

---

**Capacity Building in and Mainstreaming of  
Sustainable Land Management in Barbados  
GEF Medium-Sized Project**

**(PIMS 3408 – Atlas ID 00046566)**

**Terminal Evaluation Report**

**17 September, 2013**

**Elena Laura Ferretti  
Independent Consultant**

## **Acknowledgements**

The Consultant would like to express his appreciation and gratitude to all those who gave their time and provided invaluable information during the Terminal Evaluation of the GEF Barbados Sustainable Land Management Project; their thoughts and opinions have informed the evaluation and contributed to its successful conclusion.

Special thanks go to those in the national government and in the UNDP Country Office who provided their time to the Consultant notwithstanding the very busy moment in which they found themselves for the concomitant event of the Third SIDS Global Inter-Regional Conference, in Bridgetown.

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....  | 4         |
| I Project Summary Table .....  | 4         |
| II Project Description and Design .....  | 4         |
| III Summary of Conclusions .....   | 5         |
| IV Recommendations .....   | 8         |
| V Lessons Learnt .....   | 8         |
| 1. INTRODUCTION .....  | 10        |
| 1.1 Purpose of the evaluation .....  | 10        |
| 1.2 Scope and methodology .....  | 10        |
| 1.2.1 Limitations and elements of attention .....  | 11        |
| 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT .....   | 12        |
| 2.1 Description of the project .....   | 12        |
| 2.2 Basic environmental and socio-economic background .....  | 12        |
| 2.3 The BAR SLM Project policy and legislative framework and main stakeholders .....                 | 13        |
| 3. FINDINGS .....  | 16        |
| 3.1 Project Design / Formulation .....   | 16        |
| 3.1.1 Project logic and strategy .....   | 16        |
| 3.1.2 The management of risk .....   | 17        |
| 3.1.3 Stakeholder involvement and Project Management Arrangements .....                              | 18        |
| 3.2 Project Implementation .....   | 19        |
| 3.2.1 Implementation approach and adaptive management .....  | 19        |
| 3.2.2 Financial planning and expenditures .....  | 19        |
| 3.2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation and Communication (*) Rating: MU .....                               | 21        |
| 3.2.4 UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation (*) and coordination Rating: MS .....             | 22        |
| 3.3 Project Results .....  | 22        |
| 3.3.1 Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*) Rating: MU .....                                | 22        |
| 3.3.2 Relevance(*) Rating: R .....   | 22        |
| 3.3.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency (*) Rating: Effectiveness: MU .....                               | 24        |
| 3.3.3.1 Cross-cutting areas .....  | 28        |
| 3.3.4 Stakeholders participation and country ownership .....   | 29        |
| 3.3.5 Sustainability (*) Rating: ML .....  | 29        |
| 3.3.7 Impact .....   | 29        |
| 4. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS .....  | 31        |
| 4.1 Recommendations .....  | 31        |
| 4.2 Lessons learnt .....   | 31        |
| <b>Annex A – Terms of Reference .....</b>  | <b>33</b> |
| <b>Annex B – Document consulted/available for consultation .....</b>                                 | <b>34</b> |
| <b>Annex C – Evaluation Questions .....</b>  | <b>35</b> |
| <b>Annex D - Tentative schedule, Itinerary and institutions/people to meet: Aug Sept. 2013 .....</b> | <b>41</b> |
| <b>Annex E – BAR SLM Project Logical Framework, July 2012 Inception Report .....</b>                 | <b>42</b> |
| <b>Annex F – Rating Table .....</b>  | <b>46</b> |
| <b>Annex G – Rating Table Barbados based on the revised Logframe July 2012 .....</b>                 | <b>47</b> |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The present Report constitutes the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Barbados GEF Sustainable Land Management Project (BAR SLM Project), an initiative to mainstream SLM into policies and regulatory framework by strengthening capacities for land management and for decision-making. The TE took place in August-September 2013 with 14 days field mission, covering both Barbados and Dominica (out of which XX days in Barbados). The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can improve their sustainability as well as aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP/GEF programming. It also identifies lessons for other conservation projects in the area and elsewhere.

The evaluation approach utilises the five standards evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact) with minor emphasis on efficiency as dictated by the evaluation stage (terminal evaluation) and impact due to the Project having achievement only a few outputs. The detailed approach is described below in chapter 1.2 and in the Inception Report prepared before the evaluation mission.

### I Project Summary Table

|                          |   |  |                                      |                                     |
|--------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Project Title:           | Capacity Building in and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Barbados |  |                                      |                                     |
| GEF Project ID:          | PIMS 3408   |  | <i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i> | <i>at completion (Million US\$)</i> |
| UNDP Project ID:         | 00046566  | GEF financing:                         | 485,000                              | <b>381,709</b>                      |
| Country:                 | Barbados  | IA/EA own:                             | IA :                                 | IA :                                |
| Region:                  | LAC   | Government:                            | 543,717                              |                                     |
| Focal Area:              | Land Degradation  | Other:                                 | 209,600                              |                                     |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP):  | OP 15 SP1   | Total co-financing:                    | 753,317                              |                                     |
| Executing Agency:        | UNDP  | Total Project Cost:                    | 1,238,317                            |                                     |
| Other Partners involved: | Ministry of Environment and Drainage  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): |                                      | 21 November 2008                    |
|                          |   | (Operational) Closing Date:            | Proposed: 30/11/2010                 | Actual: 30/06/ 2012                 |

### II Project Description and Design

The purpose of the Project was to *build capacity for sustainable land management within relevant government agencies, the private sector, non-governmental and civil society organizations, and to ensure that the practice of SLM is institutionalized within national development planning processes, programmes and strategies*. Planning was articulated into 5 outcomes which remained unchanged after the revision of planning in 2011; the new Logframe is a sound operational tool in terms of activities stemming logically from outputs and outcomes but the workplan was unrealistic with relation to the timeframe. Implementation has effectively been characterized by a continuous cancellation of activities as at the beginning of 2012 it appeared clear that most actions were not implementable.

Designed between 2005 and 2006, under a Project Development Facility (PDF A) grant from the GEF, the Project was fully in line with GEF OP#15 and in particular with SP1 Capacity Development as well as consistent with UNDP UNDAF and Country Programme's objectives; it was expected to generate substantial national benefits as well as global benefits directly and indirectly by contributing to reduce global trends in land degradation. The Project was very relevant also in consideration of national planning objectives. UNDP was the GEF implementing agency while the Project was Government executed through the Ministry of Environment and Drainage (MED).

The project budget amounted to US\$1,238,317 of which US\$500,000 by GEF (including the amount spent for PDF A), US\$543,717 from Government plus US\$209,600 from other partners' co-financing. It was approved in 2008 for an initial duration of 3 years, then extended until August 2012. During this period, the legal, policy and institutional context for land and natural resources management has not been significantly modified. The policies guiding development remain the National Development Plan 2005-2025, the Barbados Sustainable Development Policy and the Physical Development Plan. At the sectoral level, the outputs of the 1998 Environmental Management and Land Use Planning study still orient planning and implementation of line agencies. The Ministry of Environment has been re-organized to currently include also the Drainage Unit and the Waste Management and Sewage Unit.

### III Summary of Conclusions

**Table N.1 Evaluation Rating Table**

| <b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>                    |               |   |
|---|---------------|---|
| <b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>           | <i>rating</i> | <b>Comments</b>   |
| M&E design at entry                           | MS            | The original M&E design was well detailed but overly complex with too many outputs and indicators. Planning was revised in 2011, when the Project finally started after three years delay. The new Logframe is a sound operational tool on paper but unrealistic in relation to the timeframe available for implementation. Effectively many activities were further cut down in 2012 when it became apparent that time and resources would not have allowed implementation of envisaged activities.  |
| M&E Plan Implementation                       | MU            | A formal mechanism for M&E has not been established. The continual elimination of activities has led to the almost impossible task of measuring performance indicators and targets. The management of risk has been overlooked. Steering Committee (PSC) meetings were characterised by long discussions about the activities to be executed; reaching consensus was not always an easy task.   |
| Overall quality of M&E                        | MU            | Reporting is limited to requirements and appears more a formality than a real monitoring exercise. Activities have been monitored but without any real measurement of performance indicators and targets; in any case, progress has always been too limited to allow an in-depth analysis. Awareness level surveys were planned; yet, the KAP survey implemented is not a monitoring tool but an instrument to provide information on the general attitude of the wider public towards SLM and the environment in general.  |
| <b>2 IA&amp; EA Execution</b>                 | <i>rating</i> | <b>Comments</b>   |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation                | MS            | UNDP played a supportive and facilitating role to the Project in addition to supervising progress and the management of funds. In 2008-2009, UNDP promoted meetings with the national authorities to have the Project started but difficulties remained: activities started only in 2011 when the GEF implementing agency informed that projects with very low delivery rates will require immediate closure. During the last period of implementation, delays further materialised in the transfer of GEF funds from UNDP to the Project; this was apparently due to the inability of management to prove expenditure for at least 80% of the previous advance in order to be able to request a new one. |
| Quality of Execution - Executing Agency       | MU            | Project execution lagged behind until 2011 until it was evident that funds would have been lost. Planning revised in 2011 was logically articulating outputs and activities but was unrealistic with respect to the timeframe. Only the last 6 months of implementation were effective but it was too late to produce outputs that could translate into impact. Only a few demonstration activities and three in-depth studies/strategies were developed, without the possibility to implement them.  |
| Overall quality of Implementation / Execution | MU            | Overall implementation is rated as moderately unsatisfactory due to the long delay with which the Project started and other inefficiencies which occurred since its effective implementation after 2011. Although a few significant outputs have been produced, they remain at the level of studies and none of their recommendations could be implemented; GEF funds have not been utilised in an instrumental way to reach a transformational change in the legal, institutional or development context.  |
| <b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>              | <i>rating</i> | <b>Comments</b>   |

|   |               |  |
|---|---------------|--|
| Relevance                               | R             | A highly relevant initiative through all its project cycle. The Project was perfectly in line with GEF and UNDP Country Programme's objectives at project start as it is today. Relevance to national priorities is also undeniable.   |
| Effectiveness                           | MU            | Studies and strategies have been developed for the communication, GIS and Institutional Review components; none of them have reached the stage of implementation. One year after Project closure, although interest is confirmed during interviews, there is no evidence that the recommendations of these studies are being integrated into the ministries' work programmes. A few demonstration activities have been implemented with some degree of success. The legal, institutional and policy framework has not significantly changed in the last years according to a new vision for SLM which still needs to be developed and championed among stakeholders. |
| Efficiency                              | HU            | Definitely not an efficient project; long delays affected the initial start of activities and inefficiencies occurred even during the effective period of implementation. Credit must be given to the leadership assumed by MED during the last 6 months; it was however too late to recuperate time lost and a significant portion of GEF funds remained unspent. The co-financing budget has not been managed appropriately. Financial management was accurate and the audit identified only minor inaccuracies.   |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating          | U             | Overall the BAR SLM Project has produced a few noteworthy outputs but with an insignificant effect on outcomes. Unfortunately, despite its relevance and potential, it has basically been a lost occasion to effectively produce an enhanced dialogue among SLM stakeholders, mainstream SLM elements into the development policy and in regulatory frameworks, defining clear roles and mandates for an effective mechanism of inter-agency coordination and bring a transformational change in the policy and framework to produce, exchange and use data for planning.  |
| <b>4. Sustainability</b>                | <b>rating</b> | <b>Comments</b>  |
| Financial resources:                    | MU            | Within the present conditions, financial sustainability is uncertain; no steps have been taken in the last year since project closure to finance and implement any of the recommendations made in the three studies. Recently announced measures to face fiscal imbalances are likely to result in cuts in Government spending.  |
| Socio-political:                        | ML            | Collected information does not allow evaluation of the appreciation of ultimate beneficiaries with relation to the products delivered by the Project. However the recommendations contained in the three studies are likely to be well received.   |
| Institutional framework and governance: | ML            | At the technical level, most of the findings of the studies and the recommendations done are shared. The GIS Working Group members well understand the importance to share data and generally agree with the proposal to establish a centralised database. There is the need to provide adequate information to the decision-making level about the efficacy and effectiveness of data sharing for land use planning and management.   |
| Environmental :                         | L             | The demonstration activities done are best practices for land and water management. The implementation of the recommendations of the three studies would certainly support environmental sustainability.   |
| Overall likelihood of sustainability:   | ML            | Sustainability highly depends on the willingness of the various agencies to integrate the findings and recommendations of the reviews done into their work programmes.   |

*Rating for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E; I&E Execution:* HS: Highly Satisfactory; S: Satisfactory; MS: Moderately Satisfactory; MU: Moderately Unsatisfactory; U: Unsatisfactory; HU: Highly Unsatisfactory.

*Rating for Sustainability:* L: Likely; ML: Moderately likely; MU: Moderately Unlikely; U: Unlikely

### **Adaptive Management.**

Overall management proved to have difficulties in working with time and budget constraints, complex GEF/UNDP administrative rules and the high level of Government bureaucracy. Management appears to have been insufficiently efficient and realistic in adapting implementation to what was feasible; inefficiencies in setting up the minimum conditions for management (office space, recruitment of administrative staff) and in selecting consultants added up. Activities were progressively withdrawn from the already revised planning of 2011 (there is no documented evidence of UNDP approval unless the FACE

Forms with which advances were requested are taken as a request for endorsement); the result is that only a few demonstrative actions and three studies can be evaluated as outputs but without the possibility to implement any of the recommendations made. The audit undertaken in June 2013 evidenced only minor inaccuracies in **Financial Management**; the major problem has been the incapacity of the Project to take full advantage of GEF funds as a considerable amount remained unspent and will be returned to GEF. Difficulties were registered during the final phase of the implementation in receiving requested funds from UNDP; UNDP was unable to proceed to an advance until the Project could prove to have spent at least 80% of the previous one.

**Results.** Project activities started far too late even with relation to the revised 2011 planning; consequently both the budget and workplan were significantly cut down. Nonetheless a few demonstration activities (the introduction of the row cover technology, the rain garden for water and land management, educational activities), and specific outputs have been developed and are likely to produce future impacts if integrated into the work programmes of agencies, financed and implemented. At present, the situation does not look bright: one year from Project closure, no concrete steps have been taken to follow up on the recommendations of the three studies developed (Communication and Dissemination of Information, GIS and Institutional Review of the Soil Conservation Unit); in addition, recently announced national measures to address fiscal imbalances may jeopardize the availability of financial resources. Yet, Project management should have developed an exit strategy identifying all measures that could already be implemented without a major allocation of funds, among others the sustainability of the GIS Working Group (the Consultant offered to continue leading it at no cost) or the discussion of measures to strengthen the SCU; one year has elapsed from Project closure and there is no evidence of any of these activities to be implemented.

Processes have been initiated demonstrating the efficacy and effectiveness for the various government agencies to share data for planning purposes. This is well established in the development thinking of technical staff but has still to be assumed by the decision-making level to allow a long needed centralized database to be implemented. Inter-agency collaboration for a possible future Land Information System has been fostered. Problems are not of a technical nature; standardisation may be an issue but not the most important one; only awareness and commitment from decision makers may free human (a dedicated group) and financial (to set up the hardware and software needed for a centralised database connected as a clearing house) resources. Data creation and data entry would also be critical issues to consider.

The institutional review of SCU evidences the need to urgently upgrade the agency to be able to respond to current and emerging issues in SLM. Years ago there were plans to strengthen the role of the **SCU** by making it a Scotland District Authority, provide for a fiscal system favouring the development of the Scotland District and make the area a National Park. The audit suggests that some of these ideas should be recuperated. The review also evidences that there is no major need to enact new laws or formulate new policies but to make the appropriate amendments to those existing to encourage their implementation. At the same time the technical capacities of staff require upgrading both in technical, managerial and information technology areas.

Data collected suggest that the legal/institutional/policy framework for SLM has not changed significantly during the years; the highly fragmented nature of the institutional structure continues to be a significant challenge for integrated planning and coordinated management. A new vision for SLM has not been developed. Inter-agency collaboration and coordination has improved but is not formalized; the Land Degradation Committee is functioning as the inter-agency mechanism for collaboration and coordination but it does not have the legal mandate to oversee agencies' activities; land planning and management largely remain sector-driven. Nonetheless, stakeholders report that the mainstreaming of SLM is practically occurring at the technical level through the adoption of best practices; the need to reflect this into legal instruments is not particularly felt.

## **IV Recommendations**

### **R.1 Ensure further investment in Capacity Development**

Capacity development needs are still identified at different levels: i) for line ministries at the technical level to further increase GIS and planning capacities and ensuring standardisation and sharing of data; ii) at decision-making level to ensure the importance of data sharing is well understood and results in support for the setting up of a centralised database; iii) to upgrade the technical, managerial and IT skills of human resources at SCU.

### **R.2 Sustain the private-public relationship.**

Barbados has a well developed private sector. Activities identified in the communication strategy should be utilised to ensure the sector is taken on board to become a real partner in development.

### **R.3 Ensure a centralised database and GIS is set up**

GIS activities developed should be urgently sustained; the offer of the GIS Consultant to continue to lead the GIS Working Group should not be overlooked and momentum should seek to be regained. The enthusiasm and understanding of the technical level should be transmitted to the decision making level.

### **R.4 Ensure results from the three studies are integrated in agencies' work programmes**

The three studies/review undertaken produced sound analyses and sets of recommendations. These should not remain documents in a shelf otherwise the investment will be lost; some of the recommendations require the allocation of funds but others can be already integrated in the work programmes of agencies.

## **V Lessons Learnt**

### **L.1 Government endorsement of a project does not necessarily mean readiness to implement**

Support and commitment is required at all levels to ensure a project can be readily implemented; a project of this nature assigned to the political level of a ministry requires the buying-in of line ministries; possibly this would have avoided the long delay in starting the implementation. Political support is required through all the project cycle; changes in government officers at both higher and/or middle management levels may result in different conservation priorities; commitment from line ministries could help.

### **L.2 Adaptive Management and planning.**

Planning must be realistic in relation to time and financial resources. The Consultant believes that the 2011 planning was a compromise between what was feasible and the need to not alter significantly the original project design; if an attempt to redesign the project was not an option given the lengthy process of approval that it would have entailed, more realistic indicators were to be selected and the revised planning should have been accompanied by a list of pre-conditions for implementation: among others, the prompt availability of office space, staff and an immediately functional PSC would have made the difference in this project. The result was an unfeasible workplan as achievements obtained have demonstrated. Usual government bureaucracy and the tight timeframe should have suggested the identification of a well sought strategy for the management of risk.

### **L.3 Sound built-in exit strategies.**

An exit strategy is always suggested, even more when the project has only reached the level of studies/recommendations without the possibility to implement them. Management should have developed a sound exit strategy identifying measures by their importance and urgency, their priority for the sector as well as those requiring an allocation of resources and those which could already be integrated into the agencies' work programmes.



## Acronyms

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| BWA            | Barbados Water Authority  |
| CERMES         | Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies                |
| CO             | Country Office  |
| CZMU           | Coastal Zone Management Unit  |
| EMLUP          | Environmental Management and Land Use Project                           |
| ENRMP          | Environmental and Natural Resources Management Plan                     |
| EoP            | End of Project  |
| GEF            | Global Environment Facility   |
| GIS            | Geographic Information System   |
| GM             | Global Mechanism  |
| LIS (or LRIS)  | Land Information System (Land Resource Information System)              |
| M&E            | Monitoring & Evaluation   |
| MEA            | Multi-lateral Environment Agreement                                     |
| MED            | Ministry of Environment and Drainage                                    |
| MoA (MoAFFWRM) | Ministry of Agriculture, Food, Fisheries and Water Resources Management |
| MoF            | Ministry of Finance   |
| MSP            | Medium-Sized Project  |
| MTE            | Mid-Term Evaluation   |
| MTW            | Ministry of Transport and Works   |
| NAP            | National Action Plan  |
| NBSAP          | National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan                          |
| NCC            | National Conservation Commission  |
| NCSA           | National Capacity Self-Assessment                                       |
| NCSDD          | National Commission on Sustainable Development                          |
| NGO            | Non-Governmental Organisation   |
| NHD            | National Heritage Department  |
| NSP            | National Strategic Plan   |
| NPD            | National Project Director   |
| OECS           | Organization of Eastern Caribbean States                                |
| PDF            | Project Development Facility  |
| PDP            | Physical Development Plan   |
| PIR            | Project Implementation Review   |
| PMU            | Project Management Unit   |
| PS             | Permanent Secretary   |
| PSC            | Project Steering Committee  |
| SCU            | Soil Conservation Unit  |
| SDAP           | Sustainable Development Policy (and Action Plan)                        |
| SIDS           | Small Island Developing States  |
| SLM            | Sustainable Land Management   |
| TE             | Terminal Evaluation   |
| TCDPO          | Town and Country Development Planning Office                            |
| ToR            | Terms of Reference  |
| UNCBD          | United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity                       |
| UNCCD          | United Nations Convention to Combat Drought and Desertification         |
| UNDP           | United Nations Development Programme                                    |
| UNEP           | United Nations Environment Programme                                    |
| UNFCCC         | United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change                   |

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### **1.1 Purpose of the evaluation**

---

The “Capacity Building in and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Barbados (BAR SLM Project) is an initiative to support sustainable land management in Barbados. The project is subject to a Terminal Evaluation (TE) under UNDP and GEF Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures.

The present report constitutes the TE of the Project and has been elaborated by the independent consultant Elena Laura Ferretti in August-September 2013. The TE has been conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects<sup>1</sup> and the ToR ([Annex A](#)). It entailed a very dedicated home-based preparation period, one week in Barbados and a final reporting period; the final report has been submitted mid-September 2013.

The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can improve their sustainability as well as aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP/GEF programming. Where possible, it also identifies lessons for other similar projects in the Barbados and the OECS and elsewhere.

As required by UNDP/GEF and generally used in international evaluations, the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact apply; the nature of the project makes mainstreaming fundamentally relevant. Evaluations questions were drafted during the inception phase, according to these criteria and based on the questions already suggested in the TOR.

### **1.2 Scope and methodology**

---

The TE aimed at collecting and analyzing data in as much as possible systematic manner to ensure that all the findings, conclusions and recommendations are substantiated by evidence.

The rationale of the Consultant’s approach included: i) a qualitative evaluation based on the collection of primarily secondary data, documents and information analysis, Logframe and M&E system analysis supplemented by interviews to relevant stakeholders and the participant observation; ii) an analysis based on the five standard evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact plus mainstreaming) but with greater emphasis on relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability included mainstreaming: while efficiency is less relevant considering that the Project has concluded activities almost one year ago, impact cannot be appreciated given the stage of development the Project reached; iii) evaluation findings assessed at national level; iv) search for key informants; v) a well prepared desk phase, considered key to the success of the mission; vii) respect of the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System. The approach developed in four phases:

- a) Preparation Phase: a home-based desk review of basic documentation and literature ([Annex B](#)) provided by the Project and obtained through a web research; first identification of gaps of information; preparation of the evaluation design (evaluation questions, proposed methods, sources of information and data collection procedures ([Annex C](#)); elaboration of the Inception Report, submitted to the UNDP Barbados Country Office (CO) on August 10<sup>th</sup>, 2013. It included the tentative schedule of the field mission with identification of relevant stakeholders to be interviewed (authorities, experts, partners, beneficiaries, stakeholders) ([Annex D](#): final mission schedule and people/institutions interviewed).

---

<sup>1</sup> As per GEF requirements, a terminal evaluation shall be conducted within six months before or after project completion.

During the preparation phase a first analysis of the Logframe, as per the revision made in 2011, was conducted ([Annex E](#) revised Logframe);

- b) Field Phase: to undertake interviews with relevant stakeholders, visit the Scotland District, analyse findings, and discuss the preliminary conclusions and lessons learnt with the project management, steering committee members and UNDP environment staff. The process has been participatory to ensure the contribution of stakeholders and beneficiaries to the analysis of the context, of the data and information collected and generally of the outcomes achieved. A wrap up moment took place with representatives of the Steering Committee;
- c) Draft reporting phase: a draft report has been submitted on September 8<sup>th</sup>, 2013 according to the guidelines provided in the TORs organised around the five evaluation criteria of Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability including mainstreaming and partially impact as much as it can be appreciated at this stage of project development;
- d) Final reporting phase: following comments received (16 September, 2013), the final report has been prepared, including the provision of ratings to assess project relevance, effectiveness and efficiency as well as the quality of the M&E system as per GEF requirements ([Annex G, Rating Table](#)).

### 1.2.1 Limitations and elements of attention

Some critical elements have to be considered in reading this report for the way in which they may have affected the evaluation process and findings:

- difficulties were encountered in setting up interviews with stakeholders for different reasons: i) the Project terminated almost one year ago and some of the key players were not available either because no longer in their roles or because out of the country, ii) the Terminal Evaluation of the Barbados and the Dominica SLM projects were done in parallel challenging the organisation of the schedule of meetings; in addition iii) the mission coincided with the Third SIDS Global Inter-Regional Conference in Barbados and both UNDP and Government officials were extremely busy with organisation and participation in the event;
- minimum results materialised making the appreciation of impact almost impossible;
- a non-systematic and structured utilization of the Logframe as a monitoring tool, especially in measuring indicators and targets and an insufficient attention to risks and assumptions as elements affecting management control.

A very well prepared desk phase, involving as many skype interviews as possible with people available but that would not be present in the island, and an in-depth study of project documentation, counterbalanced these above mentioned limitations. Flexibility in arranging interviews within the two countries was provided to a maximum extent but limited by the number of days assigned to the field mission and the urgency to conclude the assignment.

## 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

### **2.1 Description of the project**

---

The BAR SLM Project was approved under the GEF land degradation focal area, Operational Programme (OP) 15 and Strategic Priority (SP) 1- Capacity Building as part of the LDC-SIDS Global Targeted Portfolio Project on SLM<sup>2</sup>. As the sustainability of agricultural production and key economic sectors, as well as ecosystem integrity and functionality, are constrained by land degradation trends in Barbados, the Project has been designed with the long-term goal to ensure that *Agricultural land, wooded and protected areas are fully functioning, sustainable ecosystems that maintain the ecological integrity and productivity of terrestrial and associated marine ecosystems.*

The Specific Objective of the Project is to build capacity for sustainable land management within relevant government agencies, the private sector, non-governmental and civil society organisations, and to ensure that the practice of SLM is institutionalised within national development planning processes, programmes and strategies. The Project has 5 outcomes, namely, (1) Policy/regulatory framework and Resource Mobilization for SLM integrated into national development policies and legislative/regulatory frameworks governing land use planning and management (i.e. mainstreaming); (2) Institutional strengthening and coordination among all relevant planning and land management agencies; (3) Development of an Information Management System; (4) Development of human resource capacity for sustainable land management at all levels; (5) Adaptive management and learning.

The Project Document signature dates 12<sup>th</sup> November 2008. UNDP has been the GEF implementing agency with government execution through the Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment (currently Ministry of Environment and Drainage) over a period of four years beginning November 2008 with a total budget of US\$1,238,317 of which US\$485,000 (plus US\$15,000 for the PDF/A) as the GEF increment. The Delegation of Authority was made in October 2007. The original planned closing date was November 2010 but implementation delays caused the project to effectively end in June 2012, with operations further extended to August 2012.

The Project was designed to build capacities for SLM in Barbados, with environmental benefits accruing to the entire land surface of the country. If land, wooded and protected areas, open spaces and other land uses are fully functioning, systems that maintain the ecological integrity and productivity of terrestrial and associated marine ecosystems will be sustainable; land degradation trends would be reversed through enhanced capacity within relevant government agencies, the private sector, non-governmental and civil society organisations and SLM practices institutionalised within national development planning processes, programs and strategies. It was anticipated that without specific actions to meet these objectives and establish a key coordinating mechanism for SLM, reinforced by a legal mandate, a sectoral rather than an integrated and coordinated approach to land management would prevail and the goal of SLM would remain elusive. If allowed, this could have serious negative implications for agricultural production, food security, economic development and overall quality of life.

### **2.2 Basic environmental and socio-economic background**

---

The World Bank classifies Barbados as an upper middle income country. Barbados has consistently ranked third in the Americas (after Canada and the United States) on the UNDP Human Development Index and

---

<sup>2</sup> The Project had two components, one at the global level and one at the local levels to be adapted to each country context.

first among all Latin American and Caribbean countries. The country has in fact successfully moved away from a heavy reliance on the sugar industry towards a broader economy based on tourism, offshore finance and informatics. A relatively advanced level of institutional development and political and social stability have greatly facilitated this structural shift; established in the early 1990s, a social partnership of government, private sector and unions facilitates consensus-building on national policies and has allowed Barbados to surmount critical economic challenges in the past.

Despite this, a series of vulnerabilities could still threaten hard-won gains. Burgeoning fiscal and external imbalances preclude a major fiscal stimulus to soften the impact of the current global financial crisis on the island's economy, while existing weaknesses in the local business climate are increasingly exposed by the loss of trade preferences abroad and growing market liberalization at home; high energy costs exacerbate these problems. In August 2013, the Minister of Finance and Economic Affairs announced a series of economic measures to lower the fiscal deficit including i) a combination of projects to stimulate the economy, ii) spending cuts (among others a freeze on hiring in the public service, budgetary cuts in the provision for temporary post/employees), iii) new taxation and iv) foreign borrowing, to be pursued over a 19-month period. It is expected that after this period, the deficit could be reduced to 2.8 per cent of GDP (from the current 8 per cent) and a growth target of 1.0 per cent realised. Poverty is not considered a major issue; even so the Government of Barbados has established a poverty alleviation policy. Although no direct linkage has been made between poverty levels and land degradation or agriculture, about 63% of the poor in Barbados live in non-urban areas. Therefore the appropriate use of land is a major issue within the strategies of the **National Strategic Plan**.

Scarce and poorly managed water supplies and land and coastal erosion pose a threat to the island's crucial tourism industry, and climate change is likely to further increase these vulnerabilities. The **Barbados State of the Environment Report (2000)** noted that the coastline and near-shore areas of the island are under stress from the many competing demands on its fragile ecosystem. Land degradation is occurring in both of the two main geologic regions of Barbados – the Scotland District and the limestone region. **The Scotland District**, - the north-eastern part of Barbados, - is considered one of the most scenic landscapes but also one of the most vulnerable area of the island due to its peculiar and unique geological and ecological characteristics; it occupies one seventh of the entire territory of the island and is naturally prone to land slippage, aggravated by inappropriate construction and agricultural activity. The designation of the area as a national park largely remains on paper for the moment; nonetheless its national significance makes land management in this area a critical component of the overall national development framework. Land degradation occurs also in the **limestone regions**, where the problem appears to be much more gradual but equally, if not more, damaging; most of the soil erosion is attributable to human activity. Barbados is considered one of the ten most **scarce water countries** in the world; this is due to its geological structure and thereafter the distribution system of fresh water supply. The protection of groundwater resources and the management of a demand which exceeds sustainable yields (to such an extent to create a risk of salt water intrusion into the aquifers due to over abstraction) are the main management issue. The risk of contamination from agricultural activity, the petrochemical industry, hazardous waste and urban development add on. Land and water management becomes imperatively a joint management issue.

A 2000 study identified that at least one fifth of the island's land was undergoing some form of degradation (slope failure leading to landslides and soil erosion). Inappropriate agricultural practices, overgrazing, soil removal and reallocation, inappropriate land use management and encroachment of settlements and other physical development are among the main causes of land degradation. The main barriers to SLM in Barbados are i) limited access to appropriate information and technology, ii) weaknesses in the institutional infrastructure, iii) unsustainable land use practices, and iv) conflict between land-use goals.

### **2.3 The BAR SLM Project policy and legislative framework and main stakeholders**

---

The design of the BAR SLM Project started in 2005; since then there have been a few administrative changes which impacted on the Project and on SLM such as i) the national administrative elections held in 2008 with a change of Government which was then reconfirmed in the 2013 elections, ii) changes in the name and organisation of the Ministry of Environment and of its Permanent Secretary.

On the other hand the policy and legal framework has not changed significantly. Three main policy documents encompass the vision for SLM, mainly: i) the **National Strategic Plan (NSP)** of Barbados 2005-2025, the **National Physical Development Plan (PDP)**, which is due for update every five years, and the **Barbados Sustainable Development Policy and its associated Action Plan (SDAP)**. A number of sectoral complementary policies exist related with SLM and will be further discussed in the Results chapter under Relevance. The **National Park Development Plan** and the **Agricultural Development Plan** are integral components of the PDP process, and the broad national policies for these are embodied in the NSP.

The institutional framework involves a number of agencies responsible for the implementation of policies related to SLM in Barbados; overlapping mandates exist even between the departments of a single agency. The **Ministry of Environment and Drainage (MED)** has the primary responsibility for global environmental management and for the implementation of the various multilateral environmental conventions to which the country is party (among others UNCCD, UNCBD, UNFCCC and the POPs). The Ministry includes various divisions whose functions have either direct or indirect relevance to land management: i) *the Environmental Unit* (policy development and coordination); ii) the *National Conservation Commission (NCC)*, conservation of the natural beauty of Barbados, including gardens, parks, beaches, caves); iii) the *Natural Heritage Division (NHD)*, conservation especially related to parks and therefore the Scotland District); iv) *the Coastal Zone Management Unit (CZMU)*, environmental management of the coastal zone); v) the *Environmental Protection Department (EPD)*, pollution monitoring and control related to public health); vi) the Botanical Garden Division; vii) the *Sewage and Waste Management Unit (SWMU)* and viii) the *Drainage Unit* (previously under the Ministry of Public Works).

The **Economic Affairs Division of the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs** is responsible for preparing the NSP and coordinating the preparation and delivery of substantive inputs from the various sectoral ministries. The NSP sets the broad policy framework for national development, including land management, and calls for the preparation of the PDP every five years. The PDP is executed by the **Town and Country Development Planning Office (TCDPO)** which sets the national land use policy.

The **Soil Conservation Unit (SCU)** was established by the **Soil Conservation Act** (1959 and Amendment in 1991) under **the Ministry of Agriculture, Food, Fisheries and Water Resources Management (MoA)**; it is responsible for managing the lands of the Scotland District, a special management area under the PDP, it undertakes extensive slope rehabilitation and stabilisation works and reviews development proposals involving the establishment of permanent structures in the area. Land use management with relation to competing interests on the resource in the District has been effective through the collaboration with the TCDPO; this is supported both by the **Soil Conservation Act** and the **Town Planning Act (1968)**. The **Barbados Water Authority (BWA)** has wide functions related to all aspects of supplying, protecting, monitoring, conserving and managing water resources.

With relation to land tenure, the policy is still firmly to establish a freehold system of tenure. The Government (**the Crown**) is the largest land owner, having large tracts of agricultural land being administered by such agencies as the **Barbados Agricultural and Development Corporation (BADC)**, the **Barbados Agricultural Management Company (BAMC)** and the **Barbados Agricultural Credit Trust (BACT)**, each one with a particular mandate which cause inter-institutional conflicts to be reflected in approaches to land use planning. In addition the National Housing Corporation also exists for lease or sale of private households for residential purposes.

In terms of inter-agency coordination, the **National Commission on Sustainable Development (NCSD)** was established by Cabinet in keeping with the recommendations of the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development and Agenda 21. It is broad-based with representatives from government agencies and all major groups including non-governmental organisations, community-based organisations, trade unions, women's organisations, the academic community and private sector entities. It is charged with advising government and facilitating coordination of sustainable development issues at the national level. The main outputs of the NCSD to date are the National Sustainable Development Policy and related Sustainable Development Action Plan. The NCSD is currently not active. With respect to the UNCCD, inter-agency coordination was to be achieved through the **Land Degradation Committee**. This is a Cabinet-appointed advisory committee charged with advising Cabinet on all issues relating to land degradation and sustainable land management. The committee, which is chaired by the Environmental Unit of MED, comprises key government agencies (NCC, CZMU, TCDPO, Barbados Water Authority, SCU and the Meteorological Department of MoA and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs) whose mandates involve or impact on land use and land management, non-governmental organisations (Barbados National Trust, Barbados Environmental Society and Caribbean Youth Environmental Network, Barbados chapter) that bring a civil society perspective to bear on the issues, and technical and inter-governmental organisations. Technical inputs and international perspectives are provided through representatives of the University of the West Indies' Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies (CERMES), the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture (IICA) and the FAO.

### 3. FINDINGS

#### **3.1 Project Design / Formulation**

---

##### **3.1.1 Project logic and strategy**

Designed between 2004 and 2005 using a GEF PDF A grants under the LDC-SIDS Global Targeted Portfolio, the BAR SLM Project was perfectly aligned with policy requirements and local natural resources conservation and livelihoods needs. Nonetheless as part of the Global Portfolio, the design of the Project stemmed more from the global than the local perspective, with negative repercussions in Government commitment as the delay with which activities started testifies, among other reasons. The budget amounted to US\$1,238,317 of which US\$485,000 by GEF (plus US\$ 15,000 as the amount spent for PDF A) and US\$ 753,317 from Government and other partners' co-financing.

Originally envisaged to be implemented over a period of three years, the Project was delayed and finally operated until August 2012. The Inception Report is well prepared with a sound revised Logframe attached, along with a workplan and revised budget. Nonetheless it was far too late to be a realistic planning tool considering that the inception phase lasted three months from Jan to March 2011, the report dates July 2011 and the project ended in August 2012, following a second extension as it was unable to meet the deadline of June 2012.

Changes in the institutional framework took place all along Project development; government and middle management staff turnover resulted in activities being put on hold for a long period (change of priorities and an insufficient flow of information to brief the newcomer); the Project was unable to start until 2011. The Permanent Secretary (PS) of the Ministry of the Environment changed within the period of effective implementation of the Project, in November 2011 and turnover happened also with the environmental officers assigned to the Project; this required some time for the new officers to get acquainted with the modifications made to the original planning and provide their own insight about how and if to conduct certain activities. The Project did not benefit from the advice of an independent Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) as progress in implementation did not justify its undertaking.

The design of the Project has substantially changed to accommodate implementation within one year instead of three years and to reflect an evolving situation both at policy and technical levels. The goal and development objectives as well as the formulation of the 5 outcomes remained unchanged; however the articulation of the 15 outputs (excluding the 3 outputs relating to project management) is different from the original planning. The fact that outcomes formulation has remained unchanged responds exclusively to UNDP/GEF rules and not to an effective planning which in 2011 facing only 15 months of implementation would have needed a more radical change. The analysis of the revised Logframe matrix, attached to the Inception Report (July 2011) ([Annex E](#)) evidences:

- **Goal:** it refers to the national and global significance of maintaining the ecological integrity and productivity of terrestrial and associated marine ecosystems.
- **Objective:** it correctly expresses the need to develop capacities for SLM and mainstream SLM into planning in order to reverse land degradation trends.  
**Purpose indicators:** two performance indicators with two targets are identified with a slight, acceptable modification from the original planning. Overall the Consultant considers that the elaboration of the National Action Programme (**NAP**) to Combat Desertification and Land Degradation should find a place at the outcome more than at the objective level.



- **Outcome N.1 and relative outputs:** the outcome is well formulated to express SLM mainstreaming into national development policies, plans and regulatory frameworks. 3 outputs are identified with a set of coherent activities but overambitious considering the moment in which they were identified (only 9 months available for implementation);  
**Indicators:** 3 performance indicators and 3 targets are appropriately identified and time bound. Sources of verification are sometimes targets in itself and quite ambitious considering time available for implementation but well identified.  
**Budget:** the original GEF budget allocated to the outcome has remained unchanged: US\$91,450
- **Outcome N.2 and relative outputs:** it has been formulated to address the need to strengthen interagency coordination and increase agencies' capacities, to be achieved through 3 identified outputs.  
**Indicators:** the revised Logframe accurately identified 2 performance indicators with 2 targets.  
**Budget:** the original GEF budget allocated to the outcome has remained unchanged: US\$129,650
- **Outcome N.3 and relative outputs:** well formulated to create an efficient information management system to support decision making. 4 outputs are identified along with a set of coherent activities.  
**Indicators:** 2 performance indicators and 2 targets are well formulated and time-bound.  
**Budget:** the original GEF budget allocated to the outcome has remained unchanged: US\$54,550
- **Outcome N.4 and relative outputs:** well formulated to develop/increase human resources capacities for SLM; the 5 outputs are certainly overambitious considering the time available for implementation.  
**Indicators:** 2 performance indicators and 2 targets are identified, correct and well targeted but certainly insufficient to respond to the outcome. More targets were to be identified.  
**Budget:** the original GEF budget allocated to the outcome has remained unchanged: US\$115,350
- **Outcome N.5 and relative outputs:** related to adaptive management, with 3 outputs.
- **Budget:** the original GEF budget allocated to the outcome has remained unchanged: US\$50,000

Overall the revised Logframe envisaged relevant activities and outputs which follow from the logic of the outcomes. However the workplan was overambitious and therefore unrealistic considering the timeframe available as achievements obtained clearly indicate. As a result, many other activities were eliminated during project implementation; evidently these additional modifications were only orally discussed as there is no documented evidence of UNDP/GEF approval unless the request for payment in FACE Forms are taken as tacit endorsements. Results obtained are assessed against the revised Logframe, with due consideration to the additional cuts operated to make planning in line with time and budget constraints.

### 3.1.2 The management of risk

The 2011 Logframe did not substantially revise the original identified assumptions and risks which included political commitment, public awareness and education generating support for SLM; planning and land management agencies understanding the benefits of coordination and collaboration; willingness to participate and share data; and availability of funding for SLM. The fundamental challenge faced by the revised planning is identified in the Inception Report and concerns the tight timeframe for the completion of the Project (15 months). To manage this challenge and the fact that agencies were already involved in a number of other projects and activities, key people with decision making capacities were identified to integrate the Steering Committee and requested to view the SLM Project as a priority. The lengthy process always involved with policy and legislation revision was also given consideration; almost every reference to legislation change was therefore removed from planning. Nonetheless the project team was not brought to full strength in time: the National Coordinator was hired in April 2011, associated project staff (a technical and an administrative person) was brought in only in October and an office space was not made available until January 2012. In addition the selection of consultants resulted in a far too long process (not in absolute terms but the tight timeframe for implementation was not compatible with usual bureaucracy).

The Consultant believes that the following issues should have been considered to be able to anticipate challenges and take remedial measures:

- i) proceed to a quick selection of the National Coordinator and support staff providing office space and basic implementation conditions;
- ii) ensure administrative issues were clear since the beginning: the Project encountered difficulties in interpreting UNDP/GEF rules resulting in important limitations on the possibility to carry on certain activities;
- iii) consider that changes in government officers at both higher and/or middle management levels may result in different conservation priorities and therefore ensure commitment from line ministries.

### 3.1.3 Stakeholder involvement and Project Management Arrangements

The BAR SLM Project is a Medium-Sized GEF Project with UNDP as the GEF implementing agency and the Government of Barbados responsible for execution through its Ministry of Environment and Drainage in collaboration with line ministries and involved agencies. The Project provides for an effective and inclusive participation of stakeholders; nonetheless the Steering Committee was mostly composed of government stakeholders with no presence of NGOs or the private sector. Project management arrangements were:

- **MED:** project execution in partnership with line ministries (at endorsement it was the Environmental Unit of the Ministry of Housing, Lands and the Environment, as focal point for UNCCD);
- **UNDP Country Office:** GEF implementing agency with the role to oversee management, support implementation, manage the GEF budget, monitor implementation. The Regional Coordination Unit in Panama was to provide technical backstopping, advice and troubleshooting if needed;
- **PSC:** chaired by MED and integrated by MED PS and staff, Economic Affairs and Development, NCC, National Council on Substance Abuse, SCU from MoA, National Botanical Gardens, Ministry of Tourism, Barbados Agricultural Development and Marketing Corporation, Rural Development Commission, University of the West Indies – CERMES, UNDP and the Project Coordinator; overall strategic policy and implementation guidance and support; oversight of project implementation and progress; approval of major changes to project plans; forum for stakeholders' input and discussion; conflict resolution; selection of consultants. It was to meet monthly and convene additional special meetings if required;
- **Project Management Unit (PMU):** comprised of the **Project Coordinator (PC)** managing overall project implementation supported by a technical and an administrative officer;
- **GIS Working Group:** constituted by Barbados Light and Power, CZMU, Land Registry, Lands and Survey Department, MoA, Ministry of Housing and Lands, Urban and Rural Development, NCC, TCPDO, UWI CERMES.

PSC meetings occurred with a one or two months frequency, the first one was held in July 2012 when the Inception Report was presented. The presence of agencies and people in the PSC minutes of the meetings indicates that there was not a noticeable turnover of representatives although some changes occurred considering it has been functioning for only a very short period. Elements to be noticed are: i) turnover of the PS in November 2011; ii) UNDP presence is not confirmed in all meetings; iii) the Barbados Agricultural Development & Marketing Corporation was invited but never attended, iv) during the first PSC meeting, the point was made to support the **National Commission on Sustainable Development (NCSD)** as it was seeking to consolidate the several committees existing in government which dealt with various environmental projects. In the interim, key members selected for the existing **Land Degradation Committee** along with additional agencies (suggested during the Inception workshop for their involvement and roles in promoting SLM) were to constitute the team reviewing all documents and providing advice.

Participating agencies in the PSC were required to present project proposals which would be financed based on technical and financial feasibility; they were also required to provide their training needs but not

all agencies responded. The PSC minutes of the meetings indicate long discussions on different proposed projects and activities which were finally not approved (i.e. an on-line GIS clearing house to allow data sharing for beach management proposed by NCC to be hosted on NCC website) or which were cancelled (i.e. the production of episodes of the Green Living TV Programme) due to budget and time constraints. Overall reaching consensus was not always an easy task.

## **3.2 Project Implementation**

---

### **3.2.1 Implementation approach and adaptive management**

Adaptive management activities can be considered only since the revision of planning in 2011 as before there were merely no activities conducted. Back in 2009, the Project was already considered at high risk of not being able to deliver. A workplan was submitted to UNDP in July 2010 but the Project recuperated momentum only when it became clear that the funds assigned to it were going to be lost. The inception phase started in 2011 when planning was revised. The Project Coordinator was not hired until April 2011, the PSC met for the first time in July 2011, PMU staff was not fully established until October 2011 causing an increased workload for the PC and the Ministry; office space was provided only in January 2012.

The long delay in having the Project started may be attributed to a multiplicity of reasons: i) turnovers in government (elections were held in 2008 with a change of government and in 2013 when the government in charge was reconfirmed), PS of the Ministry and middle management staff which may have resulted in different conservation priorities as also on an insufficient flow of information to brief newcomers assuming a specific post; ii) a top down project design which led to an inadequate buying in of activities from line agencies: complaints are reported about the fact that the Project was assigned to MED at the policy level but that many SLM agencies at the technical level became aware of funding availability only in 2011 when the Project finally started; iii) a high level of bureaucracy.

Given the normal bureaucracy each government project faces and clear inefficiencies in setting up the PMU, assigning it an office and contracting consultants, management appears to have been insufficiently efficient and realistic in adapting implementation to what was feasible. As already mentioned, only the Inception Report planning was formally approved by UNDP; other activities which were out of track or considered no longer feasible in 2012 were further cancelled as it can be appreciated in the PC Quarterly Reports to MED and in PSC minutes of meetings. Possibly these documents were sent to UNDP but there is no documented evidence of a formal approval of these additional changes unless the Face Forms with which advances were requested are taken as a request for endorsement.

A number of elements could have helped the Project to obtain more concrete and sustained results; among others the creation of partnerships with traditional and non-traditional sectors, the establishment of a network to take advantage of the lessons learnt from other SLM projects in the region, the completion of the UNEP National Capacity Self-Assessment Project (NCSA) (which was to be implemented in parallel to the SLM project and provide cross linkages with partnering agencies) which is instead still on-going.

Overall management proved to have difficulties in working with time and budget constraints, complex GEF/UNDP administrative rules and the high level of bureaucracy.

### **3.2.2 Financial planning and expenditures**

At endorsement, the BAR SLM Project budget amounted to US\$1,253,317 (including PDF A funds) over 3 years, composed of US\$485,000 of GEF funds (plus US\$15,000 for PDF A) and US\$753,317 of co-financing of which US\$543,717 from Government (in-kind) and US\$209,600 from other sources (Global Mechanism and

FAO). The only co-financing confirmed relates to US\$12,500 from the GM for the completion of the NAP. The Project followed UNDP National Execution (NEX) modality. Financial management has gone through UNDP utilizing the Direct Payment Request modality for funds disbursement to ensure greater financial accountability and transparency. Direct payments were done during the inception phase. Advances are requested via the quarterly FACE forms. These processes were effectively monitored and controlled by UNDP.

The Project Document reports budget allocations by each of the 5 outcomes and by the 15 envisaged outputs according to the source of funding. The revised planning in 2011 budgeted only outcomes, therefore comparisons with outputs is difficult. GEF figures remained unchanged, with funding allocated to all outcomes with higher figures for Outcome 2 and Outcome 4. The bulk of Government co-financing in the original budget was allocated to Outcome 5 for Project Management and Outcome 2 for Institutional Strengthening. Other co-financing was mainly allocated to Outcome 2 and partly to Outcome 4 and 1.

**Table N.2 Budget allocations**

|                  | Initial allocation (million USD) |                            | Final allocation (million US\$) * |              | Final Expenditures |              |
|------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|
|                  | GEF                              | Co-financing (Gov + other) | GEF                               | Co-financing | GEF                | Co-financing |
| <b>Outcome 1</b> | 91,450                           | 50,900+12,500 from GM      | 91,450                            | NA           | NA                 | NA           |
| <b>Outcome 2</b> | 129,650                          | 152,300 + 147,100 from GM  | 129,650                           | NA           | NA                 | NA           |
| <b>Outcome 3</b> | 54,550                           | -                          | 54,550                            | NA           | NA                 | NA           |
| <b>Outcome 4</b> | 115,350                          | 29,000 + 50,000 from FAO   | 115,350                           | NA           | NA                 | NA           |
| <b>Outcome 5</b> | 50,000                           | 311,517                    | 50,000                            |              | NA                 | NA           |

**Table N .3 Co-financing**

| Co-financing (type/source) | Other co-financing: FAO and GM (US\$) |                            | Government (US\$ value – in kind) |  |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
|                            | Planned *                             | Actual                     | Planned                           | Actual   |
| Loans/ Concessions         | • 209,600                             | • 12,500 from GM confirmed | • 543,717                         | • Confirmed although information not available on actual value |

The Project has been audited, in June 2013 for the seven years until December 2012. The audit certifies expenses for US\$373,004.13. Quarterly and annual financial reports have been reviewed as well as requests for direct payments to assess compliance with the project document and the UNDP Programme Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP) on Results Management. A few weaknesses have been encountered and are well reported in the auditors' report including i) the preparation of the accounting records which is made on a cash basis instead than on accruals basis possibly leading to errors or incompleteness, ii) need to provide evidence of procurement controls, iii) lack of evidence of employees' performance appraisals, iv) inappropriate maintenance of the assets and equipment register, v) weak system of data storage and security (while backup of data is essential for contingency and disaster planning and provide recovery plans in the event of data loss).

Quarterly and annual financial reports have been reviewed as well as requests for direct payments to assess compliance with the project document and the UNDP Programme Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP) on Results Management. The analysis of available information on paper and collected through interviews indicates consistency in financial management and reporting:

- i) GEF funding was originally especially allocated to ensure a mechanism for inter-agency collaboration in place and training at different levels: it is reported that misunderstanding about funds allocation to budget lines impeded an important allocation of money for training;
- ii) the most important expenses are related with the three consultancy undertaken: the **Institutional Review Process** (BBD\$151,200), the **Communication and Awareness Strategy** (about BBD\$112.000) and the **Soil Survey/GIS** study (BBD\$48.809);

- iii) financial management effectively included a quarterly review of budget variances to expected work for each quarter and in line with annual PIR and AWP;
- iv) difficulties are registered during the final phase of the implementation, in 2012 when the Project experienced a budgetary deficit due to a delay in the transfer of GEF funds from UNDP which caused further delays to implementation and an extension of the Project until August 2012 to finalise payments, especially to the contracted consultants. Apparently this was due to the fact that the Project already had a history of not being able to spend the money and UNDP rules are that a further advance can be made only when the project can demonstrate to have at least spent 80% of the previous one;
- v) procurement was done according to standard procedures; however, as documented in the auditors' report, there is no documentation available to prove the effectiveness of the process (if the cost was to exceed BBD\$200,000.00 there was the need to tender according to financial rules; however management tried to never exceed BBD\$120,000.00);
- vi) information on the value of Government co-financing is not available but it is reported to be in line with original pledges; vii) there is no updated information on co-financing from other sources apart from the confirmation of the GM financing having materialised; no mechanism was in place to monitor the original commitment;
- vii) notwithstanding delays, MED operated an accurate control of funds expenditures with minor issues as indicated in the audit. The major problem lies in the fact that the Project was not able to all funds assigned to it and there is an unspent amount of GEF funding of US\$118,291 which will be returned to GEF.

**Table N.4 Total expenditures until September 2012**

| Year                    | GEF (Allocations) and expenditures ( US\$) |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>2010 and prior</b>   | (253,790.01) 37,326.75                     |
| <b>2011 accumulated</b> | (131,000) 28,538.69                        |
| <b>2012</b>             | (92,173.25) 63,464.27                      |
| <b>Total</b>            | <b>381,709</b>                             |
| <b>Balance</b>          | <b>118.291</b>                             |

### 3.2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation and Communication (\*) Rating: MU

A revised M&E Plan is included in the Inception Report and refers to standard GEF tools. It appears that Annual Work plans, PIRs and Quarterly Reports were timely and effectively prepared. There is no information about a Tripartite meeting having been conducted. The MTE was cancelled due to the slow progress of the project and its overall duration of only 15 months. A financial audit was undertaken in June 2013. The two envisaged surveys were apparently conducted through the consultancy of the communication expert; the Consultant considers there is a misunderstanding on the type of survey to be conducted: under the communication component, the survey (see below) was tailored to evaluate the general public perception and attitudes towards the environment/SLM as a subject; the intention of the monitoring surveys was to assess stakeholders satisfaction about results obtained. The TE is being carried out and producing the current report. A workshop to reflect on lessons learnt has not been conducted.

Annual Operational Plans (AOPs) were to be prepared with the assistance of a toolkit based on the Logframe and made available by GEF. This was a planning tool synchronized with PIR and AWP and useful for M&E. It appears that only outcomes were budgeted. Indicators and targets were well enough identified and most of them time-bound; the baseline has been updated in relation to the original planning.

However monitoring has not been done in a structured and systematic way: the workplan attached to the Inception Report has been used to monitor activities but there is no evidence of measurement of indicators and targets; the revised Logframe has not been fully utilised as a monitoring tool. Reporting is fairly done; PIRs have been prepared but could be more informative, especially on indicators and targets. Quarterly

Reports were systematically prepared by the PC and sent to MED. It is not confirmed if these were systematically revised by UNDP. Reporting is generally on the basic operative level without major considerations for the significance of the activities or the possible impact/effects produced. [Annex G](#) is the Consultant's summary report on achievements utilising the indicators of the Logframe.

### **3.2.4 UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation (\*) and coordination Rating: MS**

UNDP provided support to the Project in terms of supervision and financial management. The budget was entirely managed by UNDP and all expenses paid through advances made to the Project utilising the Face Forms. The Project languished during the first three years; UNDP held various meetings with the Government to have the Project started; evidently this was not sufficient to avoid the significant delay which led implementation to start only in 2011 with the National Coordinator appointed in April. The Project was systematically rated by UNDP as HU for the high risk of not delivering. When the Project finally started it was given a 17-month period of operation, until June 2012 (later extended to August 2012). Several major administrative and procedural issues still needed to be clarified and organised; misunderstandings about UNDP and GEF rules materialised; there was no funds availability for certain key budget lines (i.e. training). UNDP project procurement guidelines were to be made available and interpretation of budget lines needed clarification ahead of workplan finalisation and approval. Although a different involvement of UNDP would have probably helped speeding up certain activities (among others UNDP presence is not confirmed in all PSC meetings and in 2012 there was a transition period of officers), the agency correctly interpreted its role as supportive and facilitating in addition to supervising progress and the management of funds.

Towards the end of the implementation difficulties emerged for the payment of expenditures which caused the Project to be further extended until August 2012; the main reason appears to be the inability of the Project to spend at least 80% of the advance received before being able to ask for an additional advance. As most of the implementation was rushed during the last 6 months, additional funds would have been needed to develop more activities but management was not in a position to make the request as it could not prove to have already spent 80% of the funds already received.

## **3.3 Project Results**

---

### **3.3.1 Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*) Rating: MU**

Overall the BAR SLM Project has produced a few noteworthy outputs and demonstration activities for the management of land and water; however the effect on outcomes is marginal. Unfortunately, despite its relevance and potential, it has basically been a lost occasion to effectively produce an enhanced dialogue among SLM stakeholders, mainstream SLM elements into development policies and in regulatory frameworks, defining clear roles and mandates for an effective mechanism of inter-agency coordination and bring a transformational change in the policy and framework to produce, exchange and use data for planning.

### **3.3.2 Relevance(\*)**

**Rating: R**

The analysis of documents and policies and the interviews with stakeholders confirm the BAR SLM Project as highly relevant. Identified within the LDC-SIDS Global Targeted Portfolio Approach to SLM between 2005 and 2006, the Project was to generate substantial national benefits and indirectly and directly global benefits by mainstreaming and strengthening capacities for SLM. The technical expected outcomes were in line with the GEF OP 15 on Land Degradation and particularly with the objectives of strengthening capacities of the Strategic Priority 1 ("Institutional and human resource capacity strengthened to improve

sustainable land management planning and implementation and the strengthening of policy, regulatory, and economic incentive framework to facilitate wider adaptation of sustainable land management practices across sectors,”). The project was perfectly in line with the objectives of the UNDP/Government of Barbados Country Programme (Barbados programme document for the countries of the OECS and Barbados 2005-2009, UNDAF Modified 2008-2011) and has kept relevance within the sub-regional socio-economic analysis utilised to provide guidance to the elaboration of the new UNDAF 2012-2016.

Relevance has been kept over the years with national objectives and requirements as it can be appreciated in the three main policy documents guiding sustainable development. The **NDP** of Barbados 2005-2025 is the product of the collective effort of the public and private sectors as well as labour and civil society; designed in a highly participatory way, it provides the overarching framework and national development goals and articulates the vision of “*a fully developed society that is prosperous, socially just and globally competitive.*” The fourth of the six identified goals is “Strengthening the Physical Infrastructure and Preserving the Environment”; among the six objectives identified those more directly related to land management are (1.1) to promote and facilitate the environmentally sustainable use of our natural resources; (1.2) to maintain a safe and reliable water supply; and (1.6) to maintain an efficient land use policy. Each of these objectives have strategies and targets identified, among which *the integration of environmental considerations into all aspects of national development, the promotion of sustainable land management practices* and many others related with SLM. The NDP is enshrined in the **Town Planning Act (1968)** which authorises state control and regulation of the use of all land in and around the island, and institutionalises the preparation of the PDP. The **PDP** is the most comprehensive national development framework for the management of land, taking into account the associated environmental and natural heritage concerns. It guides development and allocation of land among competing uses. It is due for update every 5 years; yet the last one was produced in 2003 and there has been no update since then.

The **Barbados Sustainable Development Policy** was adopted by Parliament in 2004 and it was the major output of the National Commission on Sustainable Development; its goal is “*to ensure the social organisation of the quality of life of every person by ensuring that economic growth and development does not occur to the detriment of our ecological capital.*” The policy five core principles (quality of life, conservation of resources, economic efficiency, equity and participation) are expected to inform national decision-making at the sectoral, organizational and individual levels. The policy is complemented by the **Sustainable Development Action Plan (SDAP)** which recommends a series of actions to be taken by each sector towards achieving the goal of sustainable development.

The **Environmental Management and Land Use Planning (EMLUP)**, a major study undertaken in 1998, produced among others: i) the revision of the PDP, ii) a draft Environmental and Natural Resources Management Plan (ENRMP), iii) a draft Environmental Management Act for Barbados, iv) an Institutional Framework for Environmental Management; v) a National Park Development Plan including an assessment and classification of sensitive ecosystems and proposals for their protection; and vi) a Geographic Information System (GIS) as the foundation for developing and maintaining a long-term National Natural Resources Data Base of biophysical and other planning related information (fully established within the Town and Country Development Planning Office and used as an essential tool for land use planning and development control). Although several of the recommendations of this study have been implemented and most of its key outputs are still a point of reference for planning in the sector, many aspects urgently need to be update and revised. The relevance of the Project can be appreciated also on the still current need to define clear roles and mandates for the various agencies dealing with sustainable development and land management, among others the UNCCD related **Land Degradation Committee** and the **National Commission on Sustainable Development (NCSD)** (see findings about Outcome 1 below). Even more urgent is to strengthen the role of the **SCU** which has very large responsibilities over soil and land within the Scotland District and has to interface with a large number of other institutions and agencies.

### 3.3.3 Effectiveness and Efficiency (\*)

Rating: Effectiveness: MU

The project was definitely not efficient; although stakeholders interest is confirmed during interviews, the SLM Project did not rank high in the agencies work programmes considering that notwithstanding several meetings held between UNDP and relevant authorities, it started with a three years delay; the National Coordinator was hired in April 2011 when it appeared clear that otherwise the Project would have been cancelled and funding lost. The inception phase is reported to have lasted from January to March 2011 but the Inception Report only dates July 2011; planning has been accurately revised and a sound report produced with a revised Logframe, Workplan and Budget. Yet, considering timing at its disposal, planning and targets were clearly overambitious and unrealistic. The Project accumulated delays even during the effective period of implementation; inefficiencies materialised in the mechanisms to recruit the three national consultants for the **Institutional Review Process**, the **Communication and Awareness Strategy**, and the **Soil Survey/GIS** study (contracts were negotiated with resources and activities cut down to be able to remain within the budget limits; all consultants were selected far too late to have the possibility to lead the review to the point of even only initial implementation) which led activities to be rushed to be able to have outputs presented in the final meeting of the Project; typical governmental bureaucracy was incompatible with an ambitious implementation compressed in 15 months. The last 6 months of execution constitutes the most efficient period, possibly the result of the presence of a new environmental officer in MED who took the effective lead of the implementation; towards the end of the Project, further delays accumulated in the receipt of funds from UNDP due to inadequate reporting of expenditures by the PC.

While not fully efficient, the BAR SLM Project has produced a few interesting outputs which may bring further results and impact if well monitored and implemented; at present none of the outcome is fully reached. [Annex G](#) is a summary of achievements utilising the 2011 Logframe indicators. The following comments integrate the table and provide the informed observations of the Consultant, as obtained through documental reviews, interviews and visits.

#### **Outcome N.1 - Policy/Regulatory Frameworks and Resources Mobilization for SLM integrated into national development policies and legislative/regulatory frameworks governing land use planning and management (i.e. mainstreaming)**

Rating: U

The 2011 revised planning envisaged the mainstreaming of SLM elements in the ENRMP, one the products of the above mentioned EMLUP study. Long discussions characterised the PSC meetings; the minutes of meetings indicate that both the NAP and the ENRMP were circulated among PSC members only in February 2012. Ideas to revise and update the ENRMP, to complete the NAP and integrate SLM into the Cabinet-Approved Green Economy Scoping Study were cancelled in 2012 when a new Environmental Officer from MED integrated the PSC; the revision of the ENRMP was no longer considered a priority and the unrealistic planning approved with the Inception Report became evident: time would not have allowed such an undertaking; therefore also the preparation of an investment and resource mobilization plan for SLM was cut down. Notwithstanding, stakeholders report that: i) the existing ENRMP still guides planning and parts of it are integrated in the technical work of the agencies, ii) the NAP has been partially updated but it is not endorsed by Cabinet; there is the intention to finalise it by next year in parallel with the preparation of the Fifth National Report to the UNCCD Conference of the Parties; iii) the National Capacity Needs Self Assessment (NCSA) which was to complement the NAP process in order to link country actions to the broader environmental management and sustainable development framework is still on-going.

Overall the only activity which remained in place of Outcome N.1 relates to the Public Information and Dissemination Initiatives. Various ideas were discussed; those finally approved are reported under Outcome 4 as demonstration activities. A Communications Specialist was hired to prepare a set of communication and awareness tools. A research based on a Knowledge, Attitudes and Perceptions (KAP) survey was conducted and it was to be repeated after one year from the implementation of the



Communication & Information Dissemination Strategy for SLM (a three year strategy, based on the results of a Strategic Planning Session conducted with representatives from various agencies responsible for SLM). A Brand Communication Strategy was also developed together with a draft logo for the branding of SLM; they were delivered to MED along with guidelines on how to use it in the media in order to create awareness on the SLM concept. Two vertical banners were designed and produced. The SLM website was designed to showcase SLM and Land Degradation issues and best practices; it was officially launched on August 31, 2012 at the final Project Seminar hosted by MED; MED staff were trained in the maintenance and updating of the website.

Stakeholders report that the Ministry was interested in an innovative public awareness campaign with relation to the brochures and pamphlets usually utilized, focusing on a clear message to be delivered to the wider public showing that SLM is not only a public but also a private responsibility. The approach appears to justify the market orientation of the proposals where SLM comes out as a product to be sold to the public. The Ministry affirms to be satisfied with the output; yet, the Communication Expert was hired far too late to be able to produce anything implementable within the timeframe of the Project; one year from project closure, no action has still been taken to implement the recommendations; in addition the website ([www.sustainablebarbados.bb](http://www.sustainablebarbados.bb)) still requires to be uploaded and therefore has never been active.

The KAP Surveys included in the original project document as part of the monitoring activities have been added to the Communication Specialist TORs. Although one KAP study was conducted utilising as a base the 2009 Environmental Education National Survey, this is clearly not the tool envisaged in the monitoring plan of the SLM Project: the KAP study is directed to understand the general public attitudes towards SLM or more in general towards the environment; while the monitoring tool would have been used to assess the satisfaction of stakeholders with the products produced by the Project.

Data collected suggest that the legal/institutional/policy framework for SLM has not changed significantly during the years (independently from the activities of the Project); nonetheless, stakeholders report that the mainstreaming of SLM is practically integrated into the work of agencies and in development planning at the technical level and through the adoption of best practices; the need to reflect this into legal instruments is not particularly felt.

**Outcome N.2 - Institutional strengthening and coordination for SLM achieved through routine consistent coordination and collaboration among all relevant planning and land management agencies** **Rating: MS**

The outcome aims to strengthen institutions and improving inter-agency coordination. A number of institutions were supposed to undergo an institutional review (SCU, MED, NHD and possibly also the Ministry of Housing according to discussions) but finally only the SCU was selected for this purpose. A consultant was hired to undertake an in-depth audit of the agency including legal and policy aspects, human resources, technical (land management) and information technology perspectives. Although limited by time constraints, the Report prepared by the Consultant still provides an in-depth analysis together with a 5-Year Strategic Management Plan providing clear recommendations for improving the effectiveness and efficiency of the agency in managing the Scotland District and land degradation areas. The Report was generally well accepted; MED delivered it to SCU which was to share the findings with its Ministry. There is no evidence that the MoA has taken any action to implement the recommendations; apparently not much has happened since project closure.

The Report evidences that the SCU is well positioned to take on the lead responsibility of managing the Scotland District (1/7 of the land area of the island) given its legal mandate, technical and scientific operations and administrative functions. Its main role today is to provide land stabilization services for the many stakeholders who utilize the area (private residences, BWA, Ministry of Public Works, tourism and recreational sectors and agricultural enterprises, both public and private). As a consequence the SCU is

required to coordinate its work with a number of other agencies, a particularly challenging task given the number of operators and the fact that 81% of the lands are privately owned. As the institutional review shows, the SCU urgently needs to be upgraded to be able to respond to current and emerging issues in SLM. Overall the Scotland District remains a paper National Park where conflicting views between development and conservation are unresolved. SCU was established under the Soil Conservation Act, with a certain autonomy from its own Ministry and quite a large staff but without the required authority for decision-making (as a matter of example, the title of the head of the Unit is Officer-in-Charge, certainly an anomaly for a person with such an important responsibility; it is also quite relevant that SCU staff assigned to work in the Scotland District appear to view their job as a sort of punishment or exile from the capital city). Years ago there were plans to strengthen the role of the **SCU** by making it a Scotland District Authority, provide for a fiscal system favouring the development of the Scotland District and make the area a National Park. The audit suggests that some of these ideas should be recuperated. The review also evidences that there is no major need to enact new laws or formulate new policies but to make the appropriate amendments to those existing to encourage their implementation. At the same time the technical capacities of staff require upgrading both in technical, managerial and information technology areas (out of 237 staff, approximately only 10% possess any form of qualifications; IT skills of staff are generally quite low reflecting a lack of an information technology management culture) to enhance the capacity of the agency to deliver quality services in the area of SLM.

The **Ministry of Environment** underwent a re-organisation during the last years; it currently includes the Drainage Unit (previously under the Ministry of Public Works) and the Sewage and Waste Management Unit. Overall overlapping mandates still exist among the agencies and divisions of the MED; the highly fragmented nature of the institutional structure remains a fact and a significant challenge for integrated planning and coordinated management. In terms of inter-agency coordination, at Project design the need to clarify the relationship between the **NCS** and the **Land Degradation Committee** was identified. They are both Cabinet-appointed advisory committees; while the second one focuses on land, some level of responsibility for SLM was also implicit in the role and functions of the NCS. Although no formal revision of mandates and roles has been done, the NCS has been put on hold while the Land Degradation Committee is fully functioning and in a reduced form was reflected in the PSC. This is currently the mechanism for technical inter-agency coordination and the committee currently ensuring coordination of national level projects with components dealing with land management and land degradation. Land degradation issues are dealt with also within the Working Group on Biodiversity.

### **Outcome N.3 An efficient Information Management System to support SLM decision-making developed** **Rating: MS**

A GIS Working Group, composed of technical staff from various ministries, was established for the entire duration of the Project to advise the PSC on outcome N.3, establish a mechanism for cooperation between and among all agencies utilising GIS and select a local consulting firm to develop capacities and produce demonstration material. GeoOrbis was hired through a tender process; the original proposal budget and workplan were significantly cut down (from BBD\$120,000 to BBD\$45,000) as by the time the firm was selected, the implementation period was only about 4 months and therefore unable to perform all activities proposed.

The main outputs are as follows:

- i) a GIS capacity review was done for the main agencies involved. The most advanced capacities in GIS appear to be in the Land Survey department and in the CZMU;
- ii) a demonstration activity was conducted for an area chosen by the Government – Consett Bay (the choice was based on data availability for this area and the presence of other on-going projects which could have utilised the maps to be produced): metadata were collected from various agencies to prepare 3 GIS based analytical maps to demonstrate the efficiency and efficacy of data sharing for river

management. The material produced has been handed over to MED and it is reported to have been utilized for planning purposes;

- iii) a metadata training workshop was organized for officers within the various agencies dealing with land management; the objective was to create awareness and start building capacities in standardizing the method of storing metadata and facilitate inter-agency collaboration; participants responded very positively;
- iv) recommendations were made for the creation of a Land Information System (LIS) with a centralized database. Three options were identified and a certain level of agreement among technical staff was reached on the opportunity to have a central database housed in the MoA (where some infrastructure is already in place), managed by a group of dedicated staff. Barbados faces the not uncommon difficulty of having different departments recording data utilizing different standards; however the level of sophistication is reported to be still quite low for standardization to be a major issue. There is still an important need for training (the assessment of capacities evidences only one person as having advanced capacities for GIS management). Similar to other components, training has been insufficient compared to the original planning, mainly due to the need to reduce the budget and undertake activities in a very short period of time as well as misunderstanding on the budget rules which apparently did not allow a major investment in training. The main obstacle remains the need to increase officers' awareness on the effectiveness to exchange data; progress has been made in this sense at the technical level but this still needs to be understood and shared by decision-makers. Since August 2012 when the project was operationally closed, no decision has been taken to follow up on results obtained, notwithstanding the offer of the GIS consultant to continue leading meetings of the GIS Working Group at no or minimum cost. Stakeholders report that it is not a lack of interest but mainly of other priorities preventing members from organizing the meetings and insufficient awareness about its importance from their head offices to free their time to participate in structured GIS meetings.

All other activities and outputs envisaged in the revised Logframe have been cancelled or not achieved.

#### **Outcome N.4 Human resource capacity for SLM developed at all levels**

**Rating: MS**

**A Training Needs assessment** was not formally done but each agency was repeatedly requested to express their needs and ideas for training; only the NCC and the Drainage Division completed it. Discussion were conducted about the opportunity to organize long-term training (i.e. the National Botanical Garden suggested a post graduate degree) versus short term courses and workshops. The short timeframe of the Project suggested that only tailored short training courses could be done. An education showcase including a SLM component was developed for the Folkestone Summer Camp (Folkestone Marine Reserve, St. James) informing on the Holetown Watershed and on how land management practices affect the marine environment; developed in collaboration with NCC, the showcase was presented during the Holetown Festival. The idea to develop the *Green Living Project* was long discussed; this would have been a TV programme to be produced in episodes with the objective to show land management practices within the Scotland District, focusing on Consett Bay and ensuring that the public gain an in-depth understanding of SLM. An outline of the programme was produced and endorsed by the MoA but lack of funds/time led to the decision to cancel it from the SLM Project planning although to be produced anyway with other funds (not yet done).

Stakeholders report that a four day training session on the basic to intermediate use of GIS software was organized for 14 officers of various SLM agencies (MoHL, MoA, CZMU, MED among others). The objective of the training was to build the capacity of these agencies in acquiring the knowledge to apply GIS as a tool for better resource tracking and in scientific decision making. The training was facilitated by the Lands & Surveys Department. About 30 people participated in the Metadata Workshop organised by the GIS Consultant and were trained about the key aspects of metadata. Training was provided for the

maintenance of the SLM website. The two workshops done during the institutional review of SCU provided for awareness training of the agency's staff.

Under this Outcome, output 4.5 envisaged demonstration activities to show best practices on soil, land and water management. A few activities were conducted with success, namely:

- i) *the Reforestation and Stabilization Programme in the Scotland District*: the NCC in conjunction with SCU initiated the reforestation of three selected areas within the District with the objective to reverse the effects of land slippage and soil runoff. Government officials report the activity to have been successful; clearly monitoring is required to assess its long-term effect on land stabilization.
- ii) *the Rain Garden for land and water management*: the Drainage Division with assistance from the NCC and the Botanic Garden developed a Rain Garden in the Waterfront watershed (the largest ground water aquifer of the country) as a research tool to manage land and water conflicts; a rainfall logging system was procured which will allow the Drainage Division to monitor the project and use the data generated to assess the hydrologic performance of rain gardens with respect to catchment, rainfall, soil retention and inflows. These parameters are necessary for future design objectives / optimization in determining the performance of rain gardens for anti land degradation purposes. The works done until now have proved effective for the second raining season; although other priorities led to postpone the completion of the activity, the nursery for trees plantation is ready and the Botanic Garden with assistance from NCC will shortly complete it.
- iii) *The Row Cover Project*: the row cover technology has been introduced to the farming community with the objective to build local capacity on alternative farming techniques especially in areas where land is too limited for large greenhouses. Four training workshops were organised with the assistance of the MoA; 5 pilot sites were selected as demonstration projects to appreciate how they can be adapted for small and medium- sized farms. The workshops, which reached some 250 farmers, were well attended. Trials were done with different types of crops in order to identify the best growing conditions for crops with the goal of increasing food production year round, as well as monitoring the effectiveness of the crop shields and continue to improve on the design. Results of the crops produced using this method were to be recorded to provide data for best practices in agriculture.

Overall the demonstration activities were conducted with some degree of success. Training activities have been limited with respect to the original planning. Officers within the SLM agencies will be in a better position to eventually use GIS as a decision making tool and create data that will be integrated into the LIS when established. There is increased awareness about the importance of sharing data among technical staff from the agencies but there is no evidence that this awareness has reached the decision-making level to ensure concrete steps in the near future towards the establishment of a centralised database and a LIS. There is no evidence of stakeholders surveys being conducted to evaluate the on the ground application of training received. Notwithstanding the establishment of a website and training provided for its maintenance, the website is not active.

### **3.3.3.1 Cross-cutting areas**

**Gender mainstreaming** is reported not to be an issue in Barbados. The Consultant has no evidence of any discrimination occurring, although a larger number of men has participated in training and other project activities. **NGOs** and the **private sector** were not sitting in the PSC and had no particular role in demonstration activities. Yet, Barbados has a quite developed private sector which has to be involved as a real partner in development and in the sustainable management of resources. **Climate change** is quite well established in development thinking.

### 3.3.4 Stakeholders participation and country ownership

Barbados has several systems, policies, legislation and institutions that have been historically in place, all contributing to the implementation of SLM practices. The BAR SLM Project was nationally implemented through MED with widespread recognition that its success was highly dependent on the strong and integrated participation of key line ministries and on the establishment of an effective coordinating mechanism where broadly-based entities such as the Land Degradation Committee or the NCSD have clearly defined roles and mandates. These potentialities had to be adequately captured by the Project to add value to strategic areas.

The participation of stakeholders has been facilitated by the PSC and the GIS Working Group. Both entities met regularly and provided for a forum of discussion and decision-making. At the technical level, stakeholders manifest appreciation for the activities done and for the potential these could have opened. Clearly given the short timeframe with which the Project was implemented, the process has only initiated and there is the need for monitoring and sustaining these processes and for involving the decision-making level in a more appropriate way (see results for the GIS component). The Project did not involve communities and the private sector had a very small participation.

### 3.3.5 Sustainability (\*)

Rating: ML

As results obtained indicate, a new common vision for SLM still needs to be fully developed and championed within a broad public and private audience; nonetheless stakeholders report that mainstreaming of SLM is practically occurring through the integration of best practices at the technical level. The three products developed for the GIS component, the communication strategy and the institutional review of SCU can be given sustainability only if results are assumed by the concerned government agencies, actions integrated in their work programmes and then implemented. Without follow up, the investments made risk to remain study documents in a shelf. The interest and commitment to continue along this line is confirmed during interviews; however, as a result of recently announced measures to reduce fiscal imbalances, Government's resources may not be secured in the near future. An exit strategy should have been developed by project management to ensure that at least all recommendations of the mentioned studies that do not necessarily imply the use of financial resources are taken on board, integrated into work programmes, monitored and given adequate follow up.

*Capacity development* needs are identified for the GIS component both to upgrade technical skills within the various agencies involved in the production, entry and exchange of data as well as to improve the hardware and software to eventually set up the long needed centralised database. There is also an urgent need to organise awareness workshops for decision makers to ensure the benefits, efficiency and efficacy of exchanging data are well understood; this would hopefully result in high level support to technicians to allow the GIS Working Group to continue to function and further develop the process initiated. GIS data standardization appears not to be a major problem due to the insufficient development of the process but additional thought should be given to the subject. Capacity development needs are also identified in the **SCU** review which highlights a major requirement to upgrade the technical, managerial and IT skills of staff to allow this agency to be able to better respond to the wide responsibilities it has.

### 3.3.7 Impact

The Project reached very little impact; the short implementation timeframe, bureaucracy and inefficiencies impeded the achievements of outcomes and even less of the objective. The SLM Project was to serve as a task force to assist involved ministries to develop a shared vision on SLM and create an inter-agency

mechanism to mainstream SLM issues into policy, legislation and regulatory frameworks. Processes have been initiated, a few interesting outputs produced and a few demonstration activities implemented but this has not yet translated into impact. Much remains to be done to develop capacities, to produce and share data on the quality of land resources and their actual use to better inform decision making, to implement the recommendations made in the studies, to develop a shared vision and champion it among all relevant stakeholders and the public at large. A comprehensive, integrated and functioning land information system housed within a designated agency responsible for overall SLM is recognised as necessary but no real steps have yet been taken towards this direction. Although the Land Degradation Committee is the current mechanism for inter-agency coordination, it has not the legal authority to oversee the actions of the different agencies; land development planning in Barbados continues to be largely sector-driven, although within the context of the national PDP.

Barbados has an advanced national land use policy and planning process that has been effective in managing land use allocation and conflicts over the years; still, scarce resources to be allocated, lack of education and information, conflicting land use goals and the need to strengthen and update the role of the SCU continue to be obstacles to effective land use management. A full assessment of the institutional capacity for SLM in Barbados was to be done within the framework of this project while merely only SCU was subjected to such a review.

## 4. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

---

The BAR SLM Project started in 2008 but has been effectively implemented only for 17 months between 2011 and 2012. Despite its relevance (in line with policy and institutional requirements) and potential (an already sound land management policy in place), this resulted in a lost occasion to utilise GEF funding for an effective transformational change in mainstreaming SLM elements into development policies and regulatory frameworks. It has produced a few noteworthy outputs and demonstration activities which however mostly remain at the study and recommendations level. The short timeframe since the revision of planning combined with usual government bureaucracy produced a rushed implementation where none of the recommendations done could be effectively integrated into the agencies' work programmes and therefore produce a sustainable impact.

### **4.1 Recommendations**

---

#### **Recommendation 1: Ensure further investment in Capacity Development**

Capacity development needs are still identified at different levels: i) for line ministries at the technical level to further increase GIS and planning capacities and ensuring standardisation and sharing of data; ii) at decision-making level to ensure the importance of data sharing is well understood and result in support for the setting up of a centralised database; iii) to upgrade the technical, managerial and IT skills of human resources at SCU.

#### **Recommendation 2: Sustain the private-public relationship.**

Barbados has a well developed private sector. Activities identified in the communication strategy should be utilised to ensure it is taken on board to become a real partner in development.

#### **Recommendation 3: Ensure a centralised database and GIS is set up**

GIS activities developed should be urgently sustained; the offer of the GIS Consultant to continue to lead the GIS Working Group should not be overlooked and momentum should not be lost. The enthusiasm and understanding of the technical level should be transmitted to the decision making level.

#### **Recommendation 4: Ensure results from the three studies are integrated in agencies' work programmes.**

The three studies/review undertaken produced sound analyses and sets of recommendations. These should not remain documents in a shelf otherwise the investment will be lost; some of the recommendations require the allocation of funds but others can be already integrated in the work programmes of agencies.

### **4.2 Lessons learnt**

---

#### **Lesson N.1 Government endorsement of a project does not necessarily means readiness to implement**

Support and commitment is required at all levels to ensure a project can be readily implemented; a project of this nature assigned to the political level of a ministry requires the buying in of line ministries; possibly this would have avoided the long delay in starting the implementation. Political support is required through all the project cycle; changes in government officers at both higher and/or middle management levels may result in different conservation priorities; commitment from line ministries can counterbalance the issue.

#### **Lesson N.2 Adaptive Management and planning.**

Planning requires to be realistic with relation to time and financial resources. The Consultant believes that the 2011 planning was a compromise between what was feasible and the need to not alter significantly the

original project design; if an attempt to redesign the project was not an option given the lengthy process of approval that it would have entailed, more realistic indicators were to be selected and the revised planning should have been accompanied by a list of pre-conditions for implementation: among others, the prompt availability of office space, staff and an immediately functional PSC would have made the difference in this project. The result was an unfeasible workplan as the results obtained have demonstrated. Usual government bureaucracy and the tight timeframe should have suggested the identification of a well sought strategy for the management of risk.

**Lesson N.3      Sound built-in exit strategies.**

An exit strategy is always suggested even more when the project has only reached the level of studies and recommendations without the possibility to implement them. Management should have developed a sound exit strategy identifying measures with relation to their importance and urgency, their priorities for the sector as well as those which required an allocation of resources and those which could already be integrated into the agencies' work programmes.



**Annex A – Terms of Reference**

## **Annex B – Document consulted/available for consultation**

### **Project documents Barbados**

- Project Document – Capacity Building in and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in Barbados, UNDP/GEF, 2008
- Project, Inception Report, July 2011
- Project, Quarterly Progress Reports by the National Coordinator (all 2011 and 2012 quarters)
- PIMS, Project Quarterly Progress Reports UNDP (2011 and 2012)
- Project, Project Implementation Reports, UNDP/GEF 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012
- Project Steering Committee Minutes of Meetings (from July 2011 to March 2012)
- Annual Work plans, 2011, 2012
- Barbados Audit Report, June 2013 Ernst&Young
- Annual Operation Plan 2012
- Financial reports and Face Forms
- PIMS 3408 Barbados LDC SIDS Activity Performance revJTR as of 21 August 2013

### **Strategy and UNDP/GEF documents**

- United Nations Development Assistance Framework UNDAF 2008-2011 (modified), Barbados and the OECS
- UN Sub-regional Analysis of the Development Context in Barbados and the OECS: guide for the elaboration of the upcoming UNDAF 2012-2016
- Sub-regional programme document for the countries of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States and Barbados (2005-2009)
- GEF OP 15 Land Degradation
- The National Strategic Plan of Barbados 2005-2025
- The Barbados Sustainable Development Policy, National Commission on Sustainable Development, Government of Barbados, Jan. 2004
- IDB Country Strategy with Barbados 2009-2013
- The Government of Barbados State of the Environment Report 2000
- UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP)
- UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Finance Projects, 2012
- UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, UNDP 2009
- 2012 Key Results 3130: Targeted Portfolio Project on SLM Mainstreaming and Capacity Development in LDCs and SIDS, GEF
- UNDP EEG and GEF Annual Performance Report (APR), Simplified Project Implementation Review (PIR)/Progress Monitoring Template for Caribbean SLM MSPs under LDC-SIDS Global Targeted Portfolio Project, Reporting period: 1 July 2010 to 30 June 2011

### **Technical and Expert documents**

- The Soil Conservation Scotland District Act 1998 Cap 396
- SLM Development of a Strategic Plan & Institutional Strengthening of the Soil Conservation Unit, Droiterre August 31, 2012
- Final Report and Recommendations: The Provision of an Effective/Efficient Information Management System to Support SLM Decision-Making, GeoOrbis
- PP presentation of the GIS Metadata Workshop
- PP presentation of the Final Workshop SLM GIS Final Report, August 2012
- GeoOrbis original budget proposal and GeoOrbis revised approved budget
- Draft Communication and Information Dissemination Strategy for SLM, August 2012
- PP presentation of the SLM Communication & Information Dissemination Strategy: an Overview

## Annex C – Evaluation Questions

| Evaluative Criteria Questions  | Indicators  | Sources   | Methodology  |
|--|---|---|--|
| <b>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?</b>  |   |   |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were the Project's outcomes consistent with the GEF land degradation focal area/operational program strategies and country priorities</li> <li>• How did the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the participating country?</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF land degradation focal area as well as SP 1- Capacity Building</li> <li>• Degree to which the project supported national environmental objectives</li> <li>• Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• GEF focal areas strategies and documents</li> <li>• UNDP Country Programs</li> </ul>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents analyses</li> <li>• GEF website</li> <li>• Interviews with UNDP and project team</li> </ul>                               |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What was the level of stakeholder participation/ownership in project design and implementation?</li> <li>• How did the project take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities</li> <li>• Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation</li> <li>• Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design and implementation process</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• National policies and strategies</li> <li>• Key project partners and stakeholders</li> </ul>      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents analyses</li> <li>• Interviews with UNDP and project partners</li> <li>• Interviews with relevant stakeholders</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were there logical linkages between expected results of the project (Logframe) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc)?</li> </ul>                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• Key project stakeholders</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Key interviews</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors?</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Degree to which the project was coherent and complementary to donor funding.</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents from other donor supported activities</li> <li>• Other donor representatives</li> <li>• Project documents</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents analyses</li> <li>• Interviews with project partners and relevant</li> </ul>  |

|   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
|   |  |  | stakeholders  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree of relevance for future projects</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data analysis</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>  |  |  |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes and targets (as described in the project document or as modified in approved documents) ? Answer for each outcome</li> <li>In which ways Land Degradation issues are mainstreamed into sectoral institutions and policies?</li> <li>In case the original or modified expected outcomes are merely outputs/inputs, did the Project produced any real outcome? If yes, were these commensurate with the realistic expectations from the Project?</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indicators in project document results framework and Logframe</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>Project team and relevant stakeholders</li> <li>Data reported in project annual and quarterly reports</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents analysis</li> <li>Interviews with project team</li> <li>Interviews with relevant stakeholders</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned?</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>UNDP</li> <li>Project team</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Review of files and archives</li> <li>Key interviews</li> </ul>                         |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How well were risks and assumptions managed?</li> <li>Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completeness of identification of risks and assumptions</li> <li>Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents</li> <li>UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>  |  |  |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was the project cost effective? Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)</li> <li>Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?</li> <li>To what level was the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them used as management tools during implementation?</li> <li>Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?</li> <li>Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?</li> <li>Was the length of the Project sufficient to achieve outcomes?</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</li> <li>Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</li> <li>Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</li> <li>Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations</li> <li>Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, M&amp;E)</li> <li>Occurrence of change in project design/</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>UNDP</li> <li>Project team</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Review of files and archives</li> <li>Key interviews</li> </ul>                         |

|  |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How was results-based management used during project implementation?</li> </ul>   | <p>implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compared to alternatives</li> </ul>  |   |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent were partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organizations encouraged and supported?</li> <li>• What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? Which methods were successful or not and why?</li> <li>• How could the project have been more efficiently carry out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc?)</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners</li> <li>• Examples of supported partnerships</li> <li>• Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</li> <li>• Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• Project partners and relevant stakeholders</li> </ul>                               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis</li> </ul>                           |
| <b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>   |  |   |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What risks are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes?</li> <li>• How are these risks likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes?</li> <li>• How will other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the Project affect sustainability</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence / quality of sustainability strategy</li> <li>• Evidence / quality of steps taken to ensure sustainability</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• UNDP, project staff and partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?</li> <li>• Are the recurrent costs after project completion sustainable?</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Level and source of future financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities after project ends</li> <li>• Evidence of commitments from international partners, governments or other stakeholders to financially support relevant sectors of activities after project ends</li> <li>• Level of recurrent costs after completion of project and funding sources for those recurrent costs</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• UNDP and project personnel and project partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul> |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were the results of efforts made during the project implementation period well assimilated by organizations and their internal systems and procedures?</li> <li>• Is there evidence that project partners will continue their activities beyond project support?</li> <li>• What degree is there of local ownership of initiatives and results?</li> <li>• Were laws, policies and frameworks addressed through the project, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?</li> <li>•</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Degree to which project activities and results have been taken over by local counterparts or institutions/organizations</li> <li>• Level of financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities by in-country actors after project end</li> <li>• Efforts to support the development of relevant laws and policies</li> <li>• State of enforcement and law making capacity</li> <li>• Evidences of commitment by government enactment of laws and resource allocation to priorities</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• UNDP and project personnel and project partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there risks to the environmental benefits that were created or that are expected to occur?</li> <li>• Are there long-term environmental threats that have not been addressed by the project?</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of potential threats</li> <li>• Assessment of unaddressed or emerging threats</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents and evaluations</li> <li>• Risk assessments</li> <li>• Government documents or other external published information</li> <li>• UNDP, project personnel and project partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Documentation review</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved?</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elements in place in those different management functions, at the appropriate levels (national and local) in terms of adequate structures, strategies, systems, skills, incentives and interrelationships with other key actors</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• UNDP, project personnel and project partners</li> <li>• Beneficiaries</li> <li>• Capacity assessments available, if any</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews</li> <li>• Documentation review</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>  |   |  |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the project played a catalytic role (e.g. provided opportunities for replication, scaling up or influencing relevant public policies?)</li> <li>• What barriers remain to achieving long-term objectives, or what necessary steps remain to be taken by stakeholders to achieve sustained impacts and benefits?</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change in capacity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) To pool/mobilize resources</li> <li>ii) For related policy making and strategic planning</li> <li>iii) For implementation of related laws and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project documents</li> <li>• Key stakeholders</li> <li>• Monitoring data</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documents analysis</li> <li>• Meetings with UNDP, project team and project partners</li> <li>• Interviews with</li> </ul> |

|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there unanticipated results achieved or contributed to by the project?</li> </ul>   | <p>strategies through adequate institutional frameworks and their maintenance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change in the number and strength of barriers such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Knowledge about SLM</li> <li>ii) Cross-institutional coordination and inter-sectoral dialogue</li> <li>iii) knowledge of SLM practices used by end users</li> <li>iv) Coordination of policy and legal instruments incorporating SLM</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |  | <p>project beneficiaries and other stakeholders</p>               |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can other ongoing projects and future initiatives build on the successes of this project and learn from its weaknesses in order to enhance the potential for impact.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis</li> </ul> |

#### Specific questions for UNDP/GEF

- What type of support UNDP provided for project implementation?
- Was Adaptive Management well applied to the project? How were risks managed?
- Was a M&E system formally set up? How did you monitor project and guide project activities? Was the Steering Committee well functioning?
- Has the Logframe been changed to adapt to delays in implementation and to the evolving situation in the field? Can you provide the last updated version?
- What are the main achievements of the project? How has the Project contributed to influence policy and law making in the country?
- In which way SLM is better mainstreamed into policies, plans and programs? Is the NAP complete, approved, used?
- Capacity development was the main focus of the project; which capacities have been developed at the individual, institutional and systemic level?
- Is UNDP/GEF available to further sustain current achievements? Are there any other initiative in place or in pipeline?
- How were/are relations with other donors/partners? Did co-financing materialize? Government co-financing? By whom and for which amount?
- What should still be strengthened to ensure the initiative does not fail?
- What are the main weaknesses that should be addressed to ensure sustainability of the initiative?
- What are the main lessons learnt from project implementation according to your experience? Did the GEF Regional Office supported the project in knowledge sharing?

#### Specific questions for the PMU and Government officials

- How has the Project contributed to influence policy and law making in the country? How has it influenced mainstreaming of SLM into policies and regulatory frameworks? What are the main achievements? What type of changes took place in legislation? Which laws were developed, changed influenced by the project during the implementation period?
- Is the NAP complete (since when), approved, used? Are guidelines to mainstream SLM in policy, plans and programmes available?
- What activities did you develop to ensure stakeholders participation at both national and local levels ? Were partnership builders effective in their tasks?
- Has inter-agency coordination improved? Are there overlapping mandates? Has the situation improved in the last years?
- Has the Logframe been changed to adapt to delays in implementation and to the evolving situation in the field? Can you provided the last updated version? What are the main changes to the indicators and targets?
- Did you set up a M&E System? If not how was the project monitored? Has the Project Steering Committee well functioned? How was risk managed?
- Did you receive adequate support from UNDP?
- What changes took place in the Government during the implementation period (main changes of policies, changes in the name and roles of certain ministries, changes in legislation)?
- Has the project developed a Communication Plan? How was implemented? How effective were awareness campaigns?
- Has the project developed a Training Plan? What activities were undertaken in terms of training and capacity building at the individual, institutional and systemic levels? Were they effective? How many people and in which field have been reached? How many of them were women? Has training material been developed and is available to trainees? Are needs still present?
- What are the developments in the National Land Use Plan?
- Is the Land Resources Information system created and functioning? How was the system set up? (Explain)
- What are the main achievements?
- How are relations with other donors/partners? Did co-financing materialize?
- What activities took place at local level involving communities?
- What are the main community organization/NGOs? Were they involved and in which way?
- Is the public aware of the project? Was the Media involved in any way?
- Was climate change assessed as an important risk and the project proofed against it?
- Has Government co-financing materialized?
- Is the Government available to further sustain current achievements and not lose momentum?
- Has financial resources for sustainable land management increased? (Specify) Is donor funding available for SLM?
- What should still be strengthened to ensure the initiative does not fail?
- What are the main weaknesses that should be addressed to ensure sustainability of the initiative?
- What are the main lessons learnt from project implementation according to your experience?



**Annex D - Tentative schedule, Itinerary and institutions/people to meet: Aug Sept. 2013**

| Task  | Date – Time  | Location            | Contact   |
|---|--|---------------------|---|
| Preparation   | 3 <sup>rd</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> August                       | Home based          |   |
| Presentation of joint Inception Report  | 10 <sup>th</sup> August  | Home-based          |   |
| Lloyd Pascal, Dominica ECU Coordinator  | 10th of August   | Phone/Skype         | <a href="mailto:ecu@dominica.gov.dm">ecu@dominica.gov.dm</a><br>Mob. 1 767 295 1796 Office Tel.: (767) 266-5256<br>Roseau   |
| Reynold Murray, Former UNDP Manager   | 10 <sup>th</sup> of August                                     | Skype               | <a href="mailto:reynold.murray@gmail.com">reynold.murray@gmail.com</a>  |
| Mark Brathwaite, Barbados Project Coordinator?                                    | 11 <sup>th</sup> and 16 <sup>th</sup> of August                | Skype               | <a href="mailto:mabrathwaite@gmail.com">mabrathwaite@gmail.com</a>  |
| George de Romilly, Dominica International Consultant                              | 17 <sup>th</sup> August  | Skype/Mail          | <a href="mailto:romillyg@istar.ca">romillyg@istar.ca</a>  |
| José Vicente Troya, UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor                           | 21 <sup>st</sup> August  | Skype               | Tel 1 (507) 302-4636 <a href="mailto:jose.troya@undp.org">jose.troya@undp.org</a>   |
| Travel to Barbados  | 22 <sup>nd</sup> arriving Fri 23 <sup>rd</sup> August, 14:50pm |                     |   |
| Nicole Scholar, Environmental Officer, MED  | Fri 23 <sup>rd</sup> August                                    | Hotel               | 1st Floor, S.P Musson Building, Hincks Street<br>Tel - 1246-4675708 Mobile 1-246-8233322<br><a href="mailto:Nicole.Scholar@barbados.gov.bb">Nicole.Scholar@barbados.gov.bb</a>                  |
| Atiba Clarke, Financial Officer UNDP and Cherryanne Hinds, UNDP Programme Officer | Mon 26 <sup>th</sup>   | UNDP                | UN House, Marine Gardens, Hastings, Christ Church Tel: +1 246 467 6008  |
| Craig Batstone, GeoOrbis  | Mon 26 <sup>th</sup>   | Hotel               | Prior Park House, St. James<br>1-246.421.6875 Cell: 246.231.5665<br><a href="mailto:cbatstone@geoorbis.com">cbatstone@geoorbis.com</a> <a href="http://www.geoorbis.com">www.geoorbis.com</a>   |
| Ryan Als (Brathwaite), National Conservation Commission                           | Mon 26 <sup>th</sup>   | NCC                 | Codrington Road, St Michel<br>Tel 2303181   |
| Lynette Taylor  | Mon 26 <sup>th</sup>   | Hotel               | <a href="tel:1-246-827-5509">Mobile 1-246- 827-5509</a>   |
| Derrick Oderson   | Tue 27 <sup>th</sup>   | Consultant Office   | Tel. 429-5120 Droiterre Inc, Suite 7, Pine Plantation Road, St. Michael   |
| GIS Working Group   | Tue 27 <sup>th</sup>   | MED                 | Rohan Payne, MED; Theron Sealy, TCDPO, Carlos Gilkes, NCC; Phyllis Mayers, MoHLRD, Mark Byer, MoA   |
| Ricky Wilson, Project Manager   | Wed 28 <sup>th</sup>   | Hotel Hilton        | <a href="mailto:Ricky.Wilson@undp.org">Ricky.Wilson@undp.org</a>  |
| PSC Focus group meeting   | Thu 29 <sup>th</sup>   | MED                 | Kim Downes Agard, MED; Nicole Scholar, MED, Rohan Payne, MED, Charles Yearwood, Drainage; Ryan Als, CNN; Antonio Alleyne, Economic Affairs; Eleanor Jordan, MoT; Nigel Jones, MED               |
| Site visit to reforestation and stabilization programme areas                     | Thu 29 <sup>th</sup>   | Scotland District   | Tel (246) 467-5736<br><a href="mailto:Kim.DownesAgard@barbados.gov.bb">Kim.DownesAgard@barbados.gov.bb</a>  |
| Travel to Dominica  | Fri 29 <sup>th</sup> Aug 7:30 am                               |                     |   |
| Lloyd Pascal, Director ECU  | Fri 30 <sup>th</sup>   | ECU                 | <a href="mailto:ecu@dominica.gov.dm">ecu@dominica.gov.dm</a>  |
| Focus Group meeting with key technical staff                                      | Fri 30 <sup>th</sup>   | ECU                 | Lloyd Pascal, ECU; Adisa Trotter, Agricultural Division; Albert Gallion, Forestry Division; Magnus Williams, DOWASCO; Derrick Theophile and Iyra Gage, Fisheries Division; Kimisha Thomas, ECU. |
| Visit to Community and Village Council  | Fri 30 <sup>th</sup>   | Bagatelle community | Lloyd Pascal and representative of the community, responsible for disaster preparedness   |
| Annie Edwards, Planner  | Mon 2 <sup>nd</sup> Sept                                       | Hotel               | <a href="mailto:Annierose63@gmail.com">Annierose63@gmail.com</a> ; Tel 2777568  |
| Lloyd Pascal, ECU   | Mon 2 <sup>nd</sup> Sept                                       | Hotel               | Preliminary presentation of findings  |
| Report Preparation  | Sat 31 <sup>st</sup> August, Sun 1 <sup>st</sup> September     | Dominica            |   |
| Travel to Barbados  | Mon 2 <sup>nd</sup> September 4:10pm                           |                     |   |
| Debrief, Report preparation   | Wed 3rd September  |                     |   |
| Travel to Europe  | 4 <sup>th</sup> Sept with arrival the next day                 |                     |   |

## Annex E – BAR SLM Project Logical Framework, July 2012 Inception Report

| Project Strategy   | Objectively verifiable indicators   |   |  | Sources of verification  | Risks and Assumptions  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
|  | Indicator   | Baseline  | Target   |  |  |
| <b>Goal:</b> Agricultural land, wooded and protected areas, open spaces and other land uses are fully functioning, sustainable systems that maintain the ecological integrity and productivity of terrestrial and associated marine ecosystems.  |   |   |  |  |  |
| <b>Objective of the project:</b><br>Land degradation trends are reversed through enhanced capacity for sustainable land management within relevant government agencies, the private sector, non-governmental and civil society organisations, and the institutionalization of sustainable land management practices within national development planning processes, programmes and strategies. | Best practices and guidelines for SLM disseminated by TCDPO, MA and MED are mainstreamed and incorporated into Environmental Management Act                                 | SLM not mainstreamed at the systemic level resulting in ineffective management of land resources  | Legislative proposals within the EMA revised, amended and accepted by Cabinet of Ministers by Y2   | Published revised legislative and policy instruments in agency reports and in National Gazette   | Continued political support for integrating SLM into national development planning;  |
|  | NAP formulation completed and integrated in the Environmental and Natural Resources Management Plan   | NAP did not exist   | NAP completed by last quarter Y1   | Updated Environmental and Natural Resources Management Plan integrates requirements of UNCCD NAP   | Public education and awareness of SLM generates support for application of SLM practices and considerations in all relevant sectors  |
| <b>Outcome 1:</b><br>Policy/Regulatory Frameworks and Resource Mobilization for SLM integrated into national development policies and legislative / regulatory frameworks governing land use planning and management. ( <i>i.e. mainstreaming</i> )  | The Ministry of Economic Affairs and the Town and Country Development Planning Office (TCDPO) use natural resource economics as a tool in decision making on land use by Y2 | Guidelines for incorporating SLM into macro-economic policies do exist via the National Physical Planning System; limited capacity exist in use of resource valuation to effect mainstreaming process; limited use of environmental fiscal mechanisms | Incorporation of SLM into macro-economic policies and planning (via resource valuation and environmental fiscal mechanisms ) completed by first quarter Y2<br>Establishment of mechanisms to monitor and report fiscal | Design of Environmental Economics Framework by UWI GESS Team-Economic Department;<br>Undertaking of TEEB Phase 1 of Terrestrial Resource;<br>Design of a GOB Impact Analysis Mechanism in MEA or | Senior policy and planning authorities are motivated to facilitate the process of integration of SLM considerations into sustainable development strategies and initiatives; high level political commitment is secured. |

| Project Strategy  | Objectively verifiable indicators   |  |  | Sources of verification   | Risks and Assumptions  |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
|   | Indicator   | Baseline   | Target   |   |  |
|   |   |  | impacts re SLM   | MED   |  |
|   | The Environmental and Natural Resources Management Plan contains specific sections that address land degradation and sustainable land management including NAP requirements | Most policy instruments (outside of PDP and Agricultural Plans) do not incorporate SLM   | Integration of SLM into the Environmental and Natural Resources Management Plan by Y2  | Revised and updated Environmental and Natural Resources Management Plan document  |  |
|   | Investment plans in key economic sectors (agriculture, tourism, construction, commercial) supports SLM implementation within the ENRMP                                      | Sector investment plans generally do incorporate SLM considerations  | Investment Plan and Resource Mobilization Plan of 2013-2018  | Sector Investment plans of Agriculture, Water, Housing, Tourism, Environment, Economic and Financial Agencies; reports of government budgetary allocation | Investment climate remains favourable; political commitment continues; macroeconomic situation of Barbados remains stable  |
| <b>Outcome 2:</b><br>Institutional strengthening and coordination for SLM achieved through routine consistent coordination and collaboration among all relevant planning and land management agencies | Institutional audits completed of key SLM agencies (and staff trained in SLM related fields);   | SCU, NHD, PRPIU capacity inadequate to provide effective support to SLM considerations in developmental planning and policy; low level of resource support to these agencies | At least 6 senior staff members in the key SLM agencies receiving advanced training in soil management, technology and GIS; increase in annual budgetary allocations by 2% by 2013 | Cabinet approval of new staffing structure, Unit reports, budget allocation   | Planning and land management agencies understand benefits of coordination and collaboration and are willing to participate.<br>Budgetary allocations for the SCU are increased |
|   | Inter-agency Mechanism for coordination, implantation and monitoring of the ENRMP established and formalised by Y2.   | Agency mandates and mechanisms for effective coordination for SLM poorly defined; no formal arrangements for inclusion of NGOs and   | Coordinating mechanism between key agencies defined and established by second quarter of Y2  | Cabinet approved collaborative mechanism,   |  |

| Project Strategy  | Objectively verifiable indicators   |  |   | Sources of verification   | Risks and Assumptions  |
|---|---|--|---|---|--|
|   | Indicator   | Baseline   | Target  |   |  |
|   |   | private sector in land management  |   |   |  |
| <b>Outcome 3:</b> An efficient Information Management System to support SLM decision-making developed | Protocols for the integrated Land Resources Information System (LRIS) established; created within the MED is being consulted by at least 3 stakeholders every month by 2013   | Institutional systems exists; An Integrated land information system does not exist; Spatial information systems (GIS) with limited datasets exist in Agriculture, Land and Surveys and Town Planning Dept. but not oriented to SLM decision making | GIS laboratory designed and costed by Y2  | Computer hardware and software procurement documentation; Consultant reports; record of consultations                               | Stakeholder institutions are willing to collaborate on integrated approaches to sustainable land management and to share access to land information; Adequate Institutional and financial support are provided |
|   | New studies on the status of soil/land degradation in vulnerable areas of Barbados conducted, as well as the new land use and soil survey, are available in the integrated Land Resources Information System (LRIS) by Y2 | Land degradation data in environmental hot-spots is outdated compromising effective decision making and planning   | Relevant spatial/attribute datasets compiled by Y2 and readily available on the LRIS; new soils survey completed and published by Y2; new land use cover maps available by Y2                     | Spatial data sets; Consultant reports; Planning/development application documentation<br>Published soil survey and land use maps    |  |
| <b>Outcome 4:</b> Human resource capacity for SLM developed at all levels                             | Enhanced capacity to utilize spatial land resources information in support of SLM planning within key land management and decision making agencies by Y2  | Capacity for effective application of spatial land information systems in support of SLM planning inadequate   | At least 12 senior and middle level technical staff from SLM agencies and NGOs secure training in the use/application (and maintenance) of land information systems for SLM planning by end of Y2 | Agency reports, planning/development documentation accompanied land information products; LRIS operating and maintenance procedures | Funding for SLM has been made available; There is stakeholder consensus for, and buy-in to, the process; Appropriate technologies for SLM are available  |

| Project Strategy                                   | Objectively verifiable indicators   |   |   | Sources of verification   | Risks and Assumptions |
|--|---|---|---|---|-----------------------|
|  | Indicator   | Baseline  | Target  |   |                       |
|  | Percentage of land-users satisfied with available technical support has increased | Low level of uptake of soil/land conservation measures in project design and execution the economic sectors (agriculture, tourism, industry, construction); technical staff in agencies lack requisite skills in delivering technical support for SLM | At least 35 farmers, agricultural officers, land developers and other major land users from the public and private sectors and from NGOs trained in land management principles and techniques each year | Training documentation and surveys  |                       |
| <b>Outcome 5:</b> Adaptive Management and Learning | Project Management Unit established and effective                                 | none  | PMU is operational within 1 month of Project start-up.  | Annual project progress reports;<br>Annual work plans   |                       |
|  | Project implementation guided by monitoring and evaluation programme              | None  | M+E benchmarks and targets realized   | Quarterly Operational and Annual project progress reports;<br>Published annual M+E evaluations;<br>Revised Annual work plans (based on findings of M+E) |                       |
|  | Documented lessons from project implementation                                    | none  | Lessons learnt documentation incorporated into annual progress report   | Quarterly Operational and Annual project progress reports   |                       |

## Annex F – Rating Table

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</b></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings<br/>         5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings<br/>         4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)<br/>         3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings<br/>         2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems<br/>         1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p> | <p><b>Sustainability ratings:</b></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability<br/>         3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks<br/>         2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks<br/>         1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p> | <p><b>Relevance ratings</b></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)<br/>         1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><b>Impact Ratings:</b></p> <p>3. Significant (S)<br/>         2. Minimal (M)<br/>         1. Negligible (N)</p> |
| <p><b>Additional ratings where relevant:</b><br/>         Not Applicable (N/A)<br/>         Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>  |  |  |

## Annex G – Rating Table Barbados based on the revised Logframe July 2012

| Objective   | Performance Indicator  | Baseline   | Target   | EoP and current status   | TE Comments   | Rating |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|--------|
| Land degradation trends are reversed through enhanced capacity for sustainable land management within relevant government agencies, the private sector, nongovernmental and civil society organisations, and the institutionalisation of sustainable land management practices within national development planning processes, programmes and strategies. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Best practices and guidelines for SLM disseminated by TCDPO, MA and MED are mainstreamed and incorporated into Environmental Management Act</li> <li>NAP formulation completed and integrated in the ENRMP</li> </ul> | <p>SLM not mainstreamed at the systemic level resulting in ineffective management of land resources</p> <p>NAP did not exist</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legislative proposals within the EMA revised, amended and accepted by Cabinet of Ministers by Y2</li> <li>Updated ENRMP integrates requirements of UNCCD NAP</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No major change in the legislative or policy process occurred since 2008 related with SLM;</li> <li>NAP yet to be finalised and endorsed</li> <li>Inter-agency collaboration improved through the work of the PSC and GIS WG; wide consultative activities partially took place among key SLM agencies;</li> <li>Land Degradation Committee acting as the mechanism for agencies coordination but without legal mandate to oversee their work</li> <li>Awareness for importance of data sharing increased at the technical level</li> <li>Land management and soil stabilization practices have the potential to reverse land degradation trends</li> </ul> | <p>-Neither the objective nor outcomes have been reached</p> <p>-None of the studies/strategies developed can be translated into impact as they did not reach the implementation stage; if follow up not provided and recommendations integrated in agencies work plan, the investment will be lost</p> <p>-Demonstration activities undertaken will hopefully result in a decrease in land degradation and examples of best practices in land and water management in Barbados</p> <p>-Increase awareness on the need to exchange data and set a centralised database to facilitate planning and decision-making is appreciated at the technical staff level. This has not yet reached the policy making level and there is no evidence of actions taken to sustain results obtained so far</p> <p>- NAP still to be finalised and endorsed; to be possibly done next year in parallel with the preparation of the Report to UNCCD Conference of the Parties</p> |        |
| Outcome/Output  | Performance Indicator  | Baseline   | Target   | 2012 and current EoP Status  | TE comments   | Rating |
| Outcome N.1 Policy/Regulatory Frameworks and Resources Mobilization for SLM integrated into national development policies and legislative/regulatory frameworks governing land use planning and management (i.e. mainstreaming)   |  |  |  |  |   | U      |

|  |   |   |   |  |   |           |
|--|---|---|---|--|---|-----------|
| <p><b>Output N.1.1</b> SLM and UNCCD NAP elements mainstreamed in the updated ENRMP and Site-Specific Programmes</p> <p><b>Output 1.2</b> Investment Plan and Resource Mobilisation Plan for 2013-2018 to support SLM implementation within the ENRMP</p> <p><b>Output 1.3</b> Integrated Environmental Public Information Dissemination and Demonstration initiatives</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MofEA and the TCDPO use natural resources economics as a tool in decision making on land use by Y2</li> <li>The ENRMP contains specific sections that address land degradation and SLM including NAP requirements</li> <li>Investment plans in key economic sectors (agriculture, tourism, construction, commercial) supports SLM implementation within the ENRMP</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidelines for incorporating SLM into macro-economic policies do exist via the NPP System; limited capacity exist in use of resource valuation to effect mainstreaming process; limited use of environmental fiscal mechanisms</li> <li>Most policy instruments (outside of PDP and Agricultural Plans) do not incorporate SLM</li> <li>Sector investment plans generally do incorporate SLM considerations</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporation of SLM into macro-economic policies and planning (via resource valuation and environmental fiscal mechanisms ) completed by first quarter Y2</li> <li>Establishment of mechanisms to monitor and report fiscal impacts re SLM</li> <li>Integration of SLM into the ENRMP by Y2</li> <li>Investment Plan and Resource Mobilization Plan of 2013-2018</li> </ul> | <p>-NAP partially revised; to be completed next year together with the preparation of the Fifth National Report to UNCCD Conference of the Parties</p> <p>-KAP surveys conducted</p> <p>-Communication and Information Strategy developed</p> <p>-A Brand Communication Strategy developed</p> <p>-SLM investment plans cancelled</p> <p>- SLM website prepared but not yet uploaded</p>   | <p>-Most activities under this outcome were cut down in 2012; the need to update the ENRMP was no longer a priority</p> <p>- The very detailed means of verification identified at inception are almost targets in themselves and cannot be proved</p> <p>- SLM is still not a unifying theme for agencies with a mandate in aspects of SLM but agencies report that mainstreaming happens anyway at the technical level while the need to translate this into legal instrument is not particularly felt</p> <p>- Awareness activities produced results and the process has been initiated; much remains to be done</p> |           |
| <p><b>Outcome 2 Institutional strengthening and coordination for SLM achieved through routine consistent coordination and collaboration among all relevant planning and land management agencies</b></p>   |   |   |   |  |   |           |
| <p><b>Output 2.1</b> The key SLM agencies strengthened</p> <p><b>Output 2.2</b> Mainstream SLM in National Development Governance</p> <p><b>Output 2.3</b> Establish a formal inter-agency technical mechanism to coordinate implementation, monitor, update the ENRMP</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Institutional audits completed of key SLM agencies (and staff trained in SLM related fields)</li> <li>Inter-agency Mechanism for coordination, implantation and monitoring of the ENRMP established and formalised by Y2.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SCU, NHD, PRPIU capacity inadequate to provide effective support to SLM considerations in developmental planning and policy; low level of resource support to these agencies</li> <li>Agency mandates and mechanisms</li> </ul>  | <p>At least 6 senior staff members in the key SLM agencies receiving advanced training in soil management, technology and GIS; increase in annual budgetary allocations by 2% by 2013</p> <p>Coordinating mechanism between key agencies defined and established by second quarter of Y2</p>  | <p>- Institutional review of SCU</p> <p>- A 5-year Strategic Management Plan developed with recommendations to improve effectiveness and efficiency of the agency in managing the Scotland District</p> <p>-Report presented to SCU and MoA</p> <p>-Two workshops organised which also served as awareness activities</p> <p>-Land Degradation Committee functioning as the inter-agency mechanism for coordination</p> <p>-SLM issues practically mainstreamed into the work of line agencies through</p> | <p>-Sound institutional review of SCU but no measures recommended has been implemented, not even in the year after Project closure</p> <p>-Interagency collaboration improved and Land Degradation Committee functioning as mechanism of coordination of agencies but without a legal mandate to oversee their work</p>   | <p>MS</p> |



|  |  |  |   |  |   |    |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|----|
|  |  | for effective coordination for SLM poorly defined; no formal arrangements for inclusion of NGOs and private sector in land management  |   | best practice and technical work   |   |    |
| <b>Outcome N.3 An efficient Information Management System to support SLM decision-making developed</b>   |  |  |   |  |   |    |
| <p><b>Output 3.1</b> Review and update the LIS data and systems within the MoA (SCU) and MED</p> <p><b>Output 3.2</b> Support the operationalization of National LIS and National Environmental Resources Management Information System</p> <p><b>Output 3.3</b> Assess the establishment of a Laboratory to support Training and Analysis Visualisation and Modelling to support NERMIS</p> <p><b>Output 3.4</b> Establish an Environmental Information and Communication Platform to support SLM, NCSA and ENRMP</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protocols for the integrated LRIS established; created within the MED is being consulted at least by 3 stakeholders every month by 2013</li> <li>• New studies on the status of soil/land degradation in vulnerable areas of Barbados conducted, as well as the new land use and soil survey, are available in the integrated Land Resources Information System (LRIS) by Y2</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional systems exists; An Integrated land information system does not exist; Spatial information systems (GIS) with limited datasets exist in Agriculture, Land and Surveys and Town Planning Dept. but not oriented to SLM decision making</li> <li>• Land degradation data in environmental hot-spots is outdated compromising effective decision making and planning</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GIS laboratory designed and costed by Y2</li> <li>• Relevant spatial/attribute datasets compiled by Y2 and readily available on the LRIS; new soils survey completed and published by Y2; new land use cover maps available by Y2</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-GIS WG established</li> <li>- Review of GIS capacities within various participating agencies</li> <li>-3 SLM agencies shared datasets to produce GIS maps for a selected demonstration site (Consett Bay)</li> <li>- Metadata training workshop hosted (about 30 participants) to create awareness and start building capacity of relevant agencies in standardizing the method of storing metadata</li> <li>- Recommendations made to MED for establishing a LIS</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A few interesting outputs achieved but very far from reaching the outcome;</li> <li>-No integrated Land Resources Information System (LRIS) created</li> <li>-Awareness on the importance of sharing data increased</li> <li>-Capacities partially strengthened</li> <li>-Need for common protocol and standards raised</li> <li>-Inter-agency integration fostered for LIS</li> <li>-Benefits of sharing data demonstrated</li> <li>-No follow up since project ended</li> <li>-No evidence that maps created with the demonstration activity are being used</li> </ul> | MS |
| <b>Outcome N. 4 Human resource capacity for SLM developed at all levels</b>  |  |  |   |  |   |    |
| <p><b>Outputs:4.1</b> Enhanced capacity for SLM among senior and middle technical levels in</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced capacity to utilize spatial land resources information in</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capacity for effective application of spatial land</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 12 senior and middle level technical staff from SLM agencies and NGOs secure training</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-14 officers from SLM agencies trained in use and application of GIS software</li> <li>-Recommendations for the training in SCU developed for the short, medium</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GIS capacity improved as a tool for decision-making</li> <li>-Demonstration activities able to contribute towards the goal</li> </ul>  | MS |

|  |   |  |   |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| <p>NERM Committee</p> <p><b>Output 4.2</b> Enhanced capacities among personnel in key land management agencies for the use of LIS</p> <p><b>Output 4.3</b> Enhanced capacity for sustainable agriculture among farmers and other relevant stakeholders groups enhanced and disseminated</p> <p><b>Output 4.4</b> Design and execute SLM Public Education Showcase by MED</p> <p><b>Output 4.5</b> Best practices for soil, land and flood water management developed, disseminated and physically demonstrated</p> | <p>support of SLM planning, within key land management and decision making agencies by Y2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage of land-users satisfied with available technical support has increased</li> </ul> | <p>information systems in support of SLM planning inadequate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low level of uptake of soil/land conservation measures in project design and execution the economic sectors (agriculture, tourism, industry, construction); technical staff in agencies lack requisite skills in delivering technical support for SLM</li> </ul> | <p>in the use/application (and maintenance) of land information systems for SLM planning by end of Y2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At least 35 farmers, agricultural officers, land developers and other major land users from the public and private sectors and from NGOs trained in land management principles and techniques each year</li> </ul> | <p>and long term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Training session in the use of metadata and its applications</li> <li>-4 workshops for approximately 250 farmers trained in the construction and use of row cover technology to increase crop production</li> <li>-NCC and MoA collaborated for a Reforestation and Stabilization Programme done in thee selected sites in Scotland District</li> <li>-NCC and Botanical Garden collaborated to establish a Rain Garden to demonstrate land to water issues management</li> </ul> | <p>of reversing land degradation trends through soil stabilization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-All activities done with involvement of an education component for children are commendable</li> <li>-Stakeholders survey not conducted</li> </ul> |  |
| <b>Outcome N.5 Adaptive Management and Learning</b>  |   |  |   |  |   |  |
| <p><b>Output 5.1</b> Project implemented in a cost-effective manner in accordance with agreed work plans and budgets</p> <p><b>Output 5.2</b> M&amp;E Plan provides inputs for robust adaptive management</p> <p><b>Output 5.3</b> Lessons learned from the project captured and disseminated</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PMU established and effective</li> <li>Project implementation guided by M&amp;E</li> <li>Documented lessons from project implementation</li> </ul>   | <p>none</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PMU is operational within 1 month of Project start-up.</li> <li>M&amp;E benchmarks and targets realized</li> <li>Lessons learnt documentation incorporated into annual progress report</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Annual project progress reports;</li> <li>-Annual work plans</li> <li>-Quarterly Operational and Annual project progress reports; Published annual M+E evaluations;</li> <li>-Revised Annual work plans (based on findings of M+E)</li> <li>-Quarterly Operational and Annual project progress reports</li> </ul>  |   |  |