



**PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR)
FY 2021**

GEF - IDB

IMPORTANT: The reporting period is GEF Fiscal Year (July 1st, 2020 to June 30th, 2021)

of PIR: 6th (final)

PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Integrated Management of the Yallahs and Hope River Watershed Management Areas Project		
Project's GEF ID:	4454	Project's IDB ID:	JA-G1001
Project financial information:	Date of First Disbursement	03/25/2015	
	Total disbursements of GEF Grant resources as of end of June 30 th , 2021 (cumulative)	US\$ 3,684,822.72	
Project dates:	Agency Approval Date	09/09/2014	
	Effectiveness (Start) Date	10/01/2014	
	Original Last Disbursement Expiration Date ¹ (OED)	10/01/2019	
	Current OED	10/31/2020	
	Estimated Operational Close Date ² (EOC)	01/29/2021	
	Actual Date of EOC, if applicable	Click here to enter text.	
Project evaluation:	Mid-term Date (Expected)	05/28/2018	
	Terminal evaluation Date (Expected)	01/21/2021	

¹ For the GEF, this is equivalent to the project's "Expected Completion Date".

² For the GEF, this is equivalent to the project's "Expected Financial Closure Date".

DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE RATING (DO) & ASSESSMENT

Make an overall assessment and provide a rating³ of “likelihood of achieving project objective” during the period (2020-2021). Describe any significant environmental or other changes attributable to project implementation.

OVERALL (DO) ASSESSMENT	RATING
<p>The Project was successful in achieving 62% of its outcome level indicators. At EOP, 97% of the expected output level results were achieved, as the project met or exceeded most of the planned outputs under its three project components. However, it only achieved 39% of its impact level.</p> <p>There were several delays from the Government for the design of the Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES), which resulted in the project not achieving outcome 2.</p> <p>In 2020, the Government was challenged by the COVID-19 pandemic and, also entered election mode as Election was held on September 3rd, 2020. Consequently, the Government was slow to identify and commit to its preferred/optimal legal and administrative arrangements to implement the PES model, operationally.</p> <p>Owing to the COVID-19 pandemic the PEU was also slow in its reporting on justification of funds resulting in a delay in the CJA closure of accounts and commencement of the Bank’s Project Completion reporting process. Although the project end date was officially October 31, 2020, the Bank experienced delays in receiving timely financial reporting within the stipulated period for project closure reporting. No implementation activities were pursued in 2021.</p>	MS

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING (IP) & ASSESSMENT

Make an assessment and provide ratings⁴ of overall Implementation Progress, including information on progress, challenges and outcomes on project implementation activities from July 1st 2020 until June 30th, 2021. As applicable, please include **information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

OVERALL (IP) ASSESSMENT	RATING
<p>For 2020 until the project’s last disbursement date, the implementation of the project was slow. The COVID-19 pandemic posed some challenges in the implementation of some final planned activities. Coupled with the Government’s preparation for the General Elections and minimal/no action to identify and commit to its preferred optimal legal and</p>	MS

³ See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

⁴ See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

administrative arrangements for its operationalization, implementation of the PES design was not achieved.

Component 1 - Institutional strengthening and capacity building for incrementing biodiversity into watershed management.

Four of six Component 1 outputs were successfully completed. The project worked with its five partner agencies and several independent consultants to implement activities designed to address some institutional weaknesses and implementing policies that support a more cohesive management in the WMUs and data gathering.

Amongst the outputs that have been achieved were the collection of socio-physical, geomorphological and hydro meteorological data for the watersheds including the equipping of hydrometeorological stations and the development of a Geographic Information (decision support) system.

Component 2 - Creating economic and financial incentives to support sustainable biodiversity and watershed management.

For Component 2, completed outputs include the valuation of ecological services and the successful completion of the PES system design supported by two technical assessments to value the WMUs' resources and two PES knowledge exchanges with Costa Rica and Mexico.

Component 3 - Implementing sustainable livelihoods, agriculture and forestry in watershed communities.

For Component 3, the project met and exceeded 87% of its EOP targets with the completion of one of two KAPB studies. The delivery and monitoring of a comprehensive field school extension program increased farmers' technical knowledge and led the adoption of GAP and SLM best practices. There were over 5,000 stakeholders in the WMUs who benefited from one or more of the project's interventions.

Component 4 – Management, Monitoring and Evaluation, and Audit.

For Component 4, outputs relating to project management, evaluation, and audits were satisfactorily met. The identification, commitment and strategic policy level decision making required to enable preferred/optimal legal and administrative arrangements to materialize/implement the PES model on an operational basis did not materialize.

RISK RATING & ASSESSMENT

Make any adjustments necessary to the assessment ratings⁵ of overall Project Risk⁶ that you provided in the last PIR (2019-2020). Please include details and remedial measures for High and Substantial Risks, specifying who will be responsible for these measures.

OVERALL RATING FOR PROJECT RISK	RATING
<p>Overall, the project risk rating was High.</p> <p>The rating for previous reporting period was Moderate (M). For fiscal year 2020-2021, the team highlighted 8 risks all being classified as High-Level risks.</p> <p>The high-level risks related mainly to the fact that the project is challenged with periodic delays in delivery of project deliverables by consultants and the timely provision of input data from Government of Jamaica sister agencies in support of the deliverables to be generated by the consultants. There was also the need to support major capacity building and inter-institutional collaboration for the PES scheme. To better manage and mitigate these risks the Project Manager:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Held frequent meetings with contracted consultants to assess status and constraints, and b) Pre-requested data and improved coordination amongst GOJ sister agencies for data provision. <p>Additionally, assessed as a high-level risk, were the lengthy approval times related to the Ministry of Finance’s appraisal and filtering of disbursement and draw-down requests in the context of available fiscal space; the GOJ agencies not working together as anticipated and, failure of the farmers to adopt the proposed technologies.</p>	<p>H</p>

GENDER

Please add information on any progress, challenges and outcomes with regards to any and all gender-responsive measures that were undertaken in the project’s activities during the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year. Also: Were indicators on gender equality and women’s empowerment incorporated in the project’s results framework? (Yes/No). If applicable, include the indicator with its baseline, target and current value (2020-2021).

No.
 However, during project implementation the Socio-Economic Assessment conducted in 2020, found that within the Yallahs Hope watershed there was a 66% to 34% male to female involvement in agriculture (271 to 139). This ratio is similar to the national pattern. Farmer field school sessions had a significant 40% (161) female participation.

⁵ See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

⁶ These should include risks identified at CEO Endorsement AND any new risks identified during implementation.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Please add information on any progress, challenges and outcomes with regards to stakeholder engagement, based on the project's activities during its implementation through the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year. As applicable, please include **information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

For this year the project was in its final stage so there was very little stakeholder engagement activities. 60 people from two WMUs were trained in IWRM and biodiversity information management.

There was also an administrative training with 28 participants on July 16, 2020, and end-user training with 53 participants on July 30, 2020. Additional stakeholder engagement occurred in the form of interviews conducted by the final evaluation consultant.

KNOWLEDGE

Please add information on knowledge activities and products developed in relation to the project (with GEF or non-GEF resources), with special emphasis on activities carried out during the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year. As applicable, please include **information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

For this reporting period the project was in closing stage. The closing ceremony was held on January 14, 2021 and streamed live on YouTube. The video is still accessible and serves as a final information dissemination method on the project activities and achievements.

Closing Ceremony streamed on January 14, 2021 - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S9BJBuXEdyo>

PROJECT MODIFICATIONS

Please report any significant modifications made to the project design since July 1st, 2020. (The basis for comparison is the Project Results Framework Matrix included in the original Request for CEO Endorsement Document.) This should be based on the Project Results Framework Matrix included in the original Request for CEO Endorsement Document.

CHANGE MADE TO	YES/NO	DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE AND EXPLANATION
Objective	No	
Outcome	No	
Output/Activities	No	
Other	NO	

Has the project been granted any extension or other modification covered by the OA-420 from July 1st, 2020, until June 30th, 2021? If yes, please explain below. As applicable, please include **information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

The project was not extended beyond the additional year of extension to October 2020 that was granted to its original scheduled conclusion in October 2019.

LESSONS LEARNED / BEST PRACTICES

If the project generated any lessons learned or best practices during the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year, please provide a short description. As applicable, please include **information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

TOPIC/THEME	LESSONS
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For design of IWRM projects, particularly those that are complex and testing novel approaches, it is important to balance project complexity and host country's absorptive capacity. Equally ensure that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Project support includes a good mix of local and international expertise that balance technical know-how and local context and underpinnings. ii. Targets are carefully set in design to allow for the country to move beyond the business as usual, but without being overly ambitious, which can lead to underperformance.

TOPIC/THEME	LESSONS
<p>Design</p>	<p>iii. The remit and capacity of project partners are considered when establishing project targets and early and targeted capacity building (e.g., knowledge exchange programmes) provisioned to address gaps.</p>
	<p>2. A strong participatory process is required for project design that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Involves key partners in all aspects of design. ii. Obtains consensus on final design elements for the project, and iii. leads to agreement on identified stakeholders' roles and responsibilities. <p>This will allow for identification of capacity gaps and needs; building capacity of partners in the different facets of the project; minimizing duplication of efforts; building ownership of project activities and creating commitment to achieving project results.</p>
<p>Pre-Implementation</p>	<p>3. A pre-implementation phase/ period that is targeted and maximized is essential for successful delivery of IWRM projects, particularly for multi-year and multi-partner projects. This phase should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Meeting special terms and conditions of the financing agreement. ii. EA readiness activities for project, including onboarding of full complement of PEU staff. iii. Knowledge transfer from design stage. iv. Planning meetings with stakeholders to finalize activity sequencing, work plans and other critical project elements; and v. Preparation of project procurement documents for works, services and goods, with input from key stakeholders.
	<p>4. EA, PEU (and project partners) must be aware of the (relevant) terms, conditions and requirements of the project/financing agreement in order to adequately structure and align project plans.</p>
	<p>5. In order to minimize administrative challenges during project implementation, inter and intra agency process flows must be well-established. Preparation for project implementation and readiness are key to strong performance. Internal coordination of EA units that will support the PEU is essential and should be well planned prior to project start-up. This should include definition of all process flows and communication channels in preparatory work.</p>
	<p>6. Where there is significant time lag between project design and implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ It is important that all design elements (operational and technical) transition into, and be used to inform, implementation. Project design documentation should be reshared and project partners re-engaged prior to project start-up to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. All assumptions still hold true, and any identified deviations addressed. ii. Stakeholders are reminded of their commitments and can begin to plan for same (i.e., include in their annual work programmes, based on joint planning with the EA); and

TOPIC/THEME	LESSONS
	<p>iii. Gaps (on account of staff turnover or otherwise) are addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Planned activities, timelines and costs should be reassessed at start-up and measures put in place to address any identified gaps, with donor approval, while adhering to project logic.
<p>Implementation</p>	<p>7. The PEU and EA should have a good understanding of the project's intervention logic, as this is a fundamental requirement for ensuring the logical sequencing of project activities to achieve the PDO, especially for an integrated, coordinated project.</p> <p>The EA and PEU should guide project partners in their understanding of the project's intervention logic and help them to be aware of how their activities contribute to the PDO and performance against the RM.</p>
	<p>8. Tracking of project performance (e.g., via an "at-a-glance" project performance dashboard) and the use of a control/trigger system will allow oversight units, structures, and entities, internal and external to the EA, to quickly determine the state of project execution and identify and implement remedial actions as needed.</p> <p>The tracking and trigger system should form part of the project's integrated risk and issue management processes that allow for project risks and issues to be addressed in a timely manner.</p>
	<p>9. M&E is critical for determining project performance and supporting decision making within the project context. Any delays in establishing baselines for project interventions (e.g., farmers' knowledge) can limit the project's ability to establish attribution to outcomes.</p> <p>M&E capacity gaps should be identified early and addressed and where there is an absence of key baselines prior to interventions, other methods to assess the effectiveness of the interventions should be identified and implemented.</p>
<p>Watershed Management</p>	<p>10. Watershed management cannot be solely projectized but needs to have a long-term programmatic approach given the importance and value of watersheds to the environment and people of Jamaica. Sustained action to maintain and improve watersheds and secure ecosystems health requires commitment of all stakeholders and government support for sustained financing that is complementary to any other long-term financing mechanisms established.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The EA, in conjunction with the PEU, should lead on ensuring project activities, outputs and outcomes form part of this programmatic approach and do not come to an end after project closure. ➤ PES, as a mechanism for sustainable financing for watershed management requires serious ownership (staff time, training etc.) and joint effort by a diverse and coordinated set of stakeholders, working at the legislative, policy, planning, regulatory, implementation and monitoring levels for seamless execution. ➤ Project partners must consider critical elements of land use, land tenure, contracts etc., for which actions can be bureaucratic. Public

TOPIC/THEME	LESSONS
	<p>education and sensitization will also be critical. For continuity, there must be a clear roadmap and plan, with roles and responsibilities of partner agencies well defined, a framework and adequate infrastructure and a robust Secretariat to coordinate and manage the initiative.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Having a high-level champion that understands clearly and can pull the pieces together, and hold entities accountable, is desirable.
	<p>11. The Y-H Project experience in its attempt to establish sustainable financing mechanism for IWRM using the PES, underscores the need for continued investment in sustainable financing mechanisms that create incentives for the range of stakeholders.</p>
	<p>BEST PRACTICES</p>
<p>Project Management</p>	<p>1. A multi-agency project is reflective of true partnership, which needs to be identified in the structures and processes utilized. This approach requires a shift from top-down to more inclusive, participatory engagement of key partners, built on trust. MOUs/PAs serve as a visible commitment by stakeholders but for execution, use of contracts is more effective and allows for flexibility in the use of partner established processes for execution.</p>
	<p>2. Direct alignment of project activities with agencies' mandate builds ownership and commitment and increases the likelihood for smooth implementation. Mainstreaming of project activities in implementing partners' work plans results in greater levels of buy-in and support for project activities, including deployment of personnel and resources.</p>
	<p>3. Project flexibility to undertake budget transfers that allow for savings in one area to be applied to enhance or support other areas that are underfunded.</p>
	<p>4. The use of structures such as the PSC and TWG to provide oversight, technical support and coordination of key implementing agencies to the project.</p>
	<p>5. Utilization of partner strengths in project design and implementation. E.g., for RADA, the following strengths were leveraged in support of the project: Relationship with the farmers; Technical capacity built in land husbandry and FFS extension delivery; The internal capacity of the RADA Project's units; Existing relationships with suppliers (e.g., tree crop nurseries).</p>
	<p>6. Obtaining commitment letters from partners during design is useful for establishing and providing a basis for reengagement once the project is approved.</p>
	<p>7. A multi-stakeholder approach to watershed management allows for access to partners' capacity for more effective activity implementation. It also provides opportunities for joint planning, implementation, data and information sharing and leveraging limited resources.</p>
	<p>8. Access to partners' internal resources (tools, personnel) enhances project delivery and can result in time and cost savings.</p>
	<p>9. Data and information sharing supports robust decision making, helps to advance activity implementation, and ultimately builds trust.</p>

TOPIC/THEME	LESSONS
<p>Watershed Management</p>	<p>10. Flexibility in activity scheduling to meet participants' needs allow for greater participation (e.g., scheduling sessions to accommodate competing activities).</p>
	<p>11. Learner-centered practical application methodologies are essential to knowledge transfer and behavior change for IWRM.</p>
	<p>12. An integrated approach to watershed management that incorporates environmental, social, institutional and financial elements can over time secure the desired environmental benefits.</p>
	<p>13. The use of farmer-to-farmer assistance ("Day-for-Day" or "Field Days") facilitates adoption of innovations by individual farmers and ensures accuracy in their replication of innovations</p>
	<p>14. Joint/Combined field visits by implementing agencies and a mix of group and one on one interaction with community persons during those visits. These helped to build trust and improved working relationships.</p>
	<p>15. Use of community persons to conduct surveys/collect data. This was an especially useful measure in response to restrictions linked to the COVID-19 pandemic.</p>

ANNEX 1. DEFINITION OF RATINGS

Development Objective Ratings

1. **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
2. **Satisfactory (S):** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
3. **Marginally Satisfactory (MS):** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
4. **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):** Project is expected to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives.
5. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
6. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Implementation Progress Ratings

1. **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of **all** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
2. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of **most** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action.
3. **Marginally Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of **some** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with **some** components requiring remedial action.
4. **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of **some** components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with **most** components requiring remedial action.
5. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of **most** components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
6. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of **none** of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk ratings

Risk ratings will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risks of projects should be rated on the following scale:

1. **High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
2. **Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
3. **Modest Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.
4. **Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.