should meet with everyone's approval;
- The state approves the use of the land for agriculture.

Notably, disasters, high UNDP and government oversight support and the high rates of staff turnover were not included in the above list of key assumptions. The 2019 project risk mitigation and acceleration plan (reviewed at TE) was not fulfilled, partly due to COVID-19. In any case, the project management adapted the risk, using it as the basis of an adapted acceleration plan for final expected results under enabling conditions from 2019.

3.1.3. Lessons from relevant projects incorporated into project design

Per interviews and desk study of the project documents, it is evident that Dominica has undertaken several programs in the past decade to strengthen and expand its system of PAs. For example, from 2005 to 2011, the country participated in the project OECS Protected Areas and Associated Livelihoods (OPAAL), a regional initiative aimed at coordinating, complementing, and integrating PA management in the Eastern Caribbean region. That project sought to promote biodiversity conservation, remove barriers to the effective management of PAs, increase the participation of the private sector and NGOs in PA management, and provide environmentally sustainable economic opportunities for nearby communities. This, along with a

notable lack of staff, prevented Dominica from making significant progress towards achieving the goals of the OPAAL project. These findings from the SSE project TE are similar in that the human capacity barrier remains a root problem for continuity and for sustaining this work. This issue is discussed in the results and recommendations section below and in executive summary. At the time of that project, the government, with EU funding of approximately US\$ 6 million, had also been implementing a program to rehabilitate trails and facilities within Dominica's national parks and various ecotourism sites, including the WNT.

Regarding productive landscapes, including areas bordering MTPNP and other PAs, Dominica has implemented several programs to improve the sustainability of development and resource use. From 2006 to 2011, for instance, the Government of Dominica led the GEF-funded Integrated Watershed and Coastal Areas Management (IWCAM) project with support from the Caribbean Environmental Health Institute (CEHI) and United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP), which addressed 1) diminishing freshwater supplies, 2) degraded freshwater and coastal water quality, 3) inappropriate land use, and 4) hygiene and sanitation. The project's intended goal was to strengthen the commitment and capacity of the participating countries to implement an integrated approach to the management of watersheds and coastal areas. Based on the lessons learned through IWCAM, Dominica conducted a pilot project for the management of the Roseau River watershed.

Another important past project was the development of an INRM approach piloted under the UNDP-GEF Sustainable Land Management project that ended in 2012. At the onset this project and other ongoing projects under the purview of the ECU at the time were expected to build on outcomes from another the GEF-funded Special Program on Adaptation to Climate Change (SPACC) (2007–2011), which had helped Dominica, Saint Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines to implement pilot adaptation measures addressing the impacts of regional climate change on the natural resource base, focused on biodiversity and land degradation along the coastal and near-coastal areas. Many more linked prior activities were highlighted in the project document. During the project however, these synergies were not actively carried through according to interviewees based on the implementation issues highlighted. Therefore, key information, while available was not adequately incorporated into the project design.

3.1.4. Planned Stakeholder Participation

The project was realized through intensive stakeholder involvement in the planning and coordination of key consultancies i.e. the PA system financial assessment, the PA system legal review consultancy and institutional assessment and decisions on key interventions i.e. to provide farmers and key staff with tools and training post disaster.

The basic project premise was to showcase national PA coordination and inclusive processes and a unique inter-sectoral planning approach to PA management. This was in addition to gaining a broad sectoral and stakeholder consensus on the financial management planning in key sites. The coordination and stakeholder engagement element were thus central to ongoing coordination function, knowledge sharing, and financial management. In this regard, the project attempted to catalyze investment by working closely with all stakeholders to obtain consensus on the institutional, financial, and legal arrangements and to showcase that the project's stakeholder engagement was inherently linked to the overall implementation toward results. The stakeholder engagement required inclusive multiyear planning and precise scheduling and coordination of key inputs toward expected results—a model national park showcasing its biodiversity assets, having clear demarcation of boundaries, co-management demonstration, and plans for other PAs as well as a broad consultation with relevant stakeholders. These consultancies in general were managed as inputs orchestrated by the final PC, who had come on board in 2020. There was also focus on the enabling

environment including co-management and legal establishment of the management and a buffer zone and classification on of PAs.

The stakeholder engagement was generally achieved through inputs to the steering committee throughout the project lifetime, and PSC meetings were held regularly over six months. This group was made up according to the project document stipulations. Notably, while the PSC meetings were generally well-attended, they are not meant to be stakeholder workshops. The main criticism was that the PSC was receiving the work plans as opposed to participatory and intersectoral work planning as it was envisioned by the project document. This speaks to an inaccurate or unrealistic expectation of the function of the PSC from the outset. Forestry, for example, was the main stakeholder responsible for the management of the national park model, but rather than engaging in the strategy and work plans, it received tasks and budgets which might have been better developed with the forestry unit as a technical implementation partner and a results stakeholder *before* the PSC meeting. Done in this way, the ownership of the work was not established.

The Evaluator found that the broader stakeholders (private sector, NGOs community, and relevant sectors) were engaged by consultants as the project was being rolled out in 2019, after the risk management strategy was developed (see the section on risk management below and the Annex 9). The stakeholder engagement was either through short-term international and or national consultancies. Due to COVID-19 and measures to prevent or minimize the transmission of the virus, the consultants used various forms of engagement to effectively reach a wide cross-section of stakeholders. Consultants used virtual meetings and workshops and in some instances telephone conversions. Additionally, online surveys to assess the population's knowledge of PAs were broadcasted using various forms of social media. In instances where in person sessions could take place, COVID-19 protocols mandated by the government were followed.

The project intention, however, was to build the capacity of existing staff. The original staff plan was adopted as inputs and was much too late to meet the softer stakeholder engagement, governance, and learning objectives.

The evaluator interviewed the main NGO involved in managing PA estates, the Soufriere/Scotts Head Marine Reserve Local Areas Management Authority (SSMR LAMA), and learned that the board of directors find value in a **systems** approach with a single, overarching management authority as it will support them with clout and accreditation for receiving grants and donations, and this will support financial and resource mobilization.

3.1.5. Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

Linkages were established in the design with complementary interventions. Synergies between the initiatives were established to the extent possible given the operational context (protracted disaster, transitions, and IP issues). The pilot concept, for example, touched on the trail extending the length of the island from north to south and traversed the island's various climatic, vegetative, topographic, and social communities, including Morne Trois Pitons and other PAs. However, that trail was poorly managed, and there was a shortage of staff to effectively handle its full length. This project would support ongoing efforts to increase ecotourism revenues while also reducing the adverse impacts of uncontrolled tourism-related activities in Dominica's PAs. The Ministry also had an ongoing public awareness campaign on PAs, including community events that bring school children to various PAs and educate them on the importance of the area in the protection and management of biodiversity. The Ministry also implemented some basic management activities at PAs, such as trail maintenance, education, surveillance, and removal of invasive alien species.

In addition to ongoing government budget allocations, a key baseline program was noted as the World Bank-funded Strategic Program for Climate Resilience (SPCR; 2014--2017), which includes 1) promotion

of Food Security through climate-resilient agricultural/fisheries development, 2) a comprehensive Risk Management Framework and Sustainable Climate Change Financing, and 3) enhancing ecosystem/Infrastructure resilience and promotion of sustainable human settlement.

Other relevant ongoing programs included the EU-funded Banana Accompanying Measures (BAM) program, a € 15.27 million project aimed at helping Dominica to reorient from banana production to other productive agricultural activities and important community-based groups implementing sustainable land management projects with support from the GEF Small Grants Program. The current coordinator was able to make an important agreement with the SGP in 2020 to establish synergies and scale up activities which focused training community groups on biodiversity conservation techniques.

In reality, the expectation for building on all these synergies from project inception in 2016 was disrupted by the disaster events (staff work went to recovery efforts) as well as the issues with the IP in the ECU during early implementation and during the post-adaptation and risk management planning in 2019, as more constraints and time delays were brought on by COVID. The TE learned the last project coordinator hired attempted to establish synergies, however, by then the time was insufficient for strategic engagement and joint work planning i.e., for the ongoing SLM UNEP project, the GIZ work on disaster desalination, and the World Bank project, was not feasible. Besides, the PC was constrained by the need to push through and monitor the approved eleven consultancies (three international) in the acceleration plan in the short time left (2020 to -2021).

An assumption was that the knowledge base of staff would improve from the project at the ECU at the start of the project, post-disaster, post-spot check (dissolution of the ECU), and in the project risk management phase with the new IP at MOHER 2019–2021. Subsequently the ECU was dissolved which prevented the continuity of learning by doing. The continuous lack of resources to build capacity thus became a major finding, highlighted as a key lesson learned, a long-term constraint and an opportunity for strategic UNDP support for a follow-up phase. The type of resources required to build sustained human capacity for coordination, support of the government vision for a protected areas systems nature-based solution and resilience will require much greater resources than a GEF project can provide. UNDP is well-positioned to help coordinate donors, therefore, the stakeholders suggested that intensive resources and training work with the higher and primary education sectors as well as the public service commission are critical.

3.1.6. Gender Responsiveness in the Design

Regarding the participation of women in project implementation, the project document provided a narrative containing baseline information as well as the vision for that participation. The KPIs for gender were not established and a gender plan was not developed. Ensuring optimal Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) for gender results was essential, however, as there was an M&E gap, the importance of establishing this practice is a lesson learned. The participation of women was highlighted as an important implementing principle for results concerning the consultative and decision-making aspects, especially where their vulnerability is very high, e.g. in poor female-headed households. Both coordinators interviewed reported taking note of women's participation in the activities.

The Department of Women's Affairs in Dominica was expected to be actively involved in outreach activities and training was to be provided to women's groups in livelihood activities. However, this department was not engaged. Special attention was expected to be given to the community groups in the buffer zone around Morne Trois Pitons and the predominant women's groups involved in agriculture, flower production, vending of local crafts, and hospitality. The project document also highlighted that efforts would be made to achieve gender parity in the representation on the Steering Committee and in the procurement of consultants. Women and youth were expected to be targeted as fundamental project stakeholders through their involvement in the design and implementation of capacity building and awareness programmes. This would ensure their equitability and sustainability. Special attention had to be

given to gender issues in developing socioeconomic indicators, and Dominica's National Council of Women was to be engaged to help ensure that women were targeted and supported through the project's agricultural and other livelihood initiatives.

Socioeconomic activities were expected to have been built on existing information on the actual benefits of women and disadvantaged communities from ecosystems. Education and outreach were to be targeting the opportunities and socioeconomic benefits to the buffer zone communities for maintaining ecosystem health and the benefits provided by the ecosystem services generated from the MTPNP. This project was not fully implemented this way as some of the engagements on the ground did not take place. However, the project targeted female agricultural groups in communities close to the buffer zone of MTPNP during stakeholder engagement. This was to ensure that women were included in the development of management structures for MTPNP. Additionally, the SSE project selected primary schools close to the buffer zone and students from the Dominica State College as part of its public relations campaign. These activities will need to be fleshed out in future projects that take on the readiness work completed by this project i.e., consultations with communities on the community-based resource plans.

3.1.7. Social and Environmental Safeguards

The environmental and social risks as identified through the SESP in line with UNDP Social and Environmental Standards were rated moderate in the overall ProDoc screening (see the ProDoc's screening checklist in the annex 13). In this regard, the project sought to improve the management of protected areas in Dominica that provide social, economic, and environmental benefits to Dominicans and visitors. Through a systems approach existence, it supports the rights of humans to access the lands and resources. The buffer zone was to be managed as a living landscape. The project intended to enhance the availability, accessibility, and quality of benefits derived from the natural resources. The ProDoc had a strong stakeholder involvement plan that was needed from the project's inception for development through all implementation and for monitoring results. For instance, the project targeted women's organizations and community groups as being "integral to project implementation." The communities and groups were expected to benefit from capacity development activities as the champions.

In reality, only communities in close proximity to the MTPNP were included. The project, however, was generally implemented through consultancies (coordinated by PC inputs). The full breadth of the consultative mechanisms envisioned by the approach would be equitable and nondiscriminatory in giving all stakeholders a voice and contributing to the decision-making process. Accountability and rule of law were not expressed to the extent they might have been if the context were always enabling, if the staff were recruited at the beginning, and if the demonstration project were written with a community engagement plan and demonstration in the buffer. By the time the project commenced in late 2019, it was over, and the work approach was through consultancies for engagement in general. There was intense engagement with communities carried out by the international financial consultant, and her work was applauded by all stakeholders interviewed. The project's outputs and the expectation that this would lead to the reduction of vulnerability and building resilience to climate change were not achieved. Much more work with the community and operationalization of a systems approach with buffer zones established will need to be done to reach this goal.

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?	QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks? <i>Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6</i>			QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?
<i>Risk Description</i>	<i>Impact and Probability (1-5)</i>	<i>Significance (Low, Moderate, High)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	<i>Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required, note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.</i>
Risk 1: Attempts to change or amend the Protected Areas Act (checklist 3.1.2)	I = 3 P = 3	Moderate	The amendment sought to reduce the physical size of the area designated as PA. If done, all PAs are then at risk of having size change at will and taking away the protection afforded to biodiversity and the global and local benefits	Consultants held meetings with senior government officials to apprise them of the potential danger. UNDP should have a dialogue with the government of Dominica on the matter.
Risk 2: There is a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights.	I = 2 P = 2	Low	Except for some areas of the proposed buffer zone, the land under consideration is state land and state-controlled, so civil society often overlooks or misses changes that will later affect them.	

3.2. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

3.2.1. Adaptive Management

Management arrangements

The project was implemented under UNDP's national implementation modality (NIM) with the ECU as the Implementing Partner and the DFWNP as the Responsible Party. These agencies were to follow the standards and regulations of the UNDP as the GEF implementing agency. The ECU Implementing Partner was the entity designated responsible for the project outcomes and is accountable for its management, including monitoring and evaluation activities, the achievement of outputs, and effective use of resources. As mentioned above, the IP for this project was changed to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Resilience in 2019, with a 2020 name change of Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment after irregularities were identified at the ECU in 2018.

Project Roles—Operational, Management, and Oversight

The organizational structure and staffing for the project are described in the project document. The project, in general, was implemented by a PC with the support of a part-time assistant. The original vision of a full staff of technical consultants was never implemented (list of project expected staff in project document). The adaptive management is provided below.

The Environmental Coordinating Unit (ECU) in the Ministry of Health and Environment was the first Implementing Partner. This changed in 2018 after irregularities were found in the ECU financial systems. At the onset, the ECU was set up to support and provide inputs to the implementation of all project activities and stakeholder groups, recruiting project staff, and contracting consultants and service providers with advice from and the involvement of the DFWPN and UNDP. International procurement was handled by the UNDP upon request of the PACU and the ECU.

The Project Steering Committee PSC is the highest decision-making body in project management and implementation. The primary function of the Project Steering Committee is to guide the technical feasibility of the project, not necessarily to do the work planning as was done in this project. There was not enough time for proper engagement during such high-level meetings to execute technical work planning, as such, a key lesson is to have a separate plan for this process. Another major finding from the TE review was on the poor use of the PSC for oversight and the need for technical work groups for work planning. The representatives from the following organizations comprised the Project Steering Committee and meet every six months:

Environmental Coordinating Unit (Chair)

Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries

Ministry of Finance

Ministry of Tourism

Physical Planning Division

Soufriere Scots-Head Marine Reserve Local Area Management Authority (SSMR LAMA)

Dominica National Council of Women

UNDP Barbados and the OECS.

According to the ProDoc, the Director of ECU chaired the Project Steering Committee and was responsible for supervising project development and coordinating the Project Steering Committee members consisting of representatives from the Ministries of Agriculture and Fisheries, Finance, Tourism, Planning, SSMR LAMA, and the Dominica National Council of Women. However, the ECU was dismantled in 2018, therefore the role of executive was assumed by the Ministry of the Environment, Climate Resilience, Disaster Management and Urban Renewal. After general elections in December 2019, there was again a change in nomenclature and structure to the Ministry which became the Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernisation and Kalinago Upliftment. Within this structure, the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry became the head of the steering committee and chaired all project meetings. The other members of the steering committee remained as established at the start of project implementation which allowed for continuity of decision making on the project.

A Protected Area Coordinating Unit (PACU) was expected to be formed and would carry out day-to-day PA management and strengthen the Implementing Partner's capacity in ensuring that project deliverables were both timely and that quality results were achieved. The TE uncovered that there was a PA committee already in place, however, generally, the project coordinator took the lead of the PACU role, with the project director authorizing project activities. The vision was that the PACU would be *a distinct unit* housed within the ECU that would parallel both the DFWNP and the Fisheries Division. As it worked to develop a systemic approach to PA management, the distinction between the roles of the PC, the ECU and the Ministry became blurred. This was a call for strategic positioning of the PACU to provide coordinated management for the PA approach. While the project had resources for a CTA, this did not come about. A CTA was engaged by the project at the start; however, the position was made vacant at the consultant's end of contract.

Adaptive management and capacity building approach

The project implementation suffered serious setbacks from Hurricane Maria in 2017. The disaster partly explained the low cumulative disbursement rate. According to the PIRs reviewed, the project's cumulative expenditure rate in 2018 was 33% and the results were negligible related to significant setbacks in implementation including financial irregularities in the IP that led to a financial assessment with a sudden change in the IP and then delays in administrative processes due to the government's focus on the elections (December 6, 2019). Moreover, stakeholders interviewed said the transition to a new IP, staff, and team took most of the project's efforts during that period. The Project Assistant resigned, creating further setbacks. The project has thus been fully staffed only since March 2020. The PMU reported not receiving a clear procurement plan for key consultancies and spent most of this reporting period updating the plan (PIR). Interviewees reported that limited government support due a shortage in staff was compounding the situation. To catch up, key procurement of international and national consultants was planned for the second half of 2019, which was expected to raise the delivery to approximately 63% by January 31, 2020. This plan was again disrupted by COVID-19.

The implementation was disrupted in three distinct operating contexts and by turnovers in staff at UNDP and at the project implementing unit. The first phase implemented in the challenging IP context , a post-

disaster with the Hurricane Maria context, a post-IP and government transition context, and then enabling context, all caused delays and setbacks i.e., the need to reeducate all the stakeholders each time. The second period was that of transition i.e., a post-UNDP spot check and then finally under enabling conditions with the new IP and MOHER but without the institutional context for strengthening. The TE found the project work planning for the original concept of a pilot demonstration model to be incomplete.

The disaster somewhat derailed the co-management demonstration community plan for intensive women's, youth's, and community education and economic support work. A livelihood grant was provided, not for sustainable livelihood post-disaster, but rather, livelihood for economic sustainability in the buffer. Some stakeholders say this could have also been better linked with the work on post-disaster grants provided to farmers and other say that although these were handouts, the stakeholder say the categories the farmers chose did support their adaptive capacity. After the UNDP spot check intervention in 2018 and the transition in IP, a risk management and acceleration plan were designed. This became the project adaption with a reduced scope and a focus on the upstream intervention for readiness. This plan was once again derailed by the COVID-19 context, and it was impossible to schedule in sequence. The result has been coordinated by the new PC as much as possible, but it still needed some synergies by TE in terms of the legal work. This is a follow-up recommendation to guarantee a process whereby the three main enabling works are synergies, and the government has a set of policy recommendations for legal work in hand.

3.2.2. Stakeholder and Partners Engagement

This is discussed in full above; however, as mentioned, the project work plan and the implementing arrangement including plans for stakeholder engagement were interrupted by the following factors: the lack of full complement of staff, the NPD was reported as over-controlling the work planning at the start when it was intended by the project document to be a multisector -stakeholder exercise, the numerous government and PC transitions, the hurricane in 2017, and dual-phased IP, first under the ECU and then under the Ministry of Environment and Climate Resilience in 2019; with a 2020 name change to Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago upliftment under enabling conditions. In interviews with the two recent project coordinators (there were three PCs since the beginning), the TE learned that they leveraged and interacted with different departments as they could under enabling conditions and serious time delays, for example, by engaging the stakeholders during the risk monitoring and reporting work, in the steering committee meetings, and then during consultancies in the adapted risk management and accelerated delivery plan designed by late 2019.

The TE has been in discussion with all groups of key stakeholders during the TE review i.e., the fisheries, forestry, and LAMA, among others involved in the project's baseline and readiness work (see the full list of consultancies and completed works in final Annex 14). In general, the project's stakeholders showed that active participation and country-driven processes were again speared by the nature of the enabling conditions for project implementation. In the first phase, the main stakeholders included the ECU and some important sectors for work planning i.e., forestry, water, and land management. In the second phase, broader stakeholders were engaged but not to the extent that the project has envisioned i.e., demonstration work with communities during the consultancy work. Key consultancies delivered were the biodiversity survey, financial plan, and PA institutional and legal consultations.

3.2.3. Project Finance and Co-finance

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP financing		Government		Partner Agency		Total	
	(US\$m)		(US\$m)		(US\$m)		(US\$m)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants/ Loans/ Concessions / In-kind support	300,000	300,000	7,400,000	8,608,762.06	1,707,306.00	1,475,563.57	9,407,306	10,384,325.63
Other								
Totals	300,000	300,000	7,400,000	8,608,762.06	1,707,306	1,475,563.57	9,407,306	10,384,325.63

Confirmed Sources of Co-Financing at TE Stage

Sources of Co-Financing	Name of Cofinancier	Type of Cofinancing	Investment Mobilized	Amount (US\$)
GEF AGENCY	GEF	GRANT	Investment mobilized	1,475,563.57.00
DONOR AGENCY	UNDP		Investment mobilized	300,000.00
Recipient Country Gov't	Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica	In-Kind	Recurrent Expenditure	8,608,762.06
Total Co-Financing				10,384,325.63

3.2.4. Monitoring and Reporting: Design (MS), Implementation (MU), Overall (MS)

Design

The project document included a robust plan for monitoring; however, this was not followed through as envisioned with a full technical staff (see staff list below). This table provides the TE findings on the various expected ME outputs. In general, the Monitoring and Evaluation was weak, and this was observed by UNDP

implementation support, the government's technical monitoring of the outputs, and the issues flagged during the process of implementation; this is a lesson learned.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget USD <i>Excluding project team Staff time</i>	Time frame	COMMENT
Inception Workshop and Report	Project Manager UNDP-MCO UNDP GEF	Indicative cost \$4,000	Within the first two months of project start-up	Yes, but it was lacking the development of an implementation strategy that scheduled the inputs and prioritized the staff input to technically monitor this project.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Purpose Indicators	UNDP-GEF RTA and Project Coordinator will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Inception Workshop	Start, middle, and end of the project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.	Not changed
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress and Performance on <i>output and implementation</i> (measured on an annual basis)	Oversight by Project Coordinator Project team	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation.	Annually before ARR/PIR and for defining the annual work plans	Yes, PIRs were provided on an annual basis.
Annual Progress Report (APR) and PIR	Project manager and team UNDP MCO UNDP RTA UNDP EEG	None	Annually	Yes, completed
Periodic status/ progress reports	Project team	None	Quarterly	Yes, completed.
Mid-term Evaluation	UNDP-MCO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e., evaluation team)	Indicative cost: \$12,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.	Not completed. It was optional with the budget.
Final Evaluation	UNDP-MCO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e., evaluation team)	Indicative cost: \$15,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation	Yes
Terminal Project Report	UNDP-MCO local consultant		At least three months before the end of the project	Will be completed

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget USD <i>Excluding project team Staff time</i>	Time frame	COMMENT
Audit	UNDP-MCO	Indicative cost per year: 6,000 x 3 = 18,000	Yearly	Yes, completed.
Visits to field sites	UNDP Country Office UNDP RCU (as appropriate) Government representatives	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly	Yes, the project manager and government visited the sites.
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 49,000		Spent

Technical Monitoring

Per ProDoc, this project focused on delivering technical assistance on the PA system to Dominica and showcasing a good practice by doing. This was the highly technical and anticipated provision of the following technical staff and/or consultants to ensure the integrity of the work and to ensure value-added technical assistance provided by the UNDP and partners. This work was to be managed by the IP with the support of UNDP on request. One of the key findings at TE is that the completed by March 2021 will need to be technically vetted by the appropriate officer at the ministry and the UNDP RTA based on the adapted strategy. These products need to be further consolidated with synergies made between them before finalizing the project.

Table: ProDoc anticipated Staff and Consultants Monitoring the project

Natl. / Intl.	Purpose	Intensity of input	Indicative budget (US\$)*	Key Tasks and Responsibilities	Status
I	Chief Technical Advisor for Protected Areas	Approximately 250 days over the 4 years of the project	150,000	Capacity building in writing PA management plans and other planning processes and tools, developing and implementing PA regulations, guiding the writing of PA's strategic and business plans, and training in financial management (see ToR for more details). Developing standard operating procedures for PA management as well as criteria and procedures for identification, assessment, and designation of new terrestrial and marine	There is no CTA currently employed on the project. However, it should be noted that one was recruited in 2016 with a 3.5 yr. contract but the position has been vacant from 2019.

Natl. / Intl.	Purpose	Intensity of input	Indicative budget (US\$)*	Key Tasks and Responsibilities	Status
				protected areas. Developing a roadmap for the establishment of CTF and DNS	
I	Ecological/ Biodiversity Inventories for Terrestrial Pas	Approximately 120 days over 2 years	85,000	Working with the DFWNP and local consultants to design and implement the ecological/biodiversity inventories at MTPNP	A Biodiversity firm, BIOTOPE, was engaged in June 2020 and conducted their field mission in February-March 2021. The agency has submitted their Forest Inventory report and a Biodiversity Assessment and Monitoring Plan. These documents have been shared with the Division of Forestry for validation.
I	Conservation Programs at Terrestrial Pas	Approximately 300 days of work over 12–18 months (2–3 consultants)	150,000	Developing targeted conservation/ monitoring programs for significant and threatened species or habitats	BIOTOPE, a biodiversity firm was engaged in June 2020 and conducted their field mission in February-March 2021. Part of their field mission entailed Fauna and Flora training on threatened and endemic species.
N	Drafting of legislation and regulations	75 days over 2 years	70,000	Drafting legislation and regulations on land tenure issues, interpreting law relating to PA governance, managing registration issues	The legal expert has contracted from August 2020 to March 31 st , 2021. The legal expert has completed stakeholder engagements and draft reports have been submitted. Comments have been given by the PC and the report was reverted to the consultant for amendment.

Natl. / Intl.	Purpose	Intensity of input	Indicative budget (US\$)*	Key Tasks and Responsibilities	Status
I	Plan for invasive species treatments & removal	Working 25 days over two (2) months.	15,500	Developing plan for invasive species treatments and removal	No consultant was engaged to develop a plan specific to invasive species treatments and removal.
N	Develop National PA system plan and 10-year finance strategy	Approximately 60 days of work over 8 months	33,000	Working with the relevant agencies to write the financial strategy to support the development of concessions	The Protected Areas Finance Specialist was recruited in November 2019 and has finalized all deliverables as set out by the contract. A Finance Strategy Report was developed through a stakeholder consultation and has undergone stakeholder review. The report proposes various mechanisms including e-ticketing which can be used to increase the finance streams of PAs.
N	Development of co-management system	100 days over 2 years	70,000	Working with the relevant agencies and stakeholders to develop a co-management system and 10-year financial strategy and support development of concession and management strategy	The Finance consultant was recruited in November 2019 and has finalized all deliverables as set out by the contract. The co-management plan has gone through a stakeholder review process and has been submitted to the IP for final approval.

Natl. / Intl.	Purpose	Intensity of input	Indicative budget (US\$)*	Key Tasks and Responsibilities	Status
I	Develop PA Units site-specific Management Plans	Approximately 120 days of work over 15 months	80,000	Working with relevant agencies and stakeholders to develop 15 management plans (PAs and nature sites), standards, and criteria for management, and support the development of a harmonized fee structure	The Finance expert was recruited in November 2019 and has finalized all deliverables as set out by her contract. A Finance Generation Feasibility Report was developed through a stakeholder consultation and has undergone stakeholder review. The report has been submitted to the IP for final approval. (The is a proposed fee structure and a suggested fee collection mechanism)
I	Design Sustainable Financing Mechanisms for PA system	Approximately 60 days of work over 8–12 months	37,500	Working with the relevant agencies to develop and implement business plans and sustainable financing mechanisms for the individual units, developing a harmonized fee structure, and a concession and management strategy	The Protected Areas Finance Specialist has developed four finance plans for all seven protected areas. The plans were categories based on specificities such as terrestrial parks, marine parks, etc.
N	PA Unit business and Management Plans	Approximately 120 days of work over 15 months	45,000	Supporting international consultants on management and business plans	No protected areas unit exists. The Department of Forestry is responsible for the park management.
I	Strengthen Fee Collection system	Approximately 15 days of work over 2 months	10,000	Reviewing and recommending the most appropriate fee collection system to be implemented across all Pas	This activity was added to the responsibilities of the Finance Specialist.
I	Development and operationalization of a Protected Areas Information System	Approximately 60 days of work over 6 months	53,142	Developing and implementing the PA information system	The PA Information Systems Specialist was contracted in September 2020. The Specialist is working in collaboration with the Information and Communication Technology Unit to finalize a data sharing platform. This is to ensure that the platform is done according to the government's standards as the department will be responsible for maintenance after project closure.
I	Buffer Zone criteria and identification	Approximately 45 days of work over 6 months	35,000	Identifying criteria for buffer zones, defining the boundaries of the MTPNP Buffer Zone, and developing land-use	The buffer zone of the MTPNP has been identified. However, the demarcation of the buffer zone is ongoing. There is a team on the ground undertaking the

Natl. / Intl.	Purpose	Intensity of input	Indicative budget (US\$)*	Key Tasks and Responsibilities	Status
				guidelines for buffer zones	task. Land use guidelines forms part of the work of the EIA codification specialist whose work is ongoing.
I	Development of 4 Community Resource atlases	Approximately 75 days over 20 months	56,000	Developing 4 Community Resource Management Plans	The consultant for this activity was recruited in 2019. The four Community Resource Management Plans have been completed and validated by stakeholders.
N	Develop 4 Community Resource Management Plans	2 consultants, 60 working days over 6 months	38,000	Supporting the international consultant for the development of the 4 Community Resource Management Plans	Only a local consultant was engaged for this assignment.
I	Capacity building of PA managers for terrestrial PAs	2 consultants for a total of 50 days over six weeks	17,875	Capacity building (training) for PA managers and co-managers	Training workshops took place for the staff of the Forestry Department on topics to include fire, site and visitor management, law enforcement and an overview of Dominica's National Parks and Protected Areas System.
N	Public education and awareness	Approximately 100 days over 15 months	37,626	Working with the PACU and other agencies to develop and implement public education and awareness programs regarding the PAS and newly established PA units	A Public education and awareness officer was contracted in August 2020. The consultant has done several public relations activities such as a radio show programme, community surveys, and education sessions in primary schools close to the MTPNP buffer area. The education session was also conducted with the Dominica State College Adventure Club, Geography and Chemistry students. There is also a hike planned for April 9 th at a MTPNP nature site where a Forest Officer will perform a sensitization talk for the students.
N	Develop and disseminate 4 community resource management plans	65 days over six months	35,000	Supporting the development of 4 community resource management plans, working with the community groups in the area	A local consultant was recruited to work with community groups in the four focal communities of Bellevue Chopin, Pond Casse, LaPlaine and Trafalgar. The groups have worked on developing resource management plans for 1 high

Natl. / Intl.	Purpose	Intensity of input	Indicative budget (US\$)*	Key Tasks and Responsibilities	Status
					value resource specific to each community.
N	Develop and disseminate training manuals	45 days over 3 months	20,000	Developing and disseminating a manual of biodiversity-friendly agricultural and land management practices (+ printing)	The SSE project is working in collaboration with the GEF-SGP in facilitating workshop and training sessions. A training manual will be an outcome of the project. The printing of the manual will be completed before project closure for dissemination to workshop participants.
N	Support biodiversity data management	12 days	3,750	Supporting biodiversity data collection and analysis in keeping with the NBSA requirements.	A biodiversity forest inventory (flora and fauna) has been submitted by the Biodiversity Assessment Firm. This inventory will be uploaded to the data platform.
N	Capacity building in the buffer zone	21 training sessions, 1 day each	20,000	8 x Training for community capacity building in surveillance and reporting (2 per community), 6 x Training for organic agriculture practices and alternative agricultural management techniques, 2 x Training for organizational management, 4 x Training for production of organic fertilizers, "Liquid Tea," 1 x Training of extension officer within key government Departments in the area of community vulnerability mapping and climate change adaptation planning, 2 x Training for community members to create community resource management plans	The SSE project is working in collaboration with the GEF-SGP in facilitating workshop and training sessions. The workshops are scheduled to be concluded 31 st March, 2021.
N	Capacity building of staff at MTPNP	Approximately 30 days over three months	10,000	Helping design and implement capacity building in terrestrial guide training of PA staff in trail design/management, enforcement,	Training workshops facilitated by local consultants took place for the staff of the Forestry Department on topics to include fire, site and visitor management, law enforcement and an overview of Dominica's

Natl. / Intl.	Purpose	Intensity of input	Indicative budget (US\$)*	Key Tasks and Responsibilities	Status
				management planning, ecology, first aid, community empowerment, outreach, and dispute resolution	National Parks and Protected Areas System. The biodiversity assessment firm also conducted training ecology training. The information was shared with the Division of Forestry for reference and guidance.
I	Development of the framework to govern trust fund	Approximately 30 days over three months	28,000	Developing the framework to promote the establishment of a national trust fund to link into regional and global BD trust funds	Guidelines have been developed by the Finance Specialist for the establishment of a National Conservation Trust (NTF). The Legal consultant has submitted a report detailing the legalities involved in establishing an NTF and the meaning of such a move for the Government of Dominica. The IP has initiated the process and as of December 2020 retained observer status from the Caribbean Biodiversity Trust Fund.
N	Local support	Approximately 200 days over 4 years	40,000	Local consultants will support international consultants on various activities and at different sites as needed over the life of the project	N/A
N	Development of business plans	100 days over two years	45,000	A local consultant will support the development and dissemination of business plans for the various PAs and the training of locals in the understanding and use of the business plans	The SSE project is working in collaboration with the GEF-SGP in facilitating workshop and training sessions. Two sessions were held to complete this session. A component on Managing Resources, Financial Management Processes-accountability, Safeguards, etc. was also included.
I	External Mid-Term Evaluation of Project	Approximately 20 days of work over 2 months (1–2 consultants)	12,000	Producing formal Mid-Term Evaluation according to UNDP and GEF templates and requirements	None was done as the revised GEF guidelines do not necessitate a formal Mid-Term Evaluation as the budgetary allowance project at 1.7 million dollars is less than the 2 million threshold.
I	External Terminal Evaluation of Project	Approximately 20 days of work over 2 months (1–2 consultants)	15,000	Producing formal Terminal Evaluation according to UNDP and GEF templates and requirements	Ongoing

3.2.5. Implementing Agency and Executing Agency Coordination and Operational issues (MU)

The UNDP's role, as stipulated by the project document for Project Assurance, is mainly to (i) monitor the project's progress toward intended outputs; (ii) monitor that resources entrusted to UNDP are utilized appropriately, (iii) ensure national ownership, ongoing stakeholder engagement, and sustainability; (iv) ensure that the project's outputs contribute to intended country programme outcomes; (v) participate in the Project Steering Committee; (v) report on progress to donors and UNDP through corporate reporting mechanisms. UNDP designated *one representative present in the PSC* to advise the Project Steering Committee in its deliberations and be able to vote in cases where a majority has not been met. Members will be elected during the Inception meeting.

The project document states that the Operational Oversight and Quality Assurance is the responsibility of each Project Steering Committee member, but it is noted, based on the project document agreement, that the role could be delegated. Key stakeholders said there was a misunderstanding of the unique UNDP dual role in the project oversight and implementation. UNDP played an important oversight role as well as a distinct national execution support role, under a NIM modality. The project assurance role was to perform objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions, independent of the Project Manager (PACU), ensuring that appropriate project management milestones were managed and completed. The regular operational (NIM) oversight was to be ensured by UNDP through the UNDP-CO in Barbados, and the strategic oversight was to be ensured by the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor (RTA). The "oversight" role i.e., was not expressed early in implementation, because the inception was lacking RTA involvement.

Slow procurement was flagged by stakeholders interviewed as being a major factor affecting implementation, and this was attributed to both UNDP and government procurement and related processes. For instance, cabinet decisions were needed on every consultancy approached. This process was said to be overly time-consuming and might have been avoided if the agreed consultancies were approached based on one procurement plan approved early. UNDP also reported that for a technical project, it should have had a plan upfront to enable the technical recruitments in a timely way.

3.2.6. Risk management including social safeguards (Annex 9: an updated risk management strategy, December 2019)

The extent to which risks, in terms of both threats and opportunities, were properly identified during the project implementation and what systems, plans, and actions taken to manage them are discussed. For this project, while the risks were monitored regularly, the action taken to deal with them was reported by all stakeholders interviewed as slow. The project document originally had a strategy inclusive of Risk Management which was updated and monitored by the PC and RTAs through regular PIRs. The following risks emerged from Risk Mitigation and Project Acceleration Plan in 2019. The TE also took note of the SSEP assessment that was prepared in terms of the UNDP's highlighted risk based on the SES checklist (annex 13). The TE also refers to the last produced PIR 2019. The following are the identified risks and ratings in the accelerated strategy Dec 2019:

- The project submitted an extension request (with a closure date of April 14, 2020). (MODERATE RISK); no MTR was conducted (it is not required for MSP);
- "Slow performing": with 33% cumulative disbursement in its last year (SUBSTANTIAL RISK); IP PIR 2019 rating was Unsatisfactory (MODERATE RISK);
- Procurement setbacks: the Project Coordinator explained that the procurement of International Consultants and National Consultants had setbacks. Working in conjunction with the Project Coordinator, the CO spearheaded the procurement of the three ICs associated with the Project (the Biodiversity Assessment Consultant, the Protected Areas Specialist, and the Financial Specialist) to

expedite the process. The CO also provided significant support in developing terms of reference ToRs. It was assumed that the CO's utilization of the Expert Roster was a relative advantage. When the number of responses to the Limited Competition approach proved insufficient, all the IC procurements were pursued using Open Competition. Even under these circumstances, the Biodiversity Assessment procurement received a low response, leading to an extension of the advertising period by 10 days. Currently, the bids presented are under evaluation (methodology and financial proposals).

Risk and Category	Level	Likelihood	Assessment	Mitigation Measure
<i>Institutional:</i> Responsibilities for PAs and their buffer zones remain diffuse and there is a lack of inter-ministerial coordination.	Medium	Moderately likely	Low	Both Components 1 and 2 of the project have been specifically designed to foster collaboration among implementing partners. The ECU will play a lead project execution role and will ensure coordination and collaboration among the different entities. The roles designated in the stakeholder plan will be formalized through agreements with clear ToRs. The project will develop management and financial strategies, clarify roles, elaborate long-term goals and objectives, and provide support to increase networking. A national Inter-sectoral committee will be established to oversee, coordinate, and support the activities of the various agencies and partners in carrying out landscape-level approaches that encompass both the protected area and its buffer zone. Responsibility will include integrated planning, harmonization, and coordination of work programmes and budgetary allocations with MOUs for interagency joint implementation of activities.
Lack of follow-through relating to implementation commitment Community Resource Management Plans are completed but never implemented	Low	Moderately likely	Low	The management structures developed under this project will delineate clear links between this project and institutional work plans, clearly showing the relationship between implementation and benefits derived from honoring obligations. It will support reporting requirements under CBD. The Community Resource Management Plans (CRMPs), developed under the UNDP-GEF SLM project, are being successfully implemented at this time. For example, communities are using the maps developed under the CRMPs in the development of their disaster management plans. Additional plans will be developed through this project to foster even more collaboration supported by the new institutional arrangement that the project will develop.
Local communities in the PA buffer zone are resistant to change in resource use and livelihood practices	Low	Unlikely	Low	Working in conjunction with the local communities, the project will develop a livelihood programme that increases the ability of residents to earn a living from sustainable agricultural practices and participate in tourism activities within the PA. The project will also emphasize communication and outreach to local communities.
<i>Environmental:</i> Natural disasters	Medium	Likely	Moderate to High	Dominica has implemented a wide range of approaches to Disaster Risk Reduction and

Risk and Category	Level	Likelihood	Assessment	Mitigation Measure
(esp. hurricanes) threaten forest habitat and livelihoods				Management to minimize the impacts of natural disasters on natural areas and the country's population, including rural residents dependent on forest resources for their livelihoods. The Office of Disaster Management has established a national Disaster Management Plan and is implementing the RDVRP (Regional Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Project). The office is supported by CDEMA (Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency) and NEPO (National Emergency Planning Organization).
Climate change, especially reduced precipitation and drought, imperils habitat and causes declines in agricultural production and livelihoods	Medium	Likely	Medium to High	Establish buffer zones (and potential for ecological corridors) to allow species to migrate to different habitat areas; strengthen capacities for surveillance and response to forest fires in PAs and buffer zones; encourage water conservation, low-water requirement crops, and rainwater harvesting among farmers and other residents in buffer zones
Legislative: Recurring discussions on land-use changes relating to PAs and their designated buffer zones.	High	Moderately likely	Medium	This project will support the review and rationalization of existing acts relating to PAs, ensuring that they meet the needs of Dominica without compromising the integrity of PAs. The project will support the development of standing procedures for the conduct and review of EIAs, provide guidelines for activities around PAs, and strengthen the legislative framework for PA management. During the implementation of the project, the economic value of PAs will be emphasized to both stakeholders and decision-makers so that the true value of PAs is appreciated and over time there will be a greater community desire to enhance BD conservation.
Financial: Government unable to guarantee consistent stable funds to ensure the sustainability of Pas	Medium	Moderately likely	Low	This project will review and improve the flexibility of the PA financial system and further explore financial mechanisms, specifically the debt for nature swap and the CTF to establish a stable base level of funding for PAs in Dominica.

4. PROJECT RESULTS

4.1. Progress towards Expected Results (MU)

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Status Update As of 07/03/2021 with TE R comments
Project Objective: To demonstrate a model for effective integrated landscape management encompassing strengthening of an existing protected area (Morne Trois Pitons National Park) and establishment of its buffer zone to reduce threats to biodiversity and ecological functioning				
Component 1: Strengthening the core zone management of Protected Areas at the systemic level and scale up innovative interventions at the core zone of selected PAs to improve sustainability				
Outcome 1. (Activity in Atlas) Biodiversity Assessment, monitoring, and conservation. Develop, approve, and operationalize management plan for MTPNP	Monitoring and assessment plan. Persons trained to carry out an assessment Improve METT scores of MTPNP and other targeted PAs A legally recognized management structure with guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised National Biodiversity Assessment and 5th National Report on Biodiversity available Current METT score for MTP is 59 Draft management plan available but not in use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual biodiversity reports used in decision-making in agriculture and planning. Conservation strategies being implemented. Target METT score at end of project 75 Implementation of the approved management plan; 75% of staff (recommended in the plan) hired. Improved financial and technical management. 	<p>This is in progress, although the biodiversity assessment firm was contracted in June 2020, due to COVID-19, the mission travels for this were postponed until February 2021.</p> <p>The management plan was revised in 2018; however, the plan has not yet been approved by Cabinet. This activity is in progress. (Partially met)</p> <p>TE comment: The biodiversity assessment was essentially the first thing that should have been scheduled in the project plan at the project's start (2016) together with the HR plan. This was not executed until the last year and d and remains incomplete... Consequently, the other work is not grounded by a proper biodiversity assessment. The issue is how to show the value of these assets, so while there has been some training and planning work, it was not logically sequenced. (Main finding). However, despite the shortfall, this assessment is now being done (July 21) for the national park. It has created readiness in the country for future work on operationalizing the model and demonstrating financial efficacy and scaling-up institutional arrangements.</p>
2. Resource MTPNP management.	A financial plan and trained staff to implement the plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing management plan lacks resource component; needs to be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dedicated financing for MTPNP identified and applied 	<p>The Finance Specialist conducted a financial assessment of the MTPNP and gave recommendations on strategies that can be used to improve the finance stream. (Partially met)</p>

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Status Update As of 07/03/2021 with TE R comments
<p>Develop Operational Capacity.</p> <p>Develop and implement surveillance plan to control hunting and harvesting wild plants and animals, land clearing, and tilling on slopes >15%, and land development.</p>	<p>Increased financing in place to address the sustainability of the NP as measured by the UNDP Financial Scorecard.</p> <p>The increased area of MTP NP from 6,342 ha to 8,372 ha including buffer zone (530 ha within and 1500 ha outside).</p> <p>Trained staff managing 8,372 ha of integrated landscape (MTPNP core and buffer zone)</p> <p>Several MTP NP staff with specialized training in surveillance techniques resulting in reduced incidences of fires, hunting, and tilling on slopes >15% in the buffer zone</p>	<p>revised and updated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Core zone legally recognized and protected. A 200 m buffer zone around MTP NP proposed · To be developed during the first year of the project cycle · Park wardens currently perform spot checks, no systematic monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · At least 530 ha added as buffer zone within the existing park · Staff adequately trained by the end of year two · BD threat minimized and illegal actions reduced by 70% by year 4 <p>Surveillance, monitoring, and fire management programme developed and implemented</p> <p>Reduced erosion</p>	<p>The 2030 ha addition was confirmed at the last PSC in March 2020 by the Forestry Division as the amount to be added. The area has been identified through consultation meetings with the departments of Land and Survey, Physical Planning and Forestry, and Wildlife and Parks.</p> <p>Training is complete and has been fully met</p> <p>The staff of the Forestry Division has been trained in surveillance, monitoring, etc. However, the staff capacity of the division affects full implementation to minimize illegal activities.</p> <p>TE comment: The project, under enabling conditions in 2019, did not have time to implement a demonstration of co-management within the buffer.</p>
3. Establish PA coordinating Unit	PA management Unit staffed with trained staff	· PA managed by staff of Forestry that will be	· PA Unit in place with adequate staff and finance	The IP recognizes the need for a PA Unit; however, the Ministry is in the process of restructuring as both the Minister and the PS of the environment were appointed in January 2020. (In progress)

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Status Update As of 07/03/2021 with TE R comments
Strengthen PA policy	PA Management capacity strengthened	upgraded to PA unit	· PA management scorecard rating improved to 85%	The legal consultant has been engaged since September 2020 and was in the process of revising all PA policies and regulations. (In progress)
Develop PA legislation	PA controls established	· PA management scorecard rating at 67%	· PA policies with regulations approved and enforced.	The finance plans for PAs have been developed; however, due to the timeframe of activity completion, there has been little time to implement the recommendations. (Partially met)
Improve financial stability of PA	PA legislation approved and registered	· Draft policies with no regulations	· PA legislation registered and enforced	A PA systems plan has been developed and submitted to the Ministries of Blue and Green Economy, Agriculture, and National Food Security & Ministry of the Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment for review and approval. (Partially met)
Develop a PA system plan	PA management adequately financed	· PA designation legislation in place, but management issues are missing	· Sustainable Finance plan; PA generating 100% of its financial needs	Co-management plans have been developed for PAs and have been designed according to the management structure of Dominica's seven PAs. Due to the limited timeframe since the plans have been proposed, the functionality cannot be measured. However, the plans were developed with community involvement. (Partially met)
Consolidate PA information system	Improved coordination among PA sites	· User fees are in place, but management is very weak	· A coordinated PA system plan with legal and financial considerations	The consultant has developed a plan for a data management system, including system specifications to foster networking with other island-based and regional systems to ensure coordination and information-sharing and incorporate data into the Geonode (Dominode). All information developed through the SSE project will be accessible through this portal. (In progress)
Develop a financial sustainability strategy	A single database and information system for Dominica's PA	· PA units are independently managed with different standards	· A unified information system and database	
Standardized administrative and financial processes in a co-management arrangement	A PA financial plan	· Ministry of Tourism provides site-specific information	· PA financing strategically managed; funds collection and used efficiently	Revenue Generation Feasibility Assessment has been conducted for Dominica's protected areas and recommendations given on strategies that can be employed to improve the finance streams of the existing protected areas. (Partially met)
	Functional Co-management arrangement	· PA sites generate finance but are unsustainable	· A functional co-management arrangement among stakeholders	
		· Community organizations have an umbrella organization but have no connection to existing PA		

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Status Update As of 07/03/2021 with TE R comments	
		management authorities			
Component 2 – Establish Buffer Zone					
<p>Outcome 2 (Activity in Atlas)</p> <p>1. Establish an Inter-sectoral committee for the management of integrated PA landscapes (2,030 ha buffer zone).</p> <p>Identify and define boundaries of a buffer zone</p> <p>Legally establish buffer zone as a managed landscape with restrictions on hunting, charcoal burning, tilling on slopes > 15%, and infrastructure development</p>	<p>A legally constituted inter-sectoral committee with mandate and authority for PA management</p> <p>2,030 ha of buffer zone marked on maps</p> <p>Approved buffer zone legislation supports zero hunting, charcoal burning, and road development</p> <p>Signposts in place around the buffer</p>	<p>· Responsible agencies exist, but no coordination is practiced</p> <p>· Preliminary buffer zone identified in studies but not established or approved</p> <p>· Landscape around buffer-zone managed in an ad hoc way with some charcoal burning, hunting, land tilling on slopes, and building construction</p>	<p>· Committee established and functioning using management plan (Component 1)</p> <p>· 1,500 ha of buffer zones outside the existing PA boundary identified, demarcated, and mapped</p> <p>· Legislation governing buffer drafted and approved. 2,030 ha of buffer zone under active management; greater limits on hunting and development, prohibition of charcoal burning, and tilling on slopes > 15%.</p> <p>· Buffer zone legally</p>	<p>No committee exists with a legal mandate to manage protected areas.</p> <p>The Land and Survey Consultant was engaged in October 2020 and his team approved in February 2021. (In progress)</p> <p>A buffer zone has not been demarcated, and the legal specialist awaits the completion of key activities to inform the work described in the ToR for this consultancy. (In progress)</p>	MU

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Status Update As of 07/03/2021 with TE R comments	
Demarc sites in the buffer zone with a signpost		· Conceptual boundary advanced but not approved or marked	established and demarcated ·		
2. Support CRMP Develop land tenure and compensation review process Expand the scope of the current outreach program for farmers	Environmental and land use standards for development in buffer zones. Land tenure review process in place. Number of farmers helped by the outreach program increased, disaggregated by age and gender	· EIA for select development activities required by Physical Planning Department · Least arrangement exists for use of state lands. · Ministry of Agriculture has an outreach to farmers (extension program)	· Operating standards and guidelines in place for the development of livelihood activities in the buffer zone. · Clear and acceptable review process for land tenure. · 100% of persons farming in and around buffer zone supported by outreach program and adhere to land-use restrictions: no charcoal burning, no tilling on slopes >15 %, no land conversion to road.	A Community Resource Management Plan was developed that recommends activities that can increase livelihood benefits while protecting biodiversity. (Fully met) The Land Tenure consultant was engaged in March 2021. (In progress) The project assisted farmers by providing and installing ten (10) greenhouses; providing funds for infrastructural improvement, tools, and equipment to support farmers in farm restoration after Hurricane Maria. Training also took place with farmers who live near the MTPNP on various topics, including but not limited to alternative agricultural practices. The project team is finalizing the procurement of a cassava grater for one female farming group. (In progress)	MS

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Status Update As of 07/03/2021 with TE R comments	
<p>3. Develop 4 Community resource management plans</p> <p>Engage local residents within buffer zone in livelihood activities</p> <p>Strengthen community organization capacity to effectively manage the buffer zone</p> <p>Community-based education program</p>	<p>Vulnerability Atlases for 4 communities listed</p> <p>Livelihood activities in buffer zone conform to land-use restrictions: no hunting, no tilling on slopes > 15%, no clear cutting, and no charcoal burning policy</p> <p>Number of persons trained in BD-friendly agriculture and land management practices, disaggregated by age and gender</p> <p>Stakeholder awareness of project progress and PA management strategy; Information on management controls: no burning of charcoal, no tilling on slopes >15%, zero land</p>	<p>· Community Vulnerability Atlas for 10 communities exists</p> <p>· Unregulated farming in parts of the buffer zone</p> <p>· Agriculture practice in the proposed buffer zone is unsustainable (including clear-cutting and burning)</p> <p>· ECU has ongoing environmental education in schools and community</p>	<p>· Four community resource management plans developed and 50% implementation</p> <p>· All farmers in buffer zone practice BD friendly agriculture</p> <p>· All stakeholders in buffer zone involved in management (co-management) 100%; buffer zone effectively managed: no charcoal burning, no road construction or tilling on slopes > 15%</p> <p>· 70% of Dominicans supporting PA agenda</p> <p>All Dominicans knowledgeable about and practice controls on charcoal burning, harvesting, and hunting restriction</p>	<p>Four community resource management plans were developed and submitted in October 2020. The timeframe does not allow for implementation; however, the SSE project team has had discussions with the SLM project and GEF-SGP to identify possible synergies and possible areas to upscale the project outcomes of SSE. (partially complete)</p> <p>The SSE project developed several knowledge-based communication outputs material to inform the practices of individuals as it relates to PA protection. Two videos are being developed to showcase project achievements. (In progress)</p>	<p>MS</p>

Outcome	Indicator	Baseline	Targets at end of Project	Status Update As of 07/03/2021 with TE R comments	
	conversion to road disseminated on all media.				

Component 1: Strengthening the core zone management of Protected Areas at the systemic level and scaling up innovative interventions at the core zone of selected PAs to improve sustainability

Output 1.1 Develop and implement resource management strategies for Morne Trois Pitons National Park (MTPNP), including guidelines and restrictions on productive activities within PA boundaries, resource management and business plan, and strategy for reducing threats to BD from within and outside the PA

1.1.1. Biodiversity assessment, monitoring, and conservation

1.1.2 Develop new and/or update draft management plan; approve and initiate implementation of Management Plan for the MTPNP.

Output 1.2 Operational and functional capacity established for the management of Morne Trois Pitons National Park to ensure that National Parks Unit capacity is increased

1.2.1. Provide sufficient resources (equipment and materials) for effective management of MTPNP

1.2.2. Establish operational capacity for MTPNP

1.2.3. Develop and implement a surveillance plan.

Output 1.3 officially establish a Protected Area Coordinating Unit to actively implement a PA system across functional managing agencies for improved management effectiveness

1.3.1. Establish Protected Areas Coordinating Unit (PACU)

1.3.2. Strengthen protected area policies

1.3.3. Develop protected area legislation or update and amend existing protected area legislation

1.3.4. Improve financial stability of Protected Area System

1.3.5. Develop a Protected Area System Plan that includes an overall management strategy for the National PA system

1.3.6. Develop evidence-based management plans.

1.3.7. Consolidate protected areas information system supporting PA management objectives

1.3.8. Standardize administrative and financial processes in co-management agreements.

Findings

The work plan for component one aimed at establishing a Model National Park completed with enabling work: biodiversity survey, financial feasibility, PA institutions and management plan, and demonstration of co-management. The TE learned this work needed precise scheduling to be effective for expected outcome level results. Interviewees explained that the key obstacle system-wide was that they were not all yet legal entities. For instance, there was one cluster of PAs that existed for terrestrial consideration and

another for marine; the issue being that the current system is fragmented with the PA system generally falling under different ministries, departments and management authorities which requires a strong collaborative overarching framework (legally).

Another highlighted issue was that all the PAs were under the purview of Ministers of Agriculture and Environment in recent years, however, this arrangement required inputs from other sectors. The PA management was thus fragmented and inefficient, including all these elements—biodiversity surveys, a national financial feasibility plan, and institutional development was therefore a challenge. The financial feasibility specialist was forced to consider all these different aspects while carrying out her duties. However, the activities of the specialist were carried out prior to the administering of PA knowledge surveys, and separate from that of the PA systems management specialist, who ~~would~~ was responsible for examining gaps in laws and capacities with stakeholders ~~at gaps~~. The National Parks and Protected Areas Act (1975), had been for nature protection and conservation. The management of Cabrits was most interesting as, while it is legally established, it needs management-level support for the terrestrial area.

The Management arrangement of existing TPAs and MPAs requires an overarching legal framework which links back to the financial management arrangements. The marine component is larger than the terrestrial, and both the terrestrial and marine areas are in one park. The fisheries need guidance for their legal status in that area and the limits of acceptable change i.e., carrying capacities. Also, for the institutional plan, the concept was a management authority. This was relevant for financing as currently; the user fees go into a central fund at MOF. The idea for the change was that the collected fees could be used for maintenance of the systems and to improve the facilities. These collected fees need to be accounted for and accessible. Also concerning these efforts, transformative work is required on education as Dominica would like to be a nature island (based on the Prime Minister's recent statements mentioned during consultations), but there is little indication yet of the value (and respect) for biodiversity resources as a whole.

The financial consultant's key task was to help and encourage Dominica to prepare a road map for a trust fund. The Caribbean biodiversity fund has eight member countries. The Commonwealth of Dominica has 75,000 km and one of three UNESCO sites in the Caribbean region. A major result came through the efforts of the financial consultant. Dominica is now an observer and can be actively involved. For finance work, the TE learned there will be a GEF 7, and it will include activities as a means of providing income. In ecotourism, this includes looking to upgrade facilities and develop safety measures.

All the readiness work completed under this component will need to be consolidated and to identify synergies and vetting for international standards i.e., IUCN classification. The legal work, when drafted, needs more inputs and presentation to the public before the cabinet or the minister as it contains aspects of co-management.

Component 2: Establish and manage a buffer zone as a key component of the National Protected Area System and select experiences to be scaled up beyond the buffer zone

Output 2.1 Buffer zone for Morne Trois Pitons National Park legally established and demarcated, with an inter-sectoral committee for the management of integrated PA landscapes (core and buffer zone) established and functioning within a legal framework

- 2.1.1. Establish an inter-sectoral committee for the management of integrated landscapes (core and buffer zone)
- 2.1.2. Identify and define the boundaries of the buffer zone
- 2.1.3. Legally establish the buffer zone as a managed landscape
- 2.1.4. Demarcate the buffer zone with signposts.

Output 2.2 Codification of higher minimum standards in environmental impact assessment (EIA) requirements for new developments in the buffer zone

- 2.2.1. Codify stronger development standards into the EIA process
- 2.2.2. Develop a land tenure and compensation review process
- 2.2.3. Conduct outreach and education programmes in the MTPNP buffer zone.

Output 2.3 Identify physical threats and reduce vulnerabilities in the MTPNP using community-based land management activities to improve livelihood viability and associated socioeconomic conditions

- 2.3.1. Develop four (4) Community Resource Management Plans (CRMP)
- 2.3.2. Engage local residents within the buffer zone in livelihood activities
- 2.3.3. Strengthen community/organization capacities to effectively manage the buffer zone
- 2.3.4. Develop a community-based education programme.

Findings

The second outcome aimed to improve the enabling environment for PAs and the conditions with the legal and operational establishment of a buffer zone and core zone. It was envisioned that the project would review the legal and institutional aspects, establish, and operationalize them. The expectation was for a functioning buffer and core system by project end. This aspirational outcome also recognized the need for a single well-planned national PA Unit; specific issues are discussed throughout this report. The TE learned the Ministry is in the process of restructuring (both the Minister and the PS of the environment were appointed in January 2020). The legal consultant has been engaged since September 2020 and is revising all PA policies and regulations but as mentioned above, this legal work will need some technical vetting by the two international consultants to vet the final products before these are results.

While the finance plans for PAs have been developed (discussed above), due to the timeframe of activity completion, there was no time to implement or *to test the recommendations*. The TE learned the PA institutions and systems plan has been developed and submitted to the Ministries of Blue and Green Economy, Agriculture, and National Food Security & Ministry of the Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment for review and approval. However, as mentioned, stakeholders suggested that this needs also to be further consolidated with the legal work and tested or operationalized in communities.

The co-management plans have been developed for PAs and have been designed according to the management structure of Dominica's seven PAs, but due to the limited time frame since the plans were proposed, the functionality cannot be measured. These plans were developed with community consultation. TE interviewed the NGOs involved in managing independently managed MPA estates and learned that there is an expressed value in having a systematic approach with a government-supported management authority because it will support them with accreditation, and this will support financial and resource mobilization. The biggest issue TE learned about was the hard-financial aspects for managing these PAs.

4.2. Relevance (HS)

This project was found to be highly relevant to the current context and at the top of Dominica's political agenda to be a sustainable, resilient, "nature island" and is highly relevant to UNDP and GEF global priorities. Additionally, the project fits GEF Biodiversity Strategic Objective 1. Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems, specifically the BD1 Focal area Outcome 1.1, "Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas" and Strategic Objective 2, Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes, and Sectors, specifically the BD 2 Focal area Outcome 2.1 "Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation."

The UNDAF Outcome(s) is also linked: Improved governance and regulation of environmental and energy issues for more resilient economies by 2016. It was designed in the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014–2017 against

the Primary Outcome: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded; and Output(s): 1.3. Solutions developed at the national and subnational level for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals, and waste. It linked to the **UNDP Strategic Plan Secondary Outcome:** (UNDP’s Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Framework 2012–2020) Signature Programme #2: Unlocking the potential of protected areas (PAs), including indigenous and community conserved areas, to conserve biodiversity while contributing to sustainable development.

- **Expected SPD Outcome(s):** Enhanced capacity of national, Subregional, and regional institutions and stakeholders to effectively manage natural resources, resilience built against the adverse impacts of climate change and natural and anthropogenic hazards; improved energy efficiency and use of renewable energy; improved policy, legal, regulatory, and institutional frameworks for environmental and energy governance.
- **Expected M-CPAP Output(s):** Output 1.4: Knowledge and good practices disseminated and capacity development in the areas of natural resource management, disaster risk reduction, climate change, renewable energy, energy efficiency, low-carbon emissions, biosafety, and adherence to international standards and norms.

Nationally, according to the Project document (confirmed), the Commonwealth of Dominica has been pursuing a “green” development path in keeping with the government’s pronouncement declaring Dominica the “Nature Isle.” Consequent to this aspiration, Dominica is committed to aligning its development agenda and biodiversity conservation strategy with the global biodiversity objectives. All the goals and targets of the 2011–2020 Strategic Plan are therefore considered relevant. However, the country has selected five targets as national priorities. It was hoped that these priorities, articulated in the NBSAP, would be realized by 2020. Among the original five targets selected were these:

- By 2020, at least 15% of terrestrial and inland water and 15% of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem service, are conserved through comprehensive ecologically representative and well-connected systems of effectively managed PAs and other means which are integrated into the wider land and seascape;
- By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stock have been enhanced through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15% of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and combating desertification.

Dominica’s revised NBSAP has listed this project, “Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening the Effectiveness of Protected Areas System,” as a first step to achieving these targets given its emphasis on the development of a PA system management plan that strengthens national institutional and systemic structures, promoting PA coordination and improved civil society participation in biodiversity management is key. Also, Dominica signed on to the UNEP-led Caribbean Challenge Initiative (CCI) that calls for the protection of 20% of terrestrial and near-shore marine and coastal resources by 2020. This is another national effort to be supported by this project. Further, this project will assist Dominica in achieving the following goals of the CBD PoWPA: 1.2: to integrate protected areas into broader land- and seascapes and sectors to maintain ecological structure and function; 1.5: to prevent and mitigate the negative impacts of key threats to protected areas; 2.2: to enhance and secure involvement of indigenous and local communities and relevant stakeholders; 3.1: to provide an enabling policy, institutional, and socioeconomic environment for protected areas; 3.2: to build capacity for the planning, establishment, and management of protected areas.

4.3. Effectiveness (MU)

The extent to which the project’s objectives were achieved is provided by the evaluation in the full assessment of the project results and indicator framework (See page 61 status of indicators- assessment

table). It is comprehensive includes whether the project met or partially met or not met its stated success indicators. In general, the project has experienced two distinct operating contexts / phases with three coordinators, three RTAs, and two counterparts. The project did not hold a Mid Term Evaluation MTE. The operating context was irregular at the start and under a changed IP the original plan was adapted to take into consideration the new context and the low delivery (2018). The TE *consultant has therefore used the indicator plan to measure this project's results but also took into account the changed operating context and the bottlenecks experienced with these elements*. In terms of the adaptation plan, the project team had adapted the plan and refocused to work upstream but it was nearing the project closure date (March 2021). The time to catch up and implement these activities in an integrated synergetic way was not there. By the end, *the project has created some readiness to move toward the relevant objectives*.

As highlighted by the analysis of expected outcomes above the project did not fulfil its first outcome result which as to showcase a national model park with a demonstration of co management in the buffer. Despite all the obstacles experienced, the final result includes useful stakeholder engagement, financial management, institutional PA systems policy review and PA system draft law review exercises that have setting the stage for continued work.

Major achievements include the following:

- Although the full adapted plan was incomplete by TE, the PC and UNDP teams had accomplished most of the accelerated plans work since 2019 when the last PC was on boarded. The scope of work to accomplish during that remaining period was reported as vast;
- The project had engaged stakeholders around key upstream outputs (financial plans for four pas and for the national park) and provided assessment of the institutional arrangement to guide the government officials in terms of the holistic PA management system.
- The final financial planning and financial streams, as well as gaps in the related institutional arrangement, were provided ;
- The development of four Co-management plans have begun a process of awareness with the community, private sector and government.
- Some tangible community benefits have been provided to farmers including small weeding/sowing tools and training. The hurricane affected the project in a major way as did COVID;
- Important baseline data for policy level decision-making was collected;
- The training complement helped changing of practices and learning around conservation. This was provided to farmers and technical staff.
- Brokering work with the small grants to continue training SGP was an achievement;
- Education work was provided to primary schools close to the buffer zone;
- Training with wardens on biodiversity assessment and conservation was completed;
- An awareness consultant did project training in March 2021;
- Capacity for monitoring was built with forestry for monitoring including providing drones;
- Communication, including an end-of-project video, was good;
- An adventure club and biodiversity clubs of the Dominica State College were engaged.

Efficiency (MU)

When considering efficiency, the TE looked at the structural change expected. The ProDoc states, under the “business as usual” scenario, that Dominica faces the possibility of little advancement in the realization of an effectively managed and financially sustainable PA estate. If not addressed in a significant way, gaps in PA financing and management will continue to threaten the integrity of the PAs, limiting the operational effectiveness (i.e., its ability to provide for biodiversity conservation, ecosystem support, and its ability to support national development goals). The project had expected to establish an enabling environment

through legal, institutional, and operational reforms supporting PA management effectiveness and financial sustainability. The project was expected to work with proposed and ongoing conservation initiatives. The project was designed to achieve the proposed outcomes **while incurring only essential incremental expenses**. To accomplish this, it was thus expended to build upon the existing baseline activities and national and local capacities as well as available infrastructure and will target increased co-financing commitments during project design and implementation.

Such ambition was not possible given the operating and contextual issues impacting on the implementation (see adaptive management, implementation context, and execution issues). Additionally, inclusive work planning and strategic scheduling of human and resource inputs was needed. The inception period is central to the design of the implementation plan including the multiyear work planning. Having GEF guidance and support inputs was missing but very important that stage. While the UNDP CO was involved, the inception period and meeting was not substantively guided by RTA.

The project did not meet its envisioned structural “reform” changes expected including new policy and legal framework by end. It did however make a limited contribution to the enabling work with good technical support of the financial analysis, the institutional technical design work and stakeholder engagement needed in these processes.

The institutional capacity and support to implement this project were not strong throughout its implementation. The government and UNDP monitoring of the early red flags was weak, and this was a lesson learned the hard way.

Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	HS
Effectiveness	MU
Efficiency	MU
Overall Project Outcome Rating	MU

4.4. Impact (MU)

In considering impact level results (systems, institutional, and legal arrangements, resilience, expansion of PA cover), the assumptions in the design were that the project technical specialists would work with the government officials, the private sector, the communities, and local organizations to ensure gender equity and participation of women and youth and all Dominica’s peoples in project activities. This was necessary to help ensure sustainable development and highlight the socioeconomic benefits to woman, youth, and all beneficiaries living and working within and on the boundaries of the PA and in the country(improved finances and protected national treasures). In this sense, impact-level collaboration would take place by increasing the value of biodiversity for all and learning by engaging with key sectors, the private sector, the public, and affected community members.

At the level of change in the communities and destructive productive practices, the project would be rolled out with all partners and those at the local level such as the Dominica Organic Agriculture Movement, the National Association of Youth in Agriculture (NAYA), and Community Councils and Community Improvement Councils. The activities would include (a) developing and disseminating a manual of biodiversity-friendly agricultural and land management practices; (b) providing technical support for local inhabitants to undertake activities such as planting trees and reforestation with native species to aid with erosion control that will provide socioeconomic benefit, improve land degradation, and reduce pressures on the protected area; (c) supporting collection and analysis of data on fast-growing species that can be encouraged in the buffer zone to support livelihood activities without impacting the PA forest (i.e., castor

seeds, cinnamon trees) while ensuring that plant pathogens such as Red Palm Mite (*Ariella indicia*) and Black Sigatoka Disease, likely to attack agricultural and important forest species, are addressed along with species that are already stressed by the effects of climate change and hurricanes; (d) encouraging and supporting the production and expansion of organic agricultural practices supporting the umbrella organization Dominica Organic Agriculture Movement and Dominica National Council of Woman.

These activities included (i) production and use of organic fertilizers (“Liquid Tea”), supporting existing and new producers; (ii) specific organic agricultural livelihood initiatives, such as the Giraudel Flower Growers (Giraudel Women’s Group), Bellevue Chopin Organic Farmers (BCOF), and Eco-balance, a Biodiversity Center for Learning and Training, organic staple flower production (Ormond’s Organics), etc., (iii) production of castor seeds and cinnamon trees; (iv) review of the viability of establishing organic standards and a certification process supporting a National Farm Certification Scheme and a GAP Standard in collaboration with BAM and Bureau of Standards. Additional agricultural and livelihood initiatives would be identified through consultations during the first 6 months of project implementation. Agricultural practices, techniques, and examples from project activities would all be incorporated into a manual of biodiversity-friendly agriculture that would be distributed island-wide.

As such, all these changes and expected good practices were central to the project impact level “transformation ‘mindset’ of biodiversity value level” results. As the project has created a level of awareness, the education complement can be a central focus of operationalizing the enabling work started under this project. The project has at its core the intent to build awareness of biodiversity assets and to gain stewardship to protect them. Soft governance, including biodiversity education work, is yet to start in the way that was envisioned.

4.5. Sustainability Overall Rating (ML)

The lack of the institutional framework to support the coordination capacity showcased by this project is a major finding during and is highlighted as a key lesson learned. The kind of resources needed to build sustained human capacity for coordination and to support the government vision for protected areas systems, nature-based solutions and resilience and will require more resources.

- **Financial resources (MU)**

The UNDP Financial Sustainability Scorecard indicates that the combined PA estate operates below critical levels (i.e., finances currently injected in the system are inadequate to completely support the basic required structures for effective PA management). These levels did not improve a lot through this project. The current economic positioning of the GoCD does not allow for immediate increases in government funding to the system. This is disturbing news for a system whose guiding policy identifies the key role of government as providing core funding to facilitate best practice management.

- **Socioeconomic (ML)**

The potential for sociopolitical sustainability is linked to enabling work for a system approach and agreements on co-management including those legally established. The projects unrealized potential was to effect a systematized and decentralized approach to management and ownership including the community stewardships. While the project failed to demonstrate the value of the co-management approach, there was stakeholder engagement. The baseline work was never conducted to be able to envision or monitor these results.

Based on the original plan, a carrying capacity assessment would be done for each site during year one of the project. Stakeholders involved in livelihood operations around the PAs (vendors, tour operators, tour guides, park personnel, taxi drivers, fishermen, and farmers) and the various public sector agencies involved in systemic planning and management would participate in the development of zoning plans that would include appropriate activities permitted at each site; however, this was not conducted. The

participatory approach, if conducted properly, would have allowed for the inclusion of differentially challenged persons, vulnerable groups, or minorities like the Kalinago people and the promotion of gender equity. This collective engagement of Dominica’s population was expected to deepen ownership of the project and ensure social sustainability. Dominica National Council of Women (DNCW) in partnership with the government’s Department of Gender was to work with Dominica Organic Agriculture Movement (DOAM) to ensure gender equity during project implementation (recruitment of staff and consultants) as well as monitor woman’s participation in training, community consultation, and other capacity-building initiatives. Giraudel Flower growers would also receive technical support under this project. These were missed opportunities.

○ **Institutional framework and governance (ML)**

For a capacity building project looking critically at the financial aspects of a PA system, generally, there is “enabling capacity” to build such project work upon. The abrupt changes in the operating context (Environmental Coordination Unit CU disbanded in 2018), Hurricane Maria (2017) and COVID 19 and with staff transitions affects institutional sustainability.

At government level, the PCs engaged to support the project and the national coordination staff were often doing tasks related to urgent government work, due to lack of institutional capacity. The project coordinator being pulled into other work remains a constant issue and not a sustainable model for implementing GEF projects. In this context, sustained HR for coordination of donor projects in the ministry is a considerable problem. If the government wants the most climate-resilient country, it needs a strong plan to build sustained national human resources and institutions.

The GEF project funding is not sufficient to deal with the level of resource needed for systemic government recruitments. Partners might be coordinated and mobilized for this; however, not for the “stand-alone” building of institutional capacity. A capacity assessment is needed to consider the human capacity challenge for resilience. Such an institutional setup for this vision will need a plan and resources outside of the GEF funding. Ultimately the government must take ownership that even after multiple donor-funded projects, institutional capacity for resilience and conservation as a part is still a bottleneck for climate and environment action. This is an opportunity for UNDP, positioned for institutional development work and for coordination of donors to get a massive influx of capacity rather than small GEF projects. UNDP could support the government with a donor’s scanning to come up with a good plan for building institutional capacity for resilience and protected areas and climate change.

○ **Environmental (L)**

This project goals support the implementation of national environmental sustainability priorities identified in the UNDAF, the Multi-Country Program Action Plan, and the country’s obligations to the Rio conventions’ Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). The project was designed to take cognizance of the country’s NBSAP and specifically supports the Aichi Targets set by Dominica. The project’s title and objective speak to strengthening environmental sustainability and improving management effectiveness at the institutional and systemic levels. The idea has been to apply precautionary approaches to natural resource conservation involving the stakeholders as both beneficiaries and custodians of the resource. In this way, the project forges linkages between environmental dimensions, disaster prevention, and improving risk resilience.

4.6. Country Ownership

In general, this section is a repeat of relevance above,^{iv} but the TE interviewed high-level government stakeholders and learned that this project is valued highly and in line with government priorities. The protracted emergency crisis and the need for economic growth have served to grow this agenda. The system and topic are directly linked to the Prime Minister’s current agenda to have a resilient flourishing nature island. Also, if the government ownership of this work was clear, it would have focused on streaming

processes like procurement and technical oversight. This was not so apparent based on the TE during the first part of the implementation before the IP was changed. The links to climate change adaptation and an ecosystem-based approach have been inherent in this project's design and intention. It should be continued and the enabling work implemented as a demonstration of these linkages. This is key for public and stakeholder enablement and continued transformation to a low-carbon nature island.

This project coordination function adds value to the Prime Minister's current agenda to have a resilient nature island. The links to climate change adaptation and an ecosystem-based approach are also inherent in this project's design and intention. It should be continued. The work to demonstrate and implement the enabling work as a demonstration of these linkages is key for public and stakeholder enablement and continued transformation to a low-carbon nature island.

4.7. Gender and Women Empowerment

The design provided a clear stakeholder engagement plan about gender and women's engagement work. The strategy for results was to be implemented through focused work with women and youth, based on issues of women and youth and their strategic engagement, and this was highlighted in ProDoc as participation in the consultative and decision-making aspects, especially where vulnerability is very high, e.g., poor, female-headed households. The Department of Women's Affairs in Dominica was expected to be involved in all the outreach activities and the training of women's groups in livelihood activities. Special attention was to be given to the community groups in the buffer zone around Morne Trois Pitons that are predominantly women's groups involved in agriculture, flower production, vending of local crafts, and hospitality. Efforts were to be made to achieve gender parity in the representation on the Steering Committee and procurement of consultants.

Women and youth were particularly targeted as fundamental stakeholders through their involvement in the design and implementation of capacity building and awareness programmes to ensure their equitability and sustainability. The assumption had been that special attention was to be paid to gender issues in developing socioeconomic indicators, and Dominica's National Council of Women would be engaged to help ensure that women are targeted and supported through the project's agricultural and other livelihood initiatives. The *project did not develop a pilot strategy* focused on women and youth nor did it refine the key performance KPI indicators as anticipated. Socioeconomic-related activities will seek to build on existing information on the actual benefits women and disadvantaged communities can draw from ecosystems with education and outreach targeting the opportunities and socioeconomic benefits to the buffer zone communities in maintaining ecosystem health and the benefits provided by the ecosystem services generated from the MTPNP. TE found that the project did not set up a "pilot project" with full operational engagement for these groups as envisioned. However, stakeholders involved in management say women were consulted during the implementation of all the enabling work carried out since 2019: financial planning at the site level (site in annex 14), PA system planning, the biodiversity baseline survey, and the development of the four CRMPs.

4.8. Cross-Cutting Issues

There was no payment for ecosystem services work done on the National Park buffer as a demonstration with communities. The financial consultant hired did, however, consult with the communities. The project has many chances for linking to the recovery work from cross-cutting issue benefits. Based on the implementation, the "readiness" upstream work had yet to have any significant effect on the local populations (e.g., income generation/job creation, improved natural resource management arrangements with local groups, improvement in policy frameworks for resource allocation and distribution, regeneration of natural resources for long term sustainability); however, if the readying work intergrated properly and the legal recommendations are put through a consultaive and techncial vetting process and then taken forward by the cabinet, this can change. The project was highly relevant and in line with project objectives to conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) and other country programme documents.

The project outcomes had the potential to contribute to better preparations to cope with disasters or mitigate risk and/or address climate change mitigation and adaptation as relevant, but these links were not communicated as they could have been, given the situation. The project was also designed to support the poor, the indigenous, persons with disabilities, women, and other disadvantaged or marginalized groups who benefited from it, but as we learned the context was not ‘ready’ for this level of demonstration. The enabling work completed now needs to be technically vetted from this perspective. The project design was also in line with the poverty-environment nexus: how the environmental conservation activities of the project contributed to poverty reduction and sustaining livelihoods, but this aspect was not taken forward as planned.

The project was designed to contribute to a human rights-based approach, however, this link was not able to be assessed concerning the technical documents produced. These aspects, however, will be featured in the legal and institutional results, and if and when the PA institutional arrangements become law, they will affect the links. Work is needed to technically vet the products by both the UNDP and the Government for these linkages. The TE has suggested that there be a process of technical review put in place before the final products are delivered to the government, especially before the cabinet, to ensure all these links are featured properly in the legal work.

4.10. GEF additionality^v

GEF project incremental reasoning was thus: “A system of protected areas with an integrated framework of PA policy, legislation, and management, and strengthened institutional capacity will further protect the forests of the MTPNP and ultimately the socioeconomic benefits derived from the protection of natural resources island-wide. A buffer zone around the MTPNP will have a regulatory framework and implement inter-institutional and stakeholder collaborative management that will also support future buffer zone designation and further strengthen sustainable land uses in buffer zones elsewhere on the island. Strengthened PA legislation will also increase terrestrial habitat and biodiversity protection and reduce pressures on intact forests both within and bordering the NP.

By supporting alternative livelihoods in the buffer zones and beyond, local inhabitants will be able to sustainably harvest forest products, but more importantly, diversified opportunities for agricultural production will be provided in the wake of the declining banana industry and the loss of agricultural production from the effects of recent hurricanes and natural disasters. Also, alternative livelihoods associated with strengthening the ecotourism industry targeting Dominica’s forests will provide increased direct income generation for local communities through ecotourism employment at nature sites within the park as well as opportunities in forests bordering the park. Participatory PA management activities will include maintenance, monitoring, and research, and the sale of souvenirs, food, and craft products that will, along with agriculture, be supported through community-based training.

By increasing the participation of local community members in PA management-related activities and by demonstrating the link between forest conservation and increased livelihood/income generation, PA support will benefit island-wide. Generation of these socioeconomic benefits for residents in areas adjacent to MTPNP and/or persons who rely directly on PA resources and/or improved income from visitation will increase local support for PA conservation.” The central issue exposed was the context for the PA systems’ readiness and the constant lack of sustainable capacity to build capacity (see above in design and adaptive management section for this key work) when answering the question of whether the outcomes can be attributed to the GEF contribution as originally anticipated and whether these are sustainable.

There is some evidence that the final project contributes to expected outcomes, both environmental and otherwise, that are attributed to the UNDP/GEF work, namely the increased stakeholder engagement and enabling context readiness work during a rocky and challenging context, the likelihood of sustainability.

Whether these results are going to be sustained and supported beyond the project end is up to the government (refer to the Sustainability section for suggestions). The central issue while implementing was that of the operational and disaster-prone context and the lack of sustained capacity to build capacity (see a full description of issues above in the design and adaptive management section). The key benefit of adapting and staying with this project's work during contribution has been recognized as an important bridge to not losing momentum on all the past work. During much government and UNDP MCO transition, the PA systems stakeholder engagement and increased readiness were built by staying with the risk management adapted plan during late implementation. There is evidence that there is a broadening of stakeholder interest to focus on the root causes (continuous lack of institutional capacity for coordination and related work within the Ministry) that need addressing to move this work higher up to match the highest political agenda (linked to resilience, ecosystem-based adaptation, and sustainable development) and recent actions of the Prime Minister. The TE discussion with the Minister and PS provided testimony to support this.

4.11. Replication and Scale-up

In terms of the extent to which the project has demonstrated a) scaling up, b) replication, c) demonstration, and/or d) production of the public good, the project was about showcasing and improving the enabling and legal environment for results and impacts. It was built on another ideal of a replication plan to scale good practices during implementation and to present an improved model of PA management that can continue to be scaled. The project was expected to support the integration of existing units and agencies into a management system that will support financial, environmental, and social sustainability and replicability. The goal of the project was to model enhancements at the national park and to work diligently in a cross-sectoral fashion on the enabling aspects including financial and legalization and strengthening the institutional arrangements for PA management. The project would also increase by 20% the effective protection of Dominica's terrestrial resources, which are currently under pressure caused by encroachment, agricultural expansion, infrastructure development, deforestation, and fires. By replication, the skills and competencies developed at MTPNP and the lessons learned will be used at other PAs, including MPAs areas that are facing threats from invasive species, overfishing, and land-based marine pollution. To date, the project team has been engaged by the Forestry Departments through a consultative process in their development of a project to establish the boundaries and management structure of the Morne Diablotin National Park.

5. MAIN FINDINGS/CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND LESSON LEARNED

5.1. Main Findings and Conclusions

Design

The project had been designed in a unique operational context and was aspirational. Many assumptions were made in the design about institutional readiness for coordination. The lag between design and implementation required early UNDP oversight and intervention to ensure the project was implemented with adequate checks and balances on the IP. The oversight role was not well understood and reported as being confused with the programme support role of UNDP Barbados. The RTA became actively involved late in the implementation and by then the UNDP had commissioned a spot check and changed the IP.

Also, the UNDP GEF Regional technical advisor was absent from the inception period, and this was likely a cause of the early design interpretation problems i.e., PSC used for work planning not oversight per se.

Implementation and Adaptive Management

The most prominent issue that emerged during TE was the continuous lack of institutional and human capacity to implement the project and sustain the results. For instance, an assumption was that existing staff would be learning from the project implementation by the ECU at the start of the project, and then post-disaster, post-spot check (dissolution of the ECU), and the project risk management phase with the new IP at MOHER 2019–2021.

This project thus began with a very poor inception and work planning process including the important sequencing of activities. One of the first matters discussed relative to inception was to use the stepwise approach, in the first year. There was nothing on the biodiversity or the biodiversity value.

The piecemeal, haphazard approach did not take into consideration a need for sequencing i.e. establishing baselines then planning actions.

The project had been adapted with the change of IP to an enabling and post-disaster context, engaging new coordination. The last coordinator brought on in March 2020 tried to catch up and sequence, but it was a difficult job to push the roadmap through at the end of the project, and then the COVID pandemic occurred.

The project was delayed and, while it did not reach all its expected results, it managed to have some key results in terms of readiness and basic information to start the much larger effort needed to build a systems approach to biodiversity and protected areas.

UNDP's comparative advantage can be tapped to support an operationalization phase two with donor coordination and scanning for a much greater resource—building the human capacity of the project to operationalize the readiness work. The work has been a stepping-stone for the project to be where it wanted to be close to the start.

In terms of the operational point of view, the government had a significant challenge with procurement when implementing this project. There was a tremendous gap in what the government needs to bring to the country (and whether that is a gap) and its capacity to bring goods and services, which required a streamlined process. Even with the long process of cabinet approval and transparency, the government needs to be informed of the progress with each contract. However, from a donor perspective, UNDP might be asked to support this process and ensure the agreement has the requirements included within the plan to overcome the hurdles and other issues which may slow the delivery.

Vehicle procurement is a case in point as the ECU was reportedly involved with UNDP on the challenges determining the correct use of resources from the start. If this procurement plan were clear from the beginning, many of the needless delays would have been avoided.

The continuous lack of the human capacity to build capacity was a major finding, highlighted as a key lesson learned, a long-term constraint, and an opportunity for strategic UNDP support for a follow-up phase. The kind of resources needed to build sustained human capacity for coordination, support of the government vision for a protected areas systems nature-based solution, and resilience will require much greater resources than a GEF project can provide.

There is a need for a phase two to operationalize the plans and process of engagement developed by this project. Phase two should, however, focus on the root issues and the needs for institutional capacity building and financial proof of concept: HR in the short-, medium-, and long-term plan for training and human capital, sustainability for that.

5.2. Lessons Learned

Design and Implementation

- The GEF project had no proper cost recovery estimates for UNDP. Careful decisions on cost-effectiveness need to be made upfront, i.e., regarding what is the added value UNDP brings to the table. The GEF UNDP has been supporting and operating at a loss on filling capacity to implement gaps.
- For work planning and logical progression, the activities must be laid out in the inception period with clear strategies. The majority of the work planning and strategic planning against the theory of change needs to be established in the inception period. For instance, the biodiversity inventory and recruitment were priorities, not negotiable work. There was need for defining how the sectoral inputs linked together for results. A better way would be to lay out the priorities upfront.
- For a complex technical project like this, the Government required a robust Monitoring and Evaluation plan while the UNDP should ensure MTRs are executed when possible. While projects under 3 million dollars can avoid an MTR, this is not the recommended standard. An MTR is a good mechanism in the project that can help implement a course correction and identify red flags. Reports were being prepared by consultants for the Government and UNDP would receive documents that first needed to be vetted by government experts locally. In the case that UNDP provided this support, the M&E should be costed and submitted with robust planning made during the project design and followed through during implementation. The KPIs and milestones needed to be smart and refined to context. The lesson learned is to develop protocols (possibly SOPs) for the various stages and possibilities for monitoring, procurement, and evaluation or adaptive management.
- A more holistic approach is needed for procuring goods and services and to ensure technical quality assurance which was a problem for the Government. If the Government is implementing these GEF projects, clarity is imperative in the design stage to recognize those gaps in procurement to avoid hindering delivery. Checks and balances must be placed in the project design. In the vision to build capacity for a resilient nature-protected island, the minister will be constrained due to issues caused by policies related to procurement and weak environmental coordination of human resources.

Results

- Capacity building is difficult and when there is no local capacity to hang on, and when PCs get pulled into other work, it becomes near impossible. At the start, the assumption is that there would be synergies with an ongoing World Bank project to build institutional capacity for risk reduction with existing ECU staff. The staff for this project were often called on to do priority work due to a general lack of capacity... That is not a sustainable model for implementing projects. In this context, HR is problematic, and if the Government wants to be the most climate-resilient country (as mentioned by key government staff during consultations), it needs a plan for human resources and a commitment to doing it. UNDP is uniquely positioned for donor coordination and support to the Government on institutional development work. It is time to seek a massive influx of capital for such work, not small GEF projects. The need is to support the Government with donor coordination and build a good plan for building institutional capacity for resilience, protected areas, and climate change.

This project is at its essence about behavior and building mindset and systems that consider biodiversity value resource sufficient. Education and awareness strategies for monitoring was needed from the start so the public and the people go through as stakeholders. Communications need to be about raising awareness of where there are issues and how to help address them.

5.3. Recommendations

- UNDP can support the final project board meeting by presenting and making available the knowledge products delivered during the project, including web page and communications, and all the consultancy work completed.
 - A key follow-up recommendation is to guarantee a process whereby there are synergies and joint review of the knowledge products (PA management plan and Financial Feasibility Plan for Protected Areas) and to distill a set of reliable policy recommendations for carrying forward the products including the legal review of the draft PA act and move towards future operationalization
 - There is a GEF 7 project under design currently in Dominica, by the World Bank. UNDP might identify proper entry points of this project's contributions with the new project. UNDP might also facilitate documentation and knowledge products handover to the World Bank, if the Government allows and requests this. It is up to the Government to ensure a smooth transition and no duplication of initiatives, for instance, if they fall under the same sector or site.
 - A follow up initiative might focus on operationalizing the financial systems management including utilizing National Conservation Trust (NTF) and considering payments and the collection system. It can also demonstrate the buffer zone co-management. The support for a national PA management system should highlight the benefits of biodiversity conservation for all. For instance, the private sector and the community play a big role. The project might focus on showcasing the opportunities created for the investment and the private sector and the community.

ANNEXES

1. ToR

**Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference (ToR) Template
for UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects****1. INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full- and medium-sized UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects are required to undergo a Terminal Evaluation (TE) at the end of the project. This Terms of Reference (ToR) sets out the expectations for the TE of the medium-sized project titled Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening the Effectiveness of Dominica's Protected Areas (*PIMS # 5089*) implemented through the *Executing Agency, (United Nations Development Programme) with Implementing Partner, the Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica*. The project started on the 14th April 2016 and is in its *fourth* year of implementation. The TE process must follow the guidance outlined in the document 'Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects' (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The Commonwealth of Dominica has a national Protected Area (PA) consisting of six (6) terrestrial and one marine park, however, the reality is that only three (3) of the PA are legally constituted, while two of the noted sites have been partially developed commercially and are no longer considered suitable as national parks while the other site is a potential marine protected area that has yet to be designated. This PA estate is supported by The National Parks and Protected Areas Act No. 16 of 1975, amended by Acts 54 of 1986, Act 12 of 1990, and Act 8 of 2001 is the principal piece of legislation relating to the management of national parks in Dominica. The Act provides for the declaration of both national parks and protected areas, leasing of land for protected areas, the establishment of a system of National Parks and Protected Areas. The Act also makes provisions for the creation of a National Parks service to manage a system of National Parks and Protected Areas. Despite the Act, there is no PA Management system, the designated World Heritage Site has no buffer zone, hence the core zone is threatened as is the case for all PAs Systems. Also, the site management of the PAs is poor, and the revenue generation potential is not maximized hence PAs is undercapitalized and local and global benefits are at risk.

The Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening the Effectiveness of Dominica's Protected Areas Project (SSE), will use GEF incremental support to build Dominica's national capacity to manage its PA systems, with emphasis on the Morne Trois Pitons National Park (MTPNP) and its buffer zone. The Project aims to; improve management effectiveness, create sustainable livelihood activities, and improve biodiversity conservation. Project implementation will ensure replication dissemination of lessons learnt at the other sites (Parks, trails and nature sites), and other GEF funded activities locally and regionally. This project will develop a protected areas management system in keeping with recommendations from previous initiatives like the OECS Protected Areas and Associated Livelihoods (OPAAL) project and the National Parks Consortium Studies. Using the GEF funding, this project will strengthen the sustainability of

Dominica's PA systems by legal establishment of a buffer zone for MTPNP, create community atlases for local communities in and around the buffer zone thus establishing living landscapes. GEF funding will also be used to build capacity at the systematic and community level to effectively manage PAs and their buffer zones.

The Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica obtained grant funding of approximately US 1.7 million dollars under the Global Environment Facility Fifth Replenishment (GEF-5) to implement the aforementioned project with implementation starting in April 2016 and is scheduled to end in April 2021, owing to a one-year extension. Hence, as a project using a nationally implemented modality (NIM), the main responsibility for this project rests with the Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica. Under this arrangement, the Implementing Partner (IP) assumes full responsibility for the effective use of project resources and the delivery of outputs.

3. TE PURPOSE

The TE report will assess the achievement of project results against what was expected to be achieved and draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The TE report promotes accountability and transparency and assesses the extent of project accomplishments.

The TE will serve to analyze project results against the indicators that have been outlined in the project document to ensure that project intention has been achieved. This will encompass the impact and the sustainability namely: (financial, environmental and social) of the results and achievement in terms of capacity building and global environmental benefits as defined by GEF. In addition, the effectiveness of the Project's interventions in meeting the Project objectives will be assessed and key findings highlighted.

The findings of the TE will serve as an evaluation of UNDP's accountability as to how resources are used, the results achieved and social impact. In addition, UNDP, GEF, the Government of Dominica (IP), stakeholders and the public stand to benefit and act accordingly from the results emanating from the TE as per the evaluation criteria as defined by UNDP which serves to:

- *Design or validate a development strategy*
- *Determine improvement in project design and implementation*
- *Increase knowledge and understanding of project's as it relates to human development*
- *Determine funding decisions by GEF and duplication of projects*
- *Determine development partners*
- *Improve project design and implementation*

The TE results will therefore be used by the Commissioning Unit, Donor, implementing partner and stakeholders to strengthen funding decisions, improve design and implementation practices and maximize positive social impact. TE results will be used to increase knowledge and understanding of the benefits and challenges of development programmes and projects intended for the enhancement of human development as per the UNDP evaluation criteria and thus fitting in with the Commissioning Unit's Evaluation plan.

4. TE APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The TE report must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful.

The TE team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure/SESP) the Project Document, project reports including annual PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based evaluation. The TE team will review the baseline and midterm GEF focal area Core Indicators/Tracking Tools submitted to the GEF at the CEO endorsement and midterm stages and the terminal Core Indicators/Tracking Tools that must be completed before the TE field mission begins.

The TE team is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), Implementing Partners, the UNDP Country Office(s), the Regional Technical Advisor, direct beneficiaries and other stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful TE. The following is an indicative list of the individuals/institutions whose views should be fully reflected in the final report.

Name	Agency/Department	Contact Information
Mr. Mohammad Nadgee	Programme Manager, Sustainable Solutions and Energy	mohammad.nadgee@undp.org
Ms. Nickez McPherson	Interim Project Coordinator (SSE)	Nickez.mcpherson@undp.org
Ms. Elizabeth Robinson	Project Associate (SSE)	Elizabeth.Robinson@undp.org
Ms. Mandra Fagan	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment	pseenvironment@dominica.gov.dm
Ms. Careen Prevost	Former Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment	psgovernance@undp.org
Ms. Claudia Ortiz	Regional Technical Adviser	claudia.ortiz@undp.org
Mr. Luis Francisco Thais Santa Cruz	Head, Dominica Project Office	luis.francisco.thais@undp.org
Anderson Parillon	UNDP Focal Point	parillona@dominica.gov.dm
Jacquelyn Andre	<i>Division of Forestry, Wildlife and Parks</i>	andrej@dominica.gov.dm
Rickey Brumant	<i>Ministry of Agriculture</i>	Brumantr@dominica.gov.dm

Name	Agency/Department	Contact Information
Lyn Baron	<i>Physical Planning Division</i>	Lyn_baron@yahoo.com
Arun Madiseti	<i>Local management authority for Soufriere Scott's Head Marine Reserve (LAMA)</i>	izzydiving@gmail.com
Magnus Williams	<i>Dominica Water and Sewerage Company (DOWASCO)</i>	m.williams@dowasco.dm
George Maxwell	<i>Ministry of Tourism, International Transport and Maritime Initiatives</i>	maxwellg@dominica.gov.dm
Kent Coipel	<i>Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA)</i>	kent.coipel@iica.int
Dawn Francis	<i>Central Universal Farmer's Group</i>	dawnymfrancis@gmail.com
Shirley George	<i>South East Women Farming Organic Group</i>	1-767-6160722
Delroy Registe	<i>Bellevue Chopin Organic Farmers Movement Inc</i>	delroyregiste@gmail.com
Alberta Sorhaindo	<i>Toloma Women in Action Inc</i>	1-767-265-7642
William Sabroache	<i>Cochrane United Farmers Group</i>	1-767-616-9117/1-767-225-6078
Dylan Williams	<i>Velvet Fragrance Essentials</i>	1-767-285-8106

The specific design and methodology for the TE should emerge from consultations between the TE team and the above-mentioned parties regarding what is appropriate and feasible for meeting the TE purpose and objectives and answering the evaluation questions, given limitations of budget, time and data. The TE team must use gender-responsive methodologies and tools and ensure that gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as other cross-cutting issues and SDGs are incorporated into the TE report.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation must be clearly outlined in the TE Inception Report and be fully discussed and agreed between UNDP, stakeholders and the TE team.

The final report must describe the full TE approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the evaluation.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE TE

The TE will assess project performance against expectations set out in the project's Logical Framework/Results Framework (see ToR Annex A). The TE will assess results according to the criteria outlined in the Guidance for TEs of UNDP-supported GEF-financed Projects (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf)

The Findings section of the TE report will cover the topics listed below. A full outline of the TE report's content is provided in ToR Annex C.

The asterisk “(*)” indicates criteria for which a rating is required.

Findings

i. Project Design/Formulation

- National priorities and country driven-ness
- Theory of Change
- Gender equality and women's empowerment
- Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
- Analysis of Results Framework: project logic and strategy, indicators
- Assumptions and Risks
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g. same focal area) incorporated into project design
- Planned stakeholder participation
- Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
- Management arrangements

ii. Project Implementation

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
- Project Finance and Co-finance
- Monitoring & Evaluation: design at entry (*), implementation (*), and overall assessment of M&E (*)
- Implementing Agency (UNDP) (*) and Executing Agency (*), overall project oversight/implementation and execution (*)
- Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)

iii. Project Results

- Assess the achievement of outcomes against indicators by reporting on the level of progress for each objective and outcome indicator at the time of the TE and noting final achievements
- Relevance (*), Effectiveness (*), Efficiency (*) and overall project outcome (*)
- Sustainability: financial (*), socio-political (*), institutional framework and governance (*), environmental (*), overall likelihood of sustainability (*)
- Country ownership
- Gender equality and women's empowerment

- Cross-cutting issues (poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, capacity development, South-South cooperation, knowledge management, volunteerism, etc., as relevant)
- GEF Additionality
- Catalytic Role / Replication Effect
- Progress to impact

Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons Learned

- The TE team will include a summary of the main findings of the TE report. Findings should be presented as statements of fact that are based on analysis of the data.
- The section on conclusions will be written in light of the findings. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced statements that are well substantiated by evidence and logically connected to the TE findings. They should highlight the strengths, weaknesses and results of the project, respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries, UNDP and the GEF, including issues in relation to gender equality and women’s empowerment.
- Recommendations should provide concrete, practical, feasible and targeted recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation.
- The TE report should also include lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. When possible, the TE team should include examples of good practices in project design and implementation.
- It is important for the conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned of the TE report to incorporate gender equality and empowerment of women.

The TE report will include an Evaluation Ratings Table, as shown below:

ToR Table 2: Evaluation Ratings Table for *Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening the Effectiveness of Dominica’s Protected Area System*

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)	Rating ⁶
M&E design at entry	
M&E Plan Implementation	
Overall Quality of M&E	

⁶ Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, Implementation/Oversight & Execution, Relevance are rated on a 6-point scale: 6=Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5=Satisfactory (S), 4=Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3=Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), 2=Unsatisfactory (U), 1=Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Sustainability is rated on a 4-point scale: 4=Likely (L), 3=Moderately Likely (ML), 2=Moderately Unlikely (MU), 1=Unlikely (U)

Implementation & Execution	Rating
Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight	
Quality of Implementing Partner Execution	
Overall quality of Implementation/Execution	
Assessment of Outcomes	Rating
Relevance	
Effectiveness	
Efficiency	
Overall Project Outcome Rating	
Sustainability	Rating
Financial resources	
Socio-political/economic	
Institutional framework and governance	
Environmental	
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TE will be approximately *35 working days* starting on *February 24th 2021*. The tentative TE timeframe is as follows:

Timeframe	Activity
<i>Feb 24 2021</i>	Selection of TE team Direct contract/Limited competitive procurement Preparation period for TE team (handover of documentation) Document review and preparation of TE Inception Report
<i>March 10 2021</i>	Finalization and Validation of TE Inception Report; latest start of TE mission TE Stakeholder Engagement: meetings and interviews Stakeholder Engagement wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings; earliest end of TE mission
<i>Mar 26 2021 (7 days)</i>	Preparation of draft TE report Circulation of draft TE report for comments

Incorporation of comments on draft TE report into Audit Trail & finalization of TE report

Preparation and Issuance of Management Response

Concluding Stakeholder Workshop (optional)

Apr 13 2021

Expected date of full TE completion

Options for site visits should be provided in the TE Inception Report.

7. TE DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	TE Inception Report	TE team clarifies objectives, methodology and timing of the TE	No later than 2 weeks before the	TE team submits Inception Report to Commissioning Unit and project management
2	Presentation	Initial Findings	End of TE engagement:	TE team presents to Commissioning Unit and project management
3	Draft TE Report	Full draft report with annexes	Within 3 weeks of end of TE stakeholder engagement: <i>by Mar 26 2021</i>	TE team submits to Commissioning Unit; reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
5	Final TE Report* + Audit Trail	Revised final report and TE Audit trail in which the TE details how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final TE report	Within 1 week of receiving comments on draft report: <i>by April 13 2021</i>	TE team submits both documents to the Commissioning Unit

*All final TE reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines.⁷

8. TE ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing the TE resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's TE is the UNDP Multi-Country Office for Barbados and the OECS in Barbados

⁷ Access at: <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/section-6.shtml>

The Commissioning Unit will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the TE team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the TE team to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TE TEAM COMPOSITION

A team of two independent evaluators will conduct the TE –*One team leader (International Consultant) and one team expert (National Consultant)*. The team leader will be responsible for the overall design, coordinating the data collection and analysis phase of the evaluation and drafting the main report among other relevant tasks. The team leader will also ensure that all evaluation criteria are adequately covered by the evaluation team. The team expert will assist the team leader in timely completion of TE deliverables including, but not limited to developing the TE itinerary and assessing emerging trends in policy development, capacity building, budget allocations, regulatory frameworks.

The international consultant will be designated as the Team Leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. The national consultant will be the team member in the evaluation team and will provide supportive roles both in terms of professional back up, translation etc. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The evaluator(s) cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation and/or implementation (including the writing of the project document), must not have conducted this project's Mid-Term Review and should not have a conflict of interest with the project's related activities.

The selection of evaluators will be aimed at maximizing the overall “team” qualities in the following areas:

Education

- Master's degree in Environmental Science, Protected Areas Management, Environment and Sustainable Development or other closely related field (20%);

Experience

- **Minimum of 10 years professional experience in evaluations, with a specific emphasis on results-based monitoring and impact evaluations for sustainable development programmes/projects (Relevant experience with results-based management/logical framework approach;(20%)**
- Experience working with the UNDP or another GEF agency or GEF project evaluations, including experience with SMART based indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios (20%);
- Experience working in the Commonwealth of Dominica or within the Caribbean; (10%)
- At least 5-10 years of proven experience in local development planning with strong elements of biodiversity conservation and environmental assessment and management (10%)
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and Biodiversity Conservation/ Sustainable Use; 5-10 years' experience in gender responsive evaluation and analysis;(10%)
- Excellent communication skills;(5%)
- Demonstrable analytical skills; (5%)

Language

- Fluency in written and spoken English.

10. EVALUATOR ETHICS

The TE team will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a code of conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses without the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

11. PAYMENT SCHEDULE

- 20% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE Inception Report and approval by the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
- 40% payment upon satisfactory delivery of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA (via signatures on the TE Report Clearance Form) and delivery of completed TE Audit Trail

Criteria for issuing the final payment of 40%⁸:

- The final TE report includes all requirements outlined in the TE TOR and is in accordance with the TE guidance.
- The final TE report is clearly written, logically organized, and is specific for this project (i.e. text has not been cut & pasted from other TE reports).
- The Audit Trail includes responses to and justification for each comment listed.

Percentage of Contract	Milestone
20%	On submission and approval of Inception Report and work plan
40%	On presentation of draft TE report to the Commissioning Unit
40%	Following submission of the final TE report and approval by the Commissioning Unit and RTA

In line with the UNDP’s financial regulations, when determined by the Commissioning Unit and/or the consultant that a deliverable or service cannot be satisfactorily completed due to the impact of COVID-19 and limitations to the TE, that deliverable or service will not be paid.

⁸ The Commissioning Unit is obligated to issue payments to the TE team as soon as the terms under the ToR are fulfilled. If there is an ongoing discussion regarding the quality and completeness of the final deliverables that cannot be resolved between the Commissioning Unit and the TE team, the Regional M&E Advisor and Vertical Fund Directorate will be consulted. If needed, the Commissioning Unit’s senior management, Procurement Services Unit and Legal Support Office will be notified as well so that a decision can be made about whether or not to withhold payment of any amounts that may be due to the evaluator(s), suspend or terminate the contract and/or remove the individual contractor from any applicable rosters. See the UNDP Individual Contract Policy for further details:

https://popp.undp.org/layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc=/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PSU_Individual%20Contract_Individual%20Contract%20Policy.docx&action=default

Due to the current COVID-19 situation and its implications, a partial payment may be considered if the consultant invested time towards the deliverable but was unable to complete to circumstances beyond his/her control.

12. APPLICATION PROCESS⁹

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

- a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the [template](#)¹⁰ provided by UNDP;
- b) **CV and a Personal History Form** ([P11 form](#)¹¹);
- c) Brief description of **approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
- d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the [Letter of Confirmation of Interest template](#). If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address (UNDP Barbados and the Eastern Caribbean, UN House, Marine Gardens, Hastings, Christ Church, Barbados) in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference “Consultant for Terminal Evaluation of Supporting Sustainable Ecosystems by Strengthening the Effectiveness of Dominica’s Protected Areas” or by email at the following address ONLY: (procurement.bb@undp.org) by (5:00 pm, Jan 26, 2021). Incomplete applications will be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

13. TOR ANNEXES

- ToR Annex A: Project Logical/Results Framework
- ToR Annex B: Project Information Package to be reviewed by TE team
- ToR Annex C: Content of the TE report
- ToR Annex D: Evaluation Criteria Matrix template
- ToR Annex E: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators
- ToR Annex F: TE Rating Scales
- ToR Annex G: TE Report Clearance Form
- ToR Annex H: TE Audit Trail

⁹ Engagement of evaluators should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx>

¹⁰<https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/psa/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx>

¹¹ http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

2. LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Name	Agency/Department	Contact Information
Mr. Mohammad Nadgee	Programme Manager, Sustainable Solutions and Energy	mohammad.nadgee@undp.org
Ms. Nickez McPherson	Interim Project Coordinator (SSE)	Nickez.mcpherson@undp.org
Hon. Mr. Cozier Frederick	Minister – Ministry of the Environment, Rural Modernisation and Kalinago Upliftment	Cozier.frederick@icloud.com
Ms. Mandra Fagan	Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Environment, Rural Modernization and Kalinago Upliftment	psenvironment@dominica.gov.dm
Ms. Claudia Ortiz	Regional Technical Adviser	claudia.ortiz@undp.org
Mr. Anderson Parillon	Immediate Past UNDP Focal Point	parillona@dominica.gov.dm
Ms. Jacquelyn Andre	<i>Division of Forestry, Wildlife and Parks</i>	andrej@dominica.gov.dm
Ms. Wynona Joseph	<i>Ministry of Blue and Green Economy, Agriculture and National Food Security</i>	Brumantr@dominica.gov.dm
Ms. Lyn Baron	<i>Physical Planning Division</i>	Lyn_baron@yahoo.com
Mr. Arun Madisetti	<i>Local management authority for Soufriere Scott's Head Marine Reserve (LAMA)</i>	izzydiving@gmail.com
Mr. Delroy Registe	<i>Bellevue Chopin Organic Farmers Movement Inc</i>	delroyregiste@gmail.com
Mr. Jason LaCorbiniere	<i>UNDP Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst</i>	jason.lacorbiniere@undp.org

Name	Agency/Department	Contact Information
Ms. Shari-Anne Gregoire	<i>Immediate Past Project Coordinator-SSE Project</i>	Sharianne.gregoire@gmail.com
Ms. Rose-Anne Charles	<i>Legal Consultant – SSE Project</i>	<i>Rosecharles2178@gmail.com</i>
Ms. Valentina Futac	<i>Finance Specialist – SSE Project</i>	<i>vfutac@gmail.com</i>
Ms. Anouska Kinahan	<i>PA Systems Management Consultant – SSE Project</i>	<i>aakinahan@gmail.com</i>

3. LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. Priority: Status matrix for the report’s effectiveness section (the status of the GEF project results against the agreed GEF indicator framework)
2. The original Project Document ProDoc in Word format
3. The MTE in Word format.
4. List of current national and regional priorities and relevance (the international and national policies and laws and the frameworks this project is contributing to)
5. List of all laws and policies GEF support has contributed to and/or developed with a summary of institutional results. (also mainstreaming results)
6. GEF project “final” inception report (if it exists)
7. Priority: GEF project Steering Committee (Project Board Meeting Minutes) including a cover page with all major decisions for adaptation of project, dates, and participants, and any major decisions
8. Priority: All GEF Annual Project Reviews (APRs) and Project Implementation Report (PIRs)
9. Priority: GEF Mid-Term Evaluation Report
10. Priority: All GEF project-supported Technical and Research Reports (Provide a cover list with the dates and work costs)
11. Priority: Matrix for report or annex of all project-supported knowledge products and communications i.e., project brochures and public awareness materials
12. Priority: Annex with final GEF tracking tools, final METTs post-MTR, Capacity Development Scorecard, and Financial Scorecard
13. Priority: List with a description of all the GEF-supported capacity building and learning activities conducted by the project since the beginning, disaggregated by gender in a matrix with a breakdown of venues, dates, participant’s gender, and results, etc.
14. Evaluation ToR in Word format
15. Priority: Matrix or list of synergistic ongoing and in the pipeline i.e., linked to this project and a short explanation of all synergistic donor activities
16. Matrix or list of the project-supported research scientific and/ or policy-related studies (enabling activities)
17. Priority: Matrix with the role and actual involvement of Stakeholders. Delineate the list to include project implementing partners and other stakeholders that have been active (how this differs from what was

- planned in the Project document. Include the government, donors, private sector, and NGOs supported by the project, and sustainability
18. Priority: List of all GEF-funded and/or supported staff attached to the project from inception with position and reason for leaving.
 19. Priority: Table explaining the gender-related disaggregated results
 20. Priority: Co-financing table making up the total and all donors, prepared in the format in the inception report below.

1	Project Identification Form (PIF)
2	UNDP Initiation Plan
3	Final UNDP GEF Project Document with all annexes
4	CEO Endorsement Request
5	UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) and associated management plans (if any)
6	Inception Workshop Report
7	Mid-Term Review report and management response to MTR recommendations
8	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
9	Progress reports (quarterly, semiannual, or annual, with associated work plans and financial reports)
10	Oversight mission reports
11	Minutes of Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e., Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
12	GEF Tracking Tools (from CEO Endorsement, mid-term, and terminal stages) Completed
13	GEF/LDCF/SCCF Core Indicators (from PIF, CEO Endorsement, mid-term, and terminal stages); for GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects only
14	Financial data including actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs and documentation of any significant budget revisions
15	Co-financing data with expected and actual contributions broken down by type of co-financing, source, and whether the contribution is considered as investment mobilized or a recurring expenditure
16	Audit reports
17	Electronic copies of project outputs (booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.)
18	Sample of project communications materials
19	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants

20	Any relevant socioeconomic monitoring data, such as average incomes/employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities
21	List of contracts and procurement items over US\$ 5,000 (i.e., organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after GEF project approval (i.e., any leveraged or “catalytic” results)
23	Data on relevant project website activity, e.g., number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over the relevant time period, if available
24	UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
25	List/map of project sites, highlighting suggested visits
26	List and contact details for project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Board members, RTA, Project Team members, and other partners to be consulted
27	Project deliverables that provide documentary evidence of achievement towards project outcomes
	<i>Additional documents, as required</i>

4. EVALUATION QUESTION MATRIX

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional, and national levels?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project relate to the GEF Climate Change focal area and has it been designed to deliver global environmental benefits in line with relevant international climate change objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project includes the relevant GEF outcomes, outputs and indicators The project makes explicit links with global climate action goals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project aligned to National development objectives broadly and to national energy transition priorities specifically? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project design includes explicit links (indicators, outputs, outcomes) to the national development policy/national energy policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document National development strategies, energy policies, Nationally Determined Contributions, etc. PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project relevant to stated regional development objectives as defined by CARICOM, OECS, and other regional frameworks? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explicit links are made within the project to regional development policies, action plans, and associated initiatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project's Theory of Change relevant to addressing the development challenge(s) identified? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Theory of Change clearly indicates how project interventions and projected results will contribute to the reduction of the three major barriers to low carbon development (policy, institutional/technical capacity, and financial) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project directly and adequately address the needs of beneficiaries at local and regional levels? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Theory of Change clearly identifies beneficiary groups and defines how their capabilities will be enhanced by the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project results framework relevant to the development challenges and are results at the appropriate level? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project results framework adequately measures impact The project indicators are SMART Indicator baselines are clearly defined and populated, and milestones and targets are The results framework is comprehensive and demonstrates systematic links to the theory of change 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project appropriately aligned with relevant UN system priorities, including thematic objectives at the national/regional and international levels? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project’s results framework includes relevant thematic outcomes and indicators from the UNDP Strategic Plan, the UNDAF, UNDP CPD, and other relevant corporate objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • UNDP CPD, UNDAF, SP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the relevant stakeholders been adequately identified and have their views, needs, and rights been considered during design and implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The stakeholder mapping and associated engagement plan includes all relevant stakeholders and appropriate modalities for engagement. • Planning and implementation have been participatory and inclusive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder Consultation Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Stakeholder Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the interventions of the project been adequately considered in the context of other development activities being undertaken in the same or related thematic area? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A partnership framework has been developed that incorporates parallel initiatives, key partners and identifies complementarities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder mapping/engagement plan and reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Stakeholder Interviews
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have relevant lessons learned from previous projects informed the design, implementation, risk management, and monitoring of the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learned are explicitly identified and integrated into all aspects of the Project Document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • PIF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the project design adequately identify, assess, and design appropriate mitigation actions for the potential social and environmental risks posed by its interventions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SES checklist was completed appropriately and all reasonable risks were identified with appropriate impact and probability ratings and risk mitigation measures specified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Document • SES Annex 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents

Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project achieved its output and outcome level objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has met or exceeded the output and outcome indicator end-of-project targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Monitoring Reports • Beneficiary testimony • Site visit/field reports • Pilot Data Analysis/ Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries • Site visits
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were lessons learned captured and integrated into project planning and decision-making? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lessons learned have been captured periodically and/or at the project end 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee Meeting Minutes • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How well were risks (including those identified in the Social and Environmental Screening (SES) Checklist), assumptions, and impact drivers being managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clearly defined risk identification, categorization, and mitigation strategy (updated risk log in ATLAS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ATLAS Risk Log • M&E Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How were risks related to COVID-19 managed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COVID-related risks were defined against project activities with mitigating actions proposed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PME COVID-updated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were relevant counterparts from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The steering committee participation included representatives from key institutions in Government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Steering Committee Meeting Minutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project contributed directly to any changes in legislation or policy in line with the project's objectives? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft legislation has been developed or enacted to catalyze the reduction of barriers to the increased penetration of renewable energy/energy-efficient technologies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft legislation • Policy Documents • Action/Implementation Plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has directly contributed to reductions in one or more vulnerabilities associated with natural disasters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project carefully considered the thematic issues related to human rights? In particular, has the project sought to and actively pursued equality of access to clean energy services and opportunities for women and men (i.e., project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A gender mainstreaming plan was completed • The project results framework has incorporated gender equality considerations, as relevant. • Multidimensional poverty reduction is an explicit objective • The project prioritized the most vulnerable as key beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender Mainstreaming Plan • Project Document • Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently in line with international and national norms and standards? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did the project adjust dynamically to reflect changing national priorities/external evaluations during implementation to ensure it remained relevant? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project demonstrated adaptive management, and changes were integrated into project planning and implementation through adjustments to annual work plans, budgets, and activities • Changes to AWP/Budget were made based on mid-term or other external evaluation • Any changes to the project's planned activities were approved by the Steering Committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Work Plans • Steering Committee Meeting Reports • Quarterly Reports • Annual Reports (PIR) • Stakeholder/beneficiary testimony 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk Review of Documents • Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any substantive changes (outcome-level) were approved by the Steering Committee and donor, as required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised Project Results Framework 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent were the project results delivered with the greatest value for money? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Value for money analyses, requests for information, market surveys, and other market intelligence were undertaken for key procurements Procurement is done on a competitive basis, where relevant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> VFM, RFI, Market Surveys Procurement Evaluation Documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was co-financing adequately estimated during project design (sources, type, value, relevance), tracked during implementation? What the reasons for any differences were between expected and realized co-financing? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-financing was realized in keeping with original estimates Co-financing was tracked continuously throughout the project lifecycle and deviations and alternative sources were identified Co-financiers were actively engaged throughout project implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Work Plans Steering Committee Meeting Reports Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (PIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Was the level of implementation support provided by UNDP adequate and in keeping with the implementation modality and any related agreements (i.e., LOA)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical support to the Executing Agency and the project team was timely and of acceptable quality. Management inputs and processes, including budgeting and procurement, were adequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> LOA(s) /Cooperation Agreement(s) UNDP project support documents (emails, procurement/recruitment documents) Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (PIR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff, UNDP personnel
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the capacities of the executing institution(s) and counterparts been properly considered when the project was designed? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An ex-ante analysis was undertaken of the internal control framework and internal capacities of the IP An ex-ante capacity analysis was undertaken of key partners with explicit responsibilities for the implementation of project funds The cash transfer modality and implementation modality appropriately reflected the findings of any ex-ante analyses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HACT Assessment(s) Capacity Assessments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the M&E plan been well-formulated and has it served as an effective tool to support project implementation? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The M&E plan has an adequate budget and was adequately funded The logical framework was used during implementation as a management and M&E tool There was compliance with the financial and narrative reporting requirements (timeliness and quality) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Document M&E Plan AWPs FACE forms Quarterly Narrative Reports Site visit reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and reporting has been at both the activity and results levels 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the project adequately used relevant national systems (procurement, recruitment, payments) for project implementation where possible? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of national systems was in keeping with relevant national requirements and internal control frameworks Management of financial resources has been in line with accounting best practice Management of project assets has been in line with accounting best practice 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procurement/Recruitment reports FACE forms CDRs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Interviews with project staff and government stakeholders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Were financial audit/spot check findings adequately addressed and relevant changes made to improve financial management? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate management responses and associated actions were taken in response to audit/spot check findings. Successive audits demonstrated improvements in financial management practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Audit Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socioeconomic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exit strategy includes explicit interventions to ensure the financial sustainability of relevant activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures, and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project benefits? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exit strategy identifies relevant sociopolitical risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate the same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have key stakeholders identified their interest in project benefits beyond project-end and accepted responsibility for ensuring that project benefits continue to flow? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key stakeholders are assigned specific, agreed on roles, and responsibilities outlined in the exit strategy MOU(s) exist for on-going monitoring, maintenance, and oversight of phased down or phased over activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy Risk Log MOU(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The exit strategy identifies relevant environmental risks and includes explicit interventions to mitigate the same 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Exit Strategy Risk Log 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? 			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are there verifiable improvements in ecological status or reductions in ecological stress that can be linked directly to project interventions? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has contributed directly to improved ecological conditions, including through reduced GHG emissions for energy generation and transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quarterly Reports Annual Reports (PIR) Monitoring Reports Pilot Data Analysis/Reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Desk Review of Documents Site visits

5. RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN DECEMBER 2019

Risk Management Action Plan			
Risk	Mitigation Measures	Person responsible	Status
Extension request-delays	- Bi-weekly oversight of CO with meetings with the Project Team to accelerate the “extension request” process	RTA – Maria Cruz CO-Allan/ Danielle Evensong Project Manager Shari-Anne	Ongoing Bi-weekly meeting planned
<p>‘slow performing’: 33% cumulative disbursement in its 4th year</p> <p>Context-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hurricane Maria/ set back of 2 years - Problems with IP low capacity/ including financial irregularities resulted in change in IP - Current IP is competent - delays in procurement of new project coordinator - set up of project management 	<p>- The project was interrupted for 2 years.</p> <p>Given the fact that the International Consultancies, represent such a significant proportion of the project’s budget, it is strongly anticipated that this disbursement rate will grow substantially once the key Consultancies are procured- example by January 31, 2020 it the resources committed would raise expenditure to 63% The Finance Specialist has been contracted; a PA final bid has been selected and the case is being prepared for review by RCAP and; and the evaluation of the Biodiversity Assessment bids are close to being completed. Two of these procurements are 6 months long and as such will have an effect on expenditure and delivery in a relatively short period.</p> <p>- The Extension request must be submitted and granted (If no Extension is granted then the consultancies cannot finish the tasks, as many are long term (example 12 months for the Biodiversity Assessment)- the</p>	RTA- Maria Cruz through PIR monitoring, and monthly meetings with CO and Project manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consultancies currently procured/in final stages of review - Extension request (w/new requirements) in final stages, to be submitted shortly - Mission suggested to CO- they are reviewing when best / to combine the mission with needs of other Barbados MCO projects (ex. Inception workshop for PIMS 5087) - Supervision trip by PTA?? I suggest it is not needed

<p>unit took 6 months</p> <p>- Now the project is fully functioning and staffed since March 2019. No need for capacity building</p>	<p>current procurements of consultants would need to be stopped if the extension is not granted</p> <p>Regular supervision missions by RTA will take place this year</p> <p>Capacity at the PMU level has been significantly reinforced with the acquisition of a shared (50%) Administrative Assistant for the project. This will support the administrative tasks currently undertaken by the Project Coordinator allowing them to more effectively manage the consultants and focus on more strategic project issues, encouraging efficient delivery.</p> <p>Similarly, the Project team receives administrative support and backing at the Ministry or national level from the Dominica Project Office. Having a senior UNDP official on site facilitates working with Government (ex. procurement delays, access to key decision makers etc. is facilitated).</p>		
<p>Procurement setbacks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support to procurement: seeking advice at HQ (Margarita and Paul Mwangi). The Dominica Project Office also supports the PC in the development of ToRs and issues with local consultants and ICs - Review of TORs by RTA - Develop a procurement plan which encourages procurement outside of critical peak periods within the CO's procurement system - Review of TORs of consultants (reduce complexity) will facilitate more bids being submitted. A number of procurements were 	<p>Maria Cruz - support from HQ</p> <p>Allan- providing support to Shari-Anne-</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support has been provided by Margarita and Mwangi) - Procurement plan to be submitted by CO with Extension request package (RTA to follow up- to make sure it is complete) - Regional Hub support to identification of consultants - IC procurements have been successful using the open competition. For local consultants, a wider range of advertising channels are recommended (CO to follow up with Project Manager/Shari-Anne)

	<p>delayed because too few submissions were made in response to the posting.</p> <p>-Ensure posts are advertised in all relevant communication channels (follow up with Allan- CO and Shari-Anne Project Manager to confirm if Consultants were procured)</p>		
--	---	--	--

6. QUESTIONNAIRE USED AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Questionnaire for Project Management

Please answer according to the main heading and use the sub questions as guides. Please provide concrete example to illustrate your answers and main points with evidence i.e., statistics, date, actual events, consultancies, policies etc.

Due:

Send to shodge1@gmail.com

1. PROJECT DESIGN, LOGIC AND STRATEGIES

Formulation/ Priorities

- How did the project contribute to the national, regional, and international priorities?
- What national, regional, and international directives and policy/laws are (include any since project signing) did this project contribute to?
- Have any of the stated priorities changed as a result of or in the background of this project?
- Describe details about the relevance to international national policy and enabling context: SDGs, CC, DRR (2015), Biodiversity, etc.

Design Process

- Were you involved in the project design? What was the process? Has the policy context changed? What are your thoughts on the project design in relation to the political operating context? How might the design have been more relevant?
- What were the main national drivers for developing this project?

Strategy/ Logic

- Is the project's rationale and logical framework smart, and as the theory of change in line with the actual problems at the national level and sub-

regional level?

- Did the project have a clear theory of change? Did the project document provide you with a strong monitoring framework for results? Did you understand the strategies in the document and how these would lead to results? Why or why not? Was the results framework logical and smart? Was there a good baseline?
- Were the expected results logical and clear to all stakeholders? How?
- Do you think the outputs link to the expected outcomes? Why or why not?
- Has the casual pathway to results been clear and concise?
- Any lessons learned?

2. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT:

- What was the overall approach to capacity-building approach?
- How did you use the mechanism for adaptive management? What was the role of the PSC in guiding this project to results? Was it useful for deciding on work plans and implementation strategies? Why or why not?? How were the work plans developed and rolled out? Who was there? Who was not there that should have been?
- Did you have a technical committee? How did that work out?
- What was the capacity building approach taken nationally? Please provide details of the approaches for training, learning, knowledge sharing, and policy advocacy. Did you have a CB strategies and strong stakeholder analysis?
- How many CB workshops did the project have? List them. Were they useful? Why?
- How many consultancies have been implemented? What were they? If you could do the project over what would you drop? And add?

Management and Oversight Arrangements

- Describe the project management and implementation and oversight arrangements, i.e., where is the PMU situated in gov and is it the right place?
- How many staff was hired since the start? Any challenges to report concerning staffing and procurement? Any lesson learned?
- How did UNDP support the NIM work? What was UNDPs role in oversight and in implementation? How did UNDP support your do your work? Any challenges? Describe how the project was coordinated daily at the national level? Any lessons learned? Did the UNDP knowledge platform support the project implementation and results? How? Why or why not?
- How often did the UNDP RTA visit or interact? What were the results of those visits?
- How did UNDP Barbados help monitor this project? Was the support effective and or useful?
- Did you have a partnership strategy?
- Did the project management, oversight, and work planning arrangements work out? Why or why not?
- What was human resources and organizational set-up?
- How did you do work planning at the national level? Describe the process.
- What were the day-to-day coordination, reporting, and monitoring mechanisms? To whom did you report? When? How? Did this system work? Why or why not?
- What was the role of the project secretariat in results monitoring, oversight, and management?

Work Planning and Procurement Processes

- What was the process for work planning and budgeting?
- Did UNDP support work planning – how? Did the UNDP CO and or RTA support work planning? How?

- How did you facilitate inter-sectoral national work planning?
- How did you present the ongoing implementation of this project to PSC meetings and policy level persons? Was this effective? Why or why not?
- Did you have a procurement plan?
- How did the government procurement process work?

Finance and Co –Finance

- How were the project finances monitored? What was UNDP's role in this? Provide all details of expenditure per year and final?
- Did you track co-financing why or why not? Provide the table in the format requested.
- Please provide the overall expenditure per outcome per year in chart and tables for the report?
- Provide a breakdown of expenditure by the outcome and by year until the end of the project.

Monitoring and Evaluation systems

- Describe the project monitoring and evaluation system? What are the main lessons learned?
- How were the technical aspects monitored and facilitated by the project? Describe.

Gender Mainstreaming

- Did you have gender results and monitoring plan? What was it? How would you do this if you could do it again?
- What are the gender related results?
- Did you have a gender mainstreaming and or safeguards plan?

Other factors influencing Results

- Were there any unintended consequences and unexpected results of the project's work?
- What were any key factors influencing this project implementation?
- How did management employ adaptive management at the national and sub-regional levels? Can you provide a few examples?
- Any lesson learned?

Governance and oversight

- What were the main mechanisms for project oversight? i.e., UNDP, RTA, meetings with the director of the department, project boards, and national workshops?
- How many steering committee meetings have there been? Who attended and when? Were these meetings useful? Why or Why not?
- Any lesson learned?

Synergies

- Did the project support any synergies with ongoing related regional or national projects and initiatives? How? Why or why not?
- What were the related projects?
- Any lesson learned?

Technical inputs

- What were the main technical consultancies and inputs?

- Did the project, project management, GEF support and monitor the implementation of technical consultancies, and provide you with sufficient technical support to enable the implementation of new approaches and tools? How? Why or why not? Any lesson learned?
- What was the CTA role? Was the CTA input useful for monitoring support? How? How can it be improved? Any Lessons?

Partnerships

- Who were the main partners to implementation?
- Who were your regional and national implementing partners? List them?
- Did the original partnership strategy play out? Why or why not?
- What might be improved?

Financial management and co-financing results

- Did the government commit all expected co-financing? Why or why not? Please provide this number and include all the in-kind and cash resources.
- Provide the final national project expenditure by the outcome and by year.

Communication and KM

- How did you employ knowledge management and use communication in this project as an enabler for results? Did you have a plan and supportive staff managing these aspects? Did this contribute to policy and learning results? How?
- Provide a highlight list of knowledge products developed by the project?
- Provide comments: communications, knowledge management, and capacity building approach, how communications supported the policy level expected results.

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Describe the monitoring and evaluation systems at the national level?
- How did you monitor and report your results- weekly, monthly, yearly and to whom?
- What were the internal project results reporting mechanisms? How often did you discuss national-level results internally and where?
- How did you monitor the capacity development work? (i.e., evidence of program-level assessments)
- Any lessons learned?

Other factors influencing implementation

3. PROJECT RESULTS

- Did the project reach its goal, expected outcomes? Why or why not. Were certain areas easy to do than others –why?
- What has been the policy level results of this project?
- Which national and regional outcomes and targets were most difficult to meet? Why?
- Which national and regional outcomes and targets were the easiest to achieve? Why?
- Are any of the national project targets outstanding? Why?
- What might have been done differently to meet all targets and goals? Why

- What do you think are the project's greatest results? At the sub-regional level, at the national level?
- How did you facilitate collaboration between sectors in project activities, Give examples?
- What is the value added of inter-project level collaboration?
- Any lessons learned?

Sustainability

- What is the overall likelihood of this project's sustainability? Why?
 - Economic sustainability
 - Political sustainability
 - Environmental sustainability
 - Social sustainability

Impact Level Results

- What do you think were the main achievement and the impact level results?

4. LESSON LEARNED AND NEXT STEPS

- What are the main lessons learned based on the following?
 - Design
 - Management and Implementation Approach
 - Finance
 - Results

5. NEXT STEPS

- What are the next steps? What are your key recommendations to share?

Draft questions for other stakeholders and implementing partners

Stakeholder Interview Questions and Templates

a. National Focal Point Questionnaire

Country:		Date/time:	
Name of Respondent:		Interviewer:	

National Focal Point Questionnaire	
Project Benefits and Results	
1. Was the project design in line with national sector development priorities and plans of participating countries?	•
2. Were you consulted during the design of the project?	•
3. What benefits have already been seen from the project activities implemented in <COUNTRY> to date?	•
4. How has the project helped to develop the capacity of <COUNTRY> to continue the project activities after the close of the project?	•

Project Achievability	
5. How successful do you think the project has been at delivering results to date?	•
6. Were any unforeseen delays experienced during project start up?	•
7. How achievable do you think the project results are in <COUNTRY> within the time remaining for the project?	•
8. Could improvements be made to make delivery more effective?	•

9. What barriers have you identified to achieving the outcomes and objectives of the project?	•
10. To what extent has the involvement of local partners contributed to the success of the site-specific projects?	

Project Management Arrangements	
11. Has communication between PIU and <COUNTRY> been clear, effective and on time?	•
12. Do you provide feedback to PIU when you receive communications from them?	•
13. Are you aware of who at PIU you should be communicating with regarding project management?	•
14. Does PIU share the annual Project Implementation Reviews with you and do you have an opportunity to provide feedback?	•
15. How well do you think Piu has communicated the project to countries and local project partners? Can you suggest any ways to improve this communication?	•

Sustainability	
16. What does <COUNTRY> expect to happen at the end of the current project to sustain the project results?	•
17. How important is it to <COUNTRY> that the programme continues after September 2019?	•
18. How relevant is PIU to the continuation of project results after September 2019?	•
19. What could <COUNTRY> do to make to ensure that results continue after September 2019?	•
20. What could <COUNTRY> do to make to ensure that PIU continues after September 2019?	•

b. Non-Country Partners Questionnaire

Non-Country Partner:		Date/time:	
Name of Respondent:		Interviewer:	

Non-Country Partner Questionnaire	
Project Benefits and Results	
1. How familiar are you with the project?	•
2. Were you consulted during the design of the project?	•
3. What benefits have already been seen from the project activities implemented in to date?	•

Project Achievability	
4. How successful do you think the project has been at delivering results to date?	•
5. Were any unforeseen delays experienced during project start up?	•
6. Could improvements be made to make delivery more effective?	•

Project Management Arrangements	
7. Has communication between Piu and <PARTNER> been clear, effective and on time?	•
8. Do you provide feedback to Piu when you receive communications from them?	•
9. How well do you think Piu has communicated the project to countries and local project partners? Can you suggest any ways to improve this communication?	•

Sustainability	
-----------------------	--

10. What does <PARTNER> expect to happen at the end of the current project to sustain the project results?	•
11. How relevant is Piu to the continuation of project results after September 2019?	•
12. How do you see your relationship with Piu continuing after the project end?	•

c. Local Stakeholder Questionnaire

Country/Project Site:		Date/time:	
Name of Respondent:		Interviewer:	

Non-Country Partner Questionnaire	
Local Benefits and Results	
1. How would you rate your knowledge about the project? (H/M/L)	•
2. How important do you think this project is, and why? (Very/moderately/less)	•
3. Were you consulted during the design of the project?	•
4. What benefits have already been seen from the project activities implemented to date?	•
5. Is equal representation and participation of women and men in project activities encouraged? Please elaborate.	•

Progress Towards Results	
6. How successful do you think the project has been at delivering results so far in your area? (Excellent/Good/Poor)	•
7. Were any delays experienced during project start up? Have you experienced any other problems?	•
8. How achievable do you think the project results are in your area within the time remaining for the project? (H/M/L)	•
9. What improvements could be made to make delivery more effective?	•

Project Management Arrangements	
10. How do you rate PIUs' Project management, communications, efficiency & general administration: (Excellent/Adequate/Poor)? Please elaborate	•
11. Have you been kept informed about the progress of the project? (Y/N)	•
12. How well do you think PIU has communicated the project to local project partners?	•
13. Can you suggest any ways to improve this communication?	•

Sustainability	
14. How has the project helped to develop capacity to continue the project activities after the close of the project?	•
15. How important is it to you that the programme continues after September 2019? [for higher level interviewees]	•
16. Do you plan to continue with the activities after the programme finishes in September 2019? (Y/N)	•
17. How important is Piu to the continuation of project results after September 2019?	•
18. How successful do you think the project has been at delivering results so far in your area? (Excellent/Good/Poor)	•

General Feedback	
19. Please list 1 or 2 major strengths of the project	•
20. Please list any major weaknesses	•
21. What are the lessons learnt to date?	•
22. What message would you like conveyed in the TR?	•

7. EVALUATION CONSULTANT AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

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

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form¹²

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

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: _____

¹²www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

8. REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: ____

9. ANNEX ORIGINAL RISK LOG

RISK LOG		FORM [029] Ref: Version:
Programme:		Project: PRINCE2
RISK IDENTIFIER: [0001]	Description: There have been attempts to amend the Protected Areas Act in a manner that threatens the sustainability and integrity of PAs in Dominica.	Risk Category: Political
Probability: Moderately Likely	Impact: If approval is given for the requested amendment, it will open the door to other amendments that reduce the size of the PA or redefine its use; ultimately converting PA to other land use type.	Proximity: Attempts were made during February 2015
Countermeasures: PPG team met with Senior Government officials to apprise them of the consequences of such actions and provided alternative actions.		

10. ANNEX METT SCORES

Strategic Areas of Support	Systemic			f	Institutional			f	Individual			F	Average %
	Project Scores	Total possible score	%		Project Scores	Total possible score	%		Project Scores	Total possible score	%		
(1) Capacity to conceptualize and develop sectoral and cross-sectoral policy and regulatory frameworks	4	6	67		3	3	100		NA	NA	NA		78%
(2) Capacity to formulate, operationalize and implement sectoral and cross-sectoral programmes and projects	7	9	78		18	27	67		5	12	42		63%
(3) Capacity to mobilize and manage partnerships, including with the civil society and the private sector	4	6	67		6	6	100		2	3	67		80%
(4) Technical skills related specifically to the requirements of the SPs and associated Conventions	2	3	67		2	3	67		3	3	100		78%
(5) Capacity to monitor, evaluate and report at the sector and project levels	2	6	33		4	6	67		2	3	67		53%
TOTAL Score and average for %'s	19	30	63%		33	45	73%		12	21	57%		67%

Components	Actual Score for PA System	Total Possible Score	Actual Score as % of TPS
COMPONENT 1: Governance frameworks that enable sustainable PA financing	7	111	6
<i>Element 1</i> – Legal, policy and regulatory support for revenue generation by Pas	3	6	50
<i>Element 2</i> - Legal, policy and regulatory support for revenue sharing within the PA system	0	9	0
<i>Element 3</i> - Legal and regulatory conditions for establishing endowment or trust funds	0	9	0

Components	Actual Score for PA System	Total Possible Score	Actual Score as % of TPS
<i>Element 4</i> - Legal, policy and regulatory support for alternative institutional arrangements for PA management	1	12	8
<i>Element 5</i> - National PA financing strategies	0	30	0
<i>Element 6</i> - Economic valuation of protected area systems	0	6	0
<i>Element 7</i> - Improved government budgeting for PA systems	0	12	0
<i>Element 8</i> - Clearly defined institutional responsibilities for PA management and financing	1	3	33
<i>Element 9</i> - Well-defined staffing requirements, profiles and incentives at site and system level	2	24	8
COMPONENT 2: Business planning and other tools for cost-effective management	3	85	3
<i>Element 1</i> - Site-level business planning	0	30	0
<i>Element 2</i> - Operational, transparent and useful accounting and auditing systems	1	9	11
<i>Element 3</i> - Systems for monitoring and reporting on financial management performance	2	12	16
<i>Element 4</i> - Methods for allocating funds across individual PA sites	0	4	0
<i>Element 5</i> - Training and support networks to enable park managers to operate more cost-effectively	0	30	0
COMPONENT 3: Tools and systems for revenue generation and mobilization	15	71	21
<i>Element 1</i> - Number and variety of revenue sources used across the PA system	4	12	33
<i>Element 2</i> - Setting and establishment of user fees across the PA system	5	15	33
<i>Element 3</i> - Effective fee collection systems	5	11	45
<i>Element 4</i> - Marketing and communication strategies for revenue generation mechanisms	0	6	0
<i>Element 5</i> - Operational PES schemes for Pas	0	12	0
<i>Element 6</i> - Operational concessions within Pas	1	12	8
<i>Element 7</i> - PA training programmes on revenue generation mechanisms	0	3	0

Components	Actual Score for PA System	Total Possible Score	Actual Score as % of TPS
Total	25	267	9%

11. ANNEXED IN A SEPARATE FILE: TE AUDIT TRAIL

12. ANNEXED IN A SEPARATE FILE: TERMINAL GEF TRACKING TOOLS, IF APPLICABLE

13. SAFEGUARDS SCREENING TOOL

Checklist Potential Social and Environmental <u>Risks</u>		
Principles 1: Human Rights		Answer (Yes/No)
1.	Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	No
2.	Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? ¹³	No
3.	Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?	No
4.	Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	No
5.	Are there measures or mechanisms in place to respond to local community grievances?	Yes
6.	Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?	No
7.	Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	Yes

¹³ Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to “women and men” or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexuals.

8.	Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process?	No
9.	Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	No
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment		
1.	Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	No
2.	Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	No
3.	Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process and has this been included in the overall Project proposal and in the risk assessment?	No
3.	Would the Project potentially limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in accessing environmental goods and services? <i>For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being</i>	No
Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability: Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below		
Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management		
1.1	Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g., modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i>	No
1.2	Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities?	Yes
1.3	Does the Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5)	No
1.4	Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?	No

1.5	Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?	No
1.6	Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?	No
1.7	Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	No
1.8	Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i>	No
1.9	Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)	No
1.10	Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	No
1.11	Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area? <i>For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g. felling of trees, earthworks, potential relocation of inhabitants). The new road may also facilitate encroachment on lands by illegal settlers or generate unplanned commercial development along the route, potentially in sensitive areas. These are indirect, secondary, or induced impacts that need to be considered. Also, if similar developments in the same forested area are planned, then cumulative impacts of multiple activities (even if not part of the same Project) need to be considered.</i>	No
Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation		
2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant ¹⁴ greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change?	No
2.2	Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?	No
2.3	Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental vulnerability to climate change now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)? <i>For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding</i>	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions		
3.1	Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities?	No

¹⁴ In regards to CO₂, 'significant emissions' corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.]

3.2	Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	No
3.3	Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)?	No
3.4	Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)	No
3.5	Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, and erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions?	No
3.6	Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)?	No
3.7	Does the Project pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, and radiological hazards during Project construction, operation, or decommissioning?	No
3.8	Does the Project involve support for employment or livelihoods that may fail to comply with national and international labor standards (i.e. principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions)?	No
3.9	Does the Project engage security personnel that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals (e.g. due to a lack of adequate training or accountability)?	No
Standard 4: Cultural Heritage		
4.1	Will the proposed Project result in interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	No
4.2	Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement		
5.1	Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?	No
5.2	Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?	No
5.3	Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions? ¹⁵	No

¹⁵ Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections.

5.4	Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	No
Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples		
6.1	Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?	No
6.2	Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.3	Would the proposed Project potentially affect the rights, lands and territories of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether Indigenous Peoples possess the legal titles to such areas)?	No
6.4	Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?	No
6.4	Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.5	Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?	No
6.6	Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	No
6.7	Would the Project potentially affect the traditional livelihoods, physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.8	Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?	No
Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency		
7.1	Would the Project potentially result in the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts?	No
7.2	Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	No
7.3	Will the proposed Project potentially involve the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials? Does the Project propose use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs? <i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol</i>	No
7.4	Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	No

7.5 Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	No
--	----

14. Project sites

Protected Area Site Specific Information

Morne Trois Pitons National Park (MTPNP) was proposed as a forest reserve in 1952 but later designated as a National Park under the National Parks ND Protected Areas Act # 16 of 1975. MTPNP includes large highly scenic tracts of the most extensive almost undisturbed tropical forest in the Lesser Antilles and the headwaters of most of the major streams and rivers in the southern half of the island. These support a high level of biodiversity. The Park lies within a Conservation International- designated Conservation Hotspot, a WWF/IUCN Centre of Plant Diversity and a Bird Life-designated Endemic Bird Area.

MTPNP is located 13 km east of the town of Roseau in the highlands of south-central Dominica and it is the basaltic spike-like remains of a former volcano rising to approximately 1,300 m, within 8 km of the sea. The landscape is characterized by volcanic piles with precipitous slopes, and deeply incised valleys (*glacis* slopes). There is also a fumarole known as Valley of Desolation (or Grand Soufriere), with fumaroles, hot springs, mud pots, sulphur vents and the Boiling Lake, which is the world's second largest of its kind. The valley is a large amphitheatre surrounded by mountains and consisting of at least three separate craters where steam vents, small ponds, and hot springs bubble up through the ground. The Boiling Lake is surrounded by cliffs and is almost always covered by clouds of steam. The Valley of Desolation drains into the Pointe Mulatre River, which flows into the Atlantic.

Other outstanding features in the area include the Emerald Pool, fed by the Middleham Falls; Stinking Hole, a lava tube in the middle of the forest; and the Boeri and Freshwater lakes. The Freshwater Lake is the largest and second deepest of Dominica's four freshwater lakes. The Boeri Lake is the second largest in Dominica and is located in the crater of an extinct volcano. Both lakes are separated from each other by Morne Macaque (1,221 m) and vary in depth with the season. These lakes are believed to have originated some 25,000-30,000 years ago¹⁶.

Five natural vegetation zones are recognized within the area namely: 1) Elfin/cloud forest, which occurs at the highest elevations, above 914 m with vegetation types consist of mosses, ferns, shrubs and stunted trees covered by lichens 2) Montane thicket, which is transitional between elfin

¹⁶ <http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/814>

and montane forests and dominated by spindly trees the most common of which is the *Podocarpus coriaceus*, the island's only native conifer, 3) Montane rainforest, which grows above 610m, is frequently in cloud cover or fog. The species composition here is similar to that of mature rainforest, yet much reduced in stature. Non-vascular epiphytes cover most of the montane rainforest plants, 4) Mature rainforest, which grows below 460m contains the most luxuriant growth, 5) Scrub wood land and savannah type vegetation.

The park is home to at least 7 species of mammals, 50 bird species include imperial Amazon and red-necked Amazon parrots, 12 reptile and amphibian species and 12 crustacean species. Apart from the introduced opossum and agouti, there are no terrestrial mammals in the area.

The Cabrits National Park (CNP) of which the marine component is an integral part, was officially designated a national park in 1987 under the “National Parks & Protected Areas Act” 1975. Its boundaries are defined in the National Parks and Protected Areas Act No. 16 of 1975 amended by SRO 54 of 1986. Since its designation, there has been no effective management of the Park or its resources due to conflict of jurisdiction between the Forestry and Fisheries Divisions for management of the marine resources and a lack of human and financial resources to support research and development of the marine section of the national park. The Fisheries Act 61:60 (1987) makes provisions for the establishment and management of marine reserve while the National Parks and Protected Areas Act of 1976 gives jurisdiction to the Forestry and National Parks for the establishment and management of all national parks.

The CNP is located along the northwestern coast of Dominica approximately 2 kilometer from the town of Portsmouth. The peninsular is comprised of twin peaks of extinct volcanoes- the east Cabrits rising to a height of 485 feet (140m) and the west Cabrits rising to 560 feet (171m). An extensive swamp, 35 ha (89 acres) is located east of the Cabrits. Immediately north of the Cabrits peninsula is Douglas Bay. The marine section consists of 1053.2 acres (421 hectares) of sea, located between Prince Rupert’s Bay and Toucarie Bay.

Dry scrub woodland and a freshwater swamp dominate the immediate terrestrial environment of the CNP. The Cabrits swamp consists of 35 ha (89 acres) along the eastern side of the Cabrits peninsula. It is considered to be one of the most important wetlands areas of Dominica “for its assemblage of swamp plants and as a notable migration haunt/ wintering area for herons, egrets, ducks and waders”¹⁷. The swamp vegetation is dominated by sedges- *Cladium jamaicensis*, *Eleocharis* species- *mutatis* and *instincta* and clumps of swamp fern- *Acrosticum aureum* and five species of crabs. The dry scrub woodland is considered one of the most extensive and best examples of this type of forest in Dominica. It covers the east and west Cabrits and is dominated by a variety of deciduous tree species and has one of the highest densities of reptiles recorded anywhere in the world with an abundance of *Anolis*, tree lizards, ground lizards, mabouya/ skinks, iguanas, geckos, boa constrictor and *Alsophis* snakes”. The area is home to the most important populations of butterflies including the endemic Godman’s leaf and the endangered endemic Dominican Snout butterfly. The Cabrits has a wide coastal shelf with large expanses of coral reef on gradual slopes from depths of 3- 25 m reaching up to and exceeding depths of 30 m.¹⁸

¹⁷ Evans

¹⁸ Beard, J.S. The Natural Vegetation of the Windward and Leeward Islands. Clarendon Press (1949)

Sea-grass beds lie towards the shoreline in the south and central areas of Douglas Bay and in the southern half of Toucarie Bay. The marine park also serves as a breeding and feeding ground for a number of seabird species found in the area. Fishing is a family tradition in Cabrits and constitutes a significant source of subsistence to many families living along the coast who practice beach seining and pot fishing for inshore pelagics and long lining and trolling for coastal pelagics.

The **Morne Diablotin National Park** (MDNP) is located at 15° 31' N and 61° 24' W in the North west portion of Dominica falling within the parishes of St. John, St. Andrew, St Peter and St. Joseph. The Park was officially created in January 2000. It is centred on the island's highest peak 4,747 ft (1 422 m). It comprises 8,425 acres of some of the finest and least disturbed rainforest in the insular Caribbean with its elfin woodland and montane thicket that are of regional significance. Several peaks occur within the Park and a deep ravine, the Picard Gorge, runs through the north-west section. Much of the land is steep or prone to landslides yet the Park has tremendous value as a carbon sink and watershed protection including portions of 12 rivers, four of which provide water to domestic, agricultural and industrial users in the north of the island. It is also host to two species of highly endangered parrots the Sisserou or Imperial Parrot, *Amazona imperialis* and the Jaco or red-necked Parrot, *Amazona arausiaca*, and a number of other rare or endemic species including the endemic plants, *Chromolaena impetolaris* and *Chromolaena macrodon* which are only known from Morne Diablotin.

The park has the most sequence of natural moist forest types that occur on the mountainous islands in the Eastern Caribbean. Standardized vegetation plots and census data has ranked this site as having the highest diversity of flora and fauna in Dominica. The entire area of the MDNP is covered with vegetation and there are no settlements in this area. This area is a true representation of the possible forest species occurring in Dominica, with an average of 60 tree species with girth at dbh 1.5 m above ground greater than 10 cm /1000 m²¹⁹. A large number of species, which is restricted to Dominica or the Lesser Antilles, occur in the park, including eleven (11) species of bird, four (4) species of mammals and six (6) species of reptile and amphibians. Though the data on the flora of the park is incomplete, four (4) of the six (6) endemic plant species recorded for Dominica are found in the park.

MDNP has a Visitor Centre with a parking area. There is a short loop trail and viewpoint over the Picard Gorge that runs from the Visitor Centre. Non-resident visitors pay a small entrance fee to the Park. No carrying capacity was established because the Park is not frequented by cruise ship visitors. As a result, no limit on the number of visitors per day has been set.

The **“Soufriere Scott’s Head Marine Reserve”** SSMR, was established to protect the marine resources and to manage multiple users. It was the first marine reserve established in Dominica. It contains both aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. It supports coastal and pelagic fishery, some of the best snorkeling and scuba diving sites in the world, excellent whale watching opportunities and beaches at Soufriere and Scott’s Head for recreational swimming. This marine park was designed to cater for the compatible trends in development without sacrificing the livelihood of the people and ensuring the conservation of a resource, which is unique; as such, the area is divided into priority areas to reduce conflicts that may

¹⁹ Varty N, R. Charles, G. Mendelssohn and D. Williams. Management and Development Plan, 1993-2003, Proposed Morne Diablotin National Park, Commonwealth of Dominica. Forestry and Wildlife Division, Dominica (1993)

arise from multiple uses, to preserve the tradition of fishing in the area and avoid the possible threats of employment displacement²⁰. Major zones include: Fishing Priority Area – part of the marine reserve set aside for fishing purposes only; **Recreation Areas** (Scuba diving, snorkeling and swimming zones) – these areas permit the various activities to take place without threats to fishing boats activities; **Fish Nursery Area** – This is an expanse of marine space set aside for juvenile fish species to grow undisturbed. The area is designated where the presence of juvenile fish has been known to aggregate. Each of these areas are clearly demarcated with buoys to ensure the rights of the respective users within set perimeters simultaneously allowing for different activities to take place in the reserve with the minimum of user conflicts. The diverse nature of the fishing resources represents both demersal and pelagic species. A few naturally occurring wonders such as hot sulphur vents bubble out of the ocean floor with steep sided under slopes which is part of the crater. The slopes are covered with arrays of coral colonies and other flora and fauna all in a single bay with a replica of an old volcanic crater.

A LAMA has been established and empowered under Part III Section 22 (1) and Part II Section 18 and 19 of the Fisheries Act, No. 11 of 1987 to manage the development of the Marine Reserve as a Fishing Priority Area within the reserve.

The LAMA is made up of representatives of the community and Central Government including: Fishermen's organisations of Pointe Michel, Soufriere and Scott's Head, Village Councils of Pointe Michel, Soufriere and Scott's Head, Community Scout Troops of Soufriere, Hospitality Industry entities of Pointe Michel, Soufriere and Scott's Head, Community groups (Scott's Head Improvement Committee), Dominica Water Sports Association, the Fisheries Division and the Dominica Police Service (Marine Section / Coast Guard)

This area is the most popular diving and snorkeling site in Dominica; the Dominica Water sports Association indicated that 2500- 3000 divers visit Dominica yearly. Ninety- five percent (95%) of these divers dive within this area. Frequent sightings of Whale and Dolphins make it a prime area for whale and dolphin watching tours.

Forest Reserves: The Commonwealth of Dominica legislated the protection of its natural forest through a series of legislative Acts and Ordinances. Under the Forest Ordinance of 1958, restrictions were placed on activities such as forest product extraction and hunting within the reserves, however, controlled felling of trees is permitted in Forest reserves. Established in 1951, 410 ha (1013 acres) (4.1 km²) of forest dominated by rainforest with an abundance of gommier/ chatannye' *Dacryodes excelsa/Sloanea sp. Association* was declared as *The Central Forest Reserve*. In 1977 another 8814 ha (21745 acres)/ (54.75 km²) of forest in the north (Northern Forest Reserve) was established principally as a watershed conservation area. It contains The MDNP was carved out of the *Northern Forest reserve*.

Nature Sites

²⁰ Lawrence , N., A. Magloire and H. Giuste. Undated. *Soufriere / Scotts Head Marine Reserve Management Plan. 40 pp. Unpubl.*

The GoCD has designated thirteen (13) sites as ecotourism sites. The designation allows the NPU to manage these sites for revenue purposes. Some of these sites are located within the PA estate and some are on private or community property.

Within the MTNP WHS there are four designated ecotourism sites: Boiling Lake Freshwater Lake, Boeri Lake, Middleham Falls and Morne Trois Pitons Trail. Three additional sites are located in CNP and MDNP. The other five (5) sites are located outside of gazetted PAs.

Where the sites are outside of the gazetted PAs there are no formal management agreements for the NPU, and activities are managed on an ad hoc basis. For all intents and purposes these sites are considered part of the NPs though management of these sites is also not accompanied by dedicated funding, staffing or resource management.

The two most visited sites, Emerald Pool and Trafalgar Falls, are located just outside of MTPNP boundaries. These sites provide 70% of the revenue generated by the PA estate.

There is no formal visitor or resource management plans at any of the thirteen (13) sites, including those within PAs, and all decisions are made on an ad hoc basis. This has led to inconsistent investment planning decisions and resource degradation.

Buffer Zones

In 2011 the Revised Management plan recommended the following proposed buffer zone for the MTPNP WHS consisting of the establishment of a 305m buffer in the northern area of the park in the Pont Casse' areas where approved building development has been granted to land owners. In other areas of the park a 200 m buffer was recommended. These recommendations will be reviewed during project implementation to determine their adequacy and fit to purpose. The project outcome may therefore differ from the 2011 recommendations.

With respect to the Morne Diablotin National park, the proposed buffer zone for the park consists of three sub-zones:

A 500 m buffer of government- owned forest lands of the Northern Forest Reserve along the eastern and southern boundaries;

A 200 m buffer of privately-owned forest lands on rugged terrain within 1km of the northern boundary, and

A 200m buffer of privately- owned agricultural lands within 2 km of the western boundary.

To date neither the management plans or strategies nor the proposed buffer zones have been approved or ratified by government.

ⁱ There are three (3) gazetted National Parks in Dominica, each having its own management arrangement with each at a different stage of development. MTPNP is the largest and most advanced in terms of development, having received World Heritage Status. The 6,872 ha park has a draft management plan but no regulations to support the management plan. The National Parks and Protected Areas Act (1975) speaks to the development of a National Park Service, with a mandate that is assumed to extend to all (terrestrial) PAs in general. However, the NPU's current responsibility lies primarily with the management of nature/recreation sites within the national parks and select sites outside its boundaries. This means that other PAs are managed by other agencies with different standards.

ii

<p>Ratings for Effectiveness, Efficiency, Overall Project Outcome Rating, M&E, IA & EA Execution:</p> <p>6. Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5. Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4. Moderately Satisfactory (MS): moderate shortcomings 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major shortcomings 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe shortcomings</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings:</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1. Not relevant (NR)</p>
<p>Additional ratings where relevant: Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

ⁱⁱⁱ These categories are already mentioned i.e. range among the following:

- The Ministry of Health and the Environment: with the ECU to collaborate and interact with private, public, and civil society stakeholders and stakeholder organizations, external research organizations, and intergovernmental institutions to monitor and report to government and relevant agencies per the requirements of this project and the relevant Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs);
- The Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, including Forestry, Wildlife and Parks Division, the Agriculture Division, and Agricultural Investment Unit: The DFWNP with responsibility for forest management including conservation and sustainable resource use of all Forest Reserves and National Parks in Dominica as well as soil and water conservation, enforcement of forestry, wildlife, and national parks legislation;
- The Fisheries Division, in collaboration with LAMA of the SSMR, will improve capacities and coordinating its activities with the terrestrial PAs;
- The Ministry of Finance: It will authorize the use of funds by this project. The ministry will also play a key role in the development of additional revenue mechanisms for the PAs;
- Ministry of Housing, Lands and Water Resource Management: Responsible for implementing the buffer zones identified as part of this Project and for regulating land uses within these areas based on the project outcomes;

-
- Ministry of Justice, Immigration and National Security: The ministry will be responsible for establishing the legal status of PAs and the development of comprehensive legislation needed for the PA system (PAS);
 - Ministry of Tourism: It sees PAs as a vital component of the country's tourism strategy;
 - Physical Planning: It has responsibility for regulating land uses within the buffer zone;
 - Bureau of Gender Affairs: It will play a key role with DNCW in identifying, ensuring, and monitoring women's participation in project activities;
 - DOWASCO: It will play a key role in protecting water sources in buffer zones and developing PAS mechanisms;
 - DOMLEC: The agency will be jointly responsible for site protection and development;
 - NGOs/CBOs: These organizations will participate in the co-management of the buffer zone of the PAs and in monitoring, evaluation, and implementation of livelihood initiatives, which will also play a key role in the Project's community projects;
 - Private landowners: They will play a role in determining land uses and development practices in the buffer zones;
 - UNESCO: It will also provide technical support to the development of the PAS plan.

^{iv} Prodoc The project was designed to further the objectives of Dominica's plans and policies regarding biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, and climate change mitigation. The NBSAP (2002) for Dominica lays out the country's vision for biodiversity conservation. Two of three goals listed in the NBSAP are directly addressed by the project, namely: "the conservation and sustainable management of Dominica's terrestrial and marine biodiversity to ensure intra- and inter-generational equity" and "the promotion of sound and sustainable agricultural practices and technology within existing agricultural human capital to minimize the loss of agro-biodiversity and reduce vulnerability to desertification, soil loss, and the contamination of water resources." The revised NBSAP (2013–2020) captures the work of the World Heritage Local Entrepreneurship Program (WH-LEEP), which supports community-based entrepreneurs operating around (the Morne Trois Pitons) World Heritage sites and the GEF-SGP community-based initiative "Compact," which supports community-based initiatives to increase the effectiveness of biodiversity conservation of global significance. These initiatives are intended to improve the livelihood of the local populations which serve as custodians of the PA.

The National Action Programme to Combat Land Degradation (2004) had identified specific priorities to strengthen land-use planning and policies and to implement land degradation mitigation measures. In this regard, Dominica has developed Community Vulnerability Atlases for four (4) communities. This project will support the preparation of four additional atlases for La Plaine, Petite Savanne, Pond Casse, and WottenWaven/Trafalgar communities on the border of the proposed buffer zone of the MTPNP. Also, Dominica currently seeks to develop a National Land-Use Plan, which will establish land-use zoning based on environmental and economic criteria to reduce the conversion of suitable agricultural lands to other uses.

Additionally, the project supported objectives of Dominica's sustainable development policies and plans, including the GSPS 2012–2014, in which the Government undertakes to "support the development of buffer zones around the PAs to check future development" and to "ensure environmentally sensitive design principles are applied in any form of development within the PAs and buffer zones." Besides this, the project will support the goals of two national strategies, the Low Carbon Climate Resilient Development Strategy and the SPCR, that were approved by the

Prime Minister and Cabinet in April 2012 to facilitate Dominica's transformation to a low-carbon climate-resilient economy while addressing pressing development, livelihood, and poverty issues confronting the country.

The project has also been instrumental to support Dominica's with its commitments to achieve the Aichi Targets as follows: Targets 5 and 12, by greatly strengthening the effective protection of MTPNP, which encompasses many critical ecosystems and habitats in Dominica; Targets 6 and 8, by reducing the negative impacts of sedimentation, nutrient overloads, and pollution on downstream coastal and marine environments critical for fishing; Target 7, by implementing sustainable agriculture and forestry activities in the PA buffer zone, and Target 14, by preserving ecosystem services (water provision, arable land) within a protected area and its surrounding landscape, which benefit *inter alia* women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.

^v **There are** six areas of GEF's additionality. These are:

- Environmental additionality: The GEF provides a wide range of value-added interventions/services to achieve the Global Environmental Benefits (e.g., CO₂ reduction, reduction/avoidance of POPs emission);
- Legal/regulatory additionality: The GEF helps stakeholders' transformational change to environmentally sustainable legal/regulatory forms;
- Institutional additionality/governance additionality: The GEF provides support to the existing institution to transform in an efficient/sustainable environment manner;
- Financial additionality: The GEF provides an incremental cost, which is associated with transforming a project with national/local benefits into one with global environmental benefits;
- Socioeconomic additionality: The GEF helps a society improve its livelihood and social benefits through GEF activities;
- Innovation additionality: The GEF provides efficient/sustainable technology and knowledge to overcome the existing social norm/barrier/practice for making a bankable project.