

**Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Caribbean Islands Programme
Mid-term Evaluation**

**Report of the Regional Workshop
Hotel Four Seasons, Kingston, Jamaica, 10-12 July 2013**

1. Introduction

The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) [Caribbean islands programme](#) is a joint initiative of l'Agence Française de Développement, Conservation International, the European Union, the Global Environment Facility, the Government of Japan, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the World Bank. The goal of the CEPF is to support the work of civil society in developing and implementing conservation strategies, as well as in raising public awareness on the implications of loss of biodiversity. The Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI), in its capacity as the Regional Implementation Team (RIT) for CEPF in the Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot, is managing a US\$6.9 million grant fund to support civil society's contribution to biodiversity conservation in eleven Caribbean islands between 2010 and 2015. Countries eligible for CEPF support in the region are: Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, The Bahamas, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, St. Kitts & Nevis and St. Vincent and the Grenadines. As of 30 June, 2013, 55 small and large grants have been issued at a total value of US\$ 5,242,333.

A mid-term evaluation of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme is required. This evaluation was conducted by CANARI in collaboration with the CEPF Secretariat during the period May – September 2013. The evaluation used a combination of methods. These included a desk review of key reports, a written survey of key stakeholders using Survey Monkey, interviews with members of the Regional Advisory Committee for CEPF in the Caribbean (RACC), interviews with grantees, a focus group session with the RIT staff, focus group sessions with grantees and key partners in three countries (the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica) and a regional workshop with grantees and key partners. This is the report of the regional workshop.

2. Objectives

The objectives of the CEPF mid-term evaluation regional workshop, focusing on both accountability and learning, were to:

- i. facilitate networking for knowledge sharing, enhanced coordination and collaboration among CEPF grantees and with their partners;
- ii. evaluate progress on achievement of CEPF Caribbean Islands Programme results - outcomes and impacts;
- iii. build awareness and commitment of CEPF grantees, synergies and coordination;
- iv. develop recommendations on strategies and priorities to achieve all results by the end of the programme;
- v. map relevant initiatives, funding development, synergies, potential areas of collaboration;
- vi. identify unexpected positive and negative impacts of CEPF in the Caribbean;
- vii. analyse lessons learnt on process of planning and implementation;
- viii. develop recommendations for improvement of the process.

3. Participants

47 participants attended the meeting, representing CEPF grantees, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Operational Focal Point for Jamaica and key government agencies in Jamaica, donors, RACC members and key regional organisations working in biodiversity conservation in the region. The list of participants is attached as Appendix 1. The workshop was facilitated by a team from CANARI constituting Nicole Leotaud, the Executive Director of CANARI, Anna Cadiz, RIT Manager, the RIT Country Coordinators for Jamaica, the Dominican Republic and Haiti (Nicole Brown, Leida Buglass and Paul Judex Edouarzin respectively). Rapporteurship was by Neila Bobb-Prescott, RIT Small Grant Manager.

4. Method

The agenda is attached as Appendix 2. The meeting was facilitated using a mix of plenary presentations by the RIT and CEPF Secretariat as well as by CEPF grantees and partners, plenary discussions, individual reflection and sharing, and small group work.

5. Findings

Key points discussed in the meeting are organised under the workshop objectives identified above.

a. Facilitating networking for knowledge sharing, enhanced coordination and collaboration among CEPF grantees and with their partners

Participants were invited to propose key topics for discussion to share knowledge and identify opportunities for coordination and collaboration. The proposed topics are presented below.

- Payment for ecosystem services and sustainable financing
- Strengthening valuation of ecosystem services
- Valuing ecosystems
- Climate change adaptation
- Collaboration between the Dominican Republic and Haiti
- Biodiversity and protected areas

Three topics were selected for further discussion by three working groups who were asked to focus on lessons learned, best practices and recommendations for civil society and their partners.

Representatives of each working group then presented a summary of the discussions to the plenary. These are presented under each of the chosen topics below.

Collaboration between the Dominican Republic and Haiti

- Beekeepers from the Dominican Republic are engaged in the sustainable use of natural resources. They received funds from the European Union to support production and are now exporting to the United States of America. A network was created and there was collaboration with Haiti on this project. The network encouraged the exchange of ideas.
- Other possible opportunities for collaboration include on bird conservation, for example, conservation of the Black-capped Petrel, and sustainable production of macadamia nuts.

Biodiversity and protected areas

- Recent calls for proposals for climate change projects have not included marine areas as illegible project sites.
- Funding available for climate change adaptation is mostly available to governments. Civil society needs to determine the entry points and look for sustainable funding.
- Key stakeholders are not efficiently communicating the urgency of climate change in Caribbean islands to donors.
- There is no regional strategic plan for adaptation to climate change¹.
- Funds are needed to do climate change work on the ground.
- The new call from CEPF should promote documenting and sharing on how terrestrial areas can count as a tool for adaptation to climate change.
- Applicants to CEPF should include climate change adaptation components in their proposals.
- The International Small Island Developing States (SIDS) agenda requires the participation of civil society so we need to identify how best we can take advantage of opportunities emerging from this event.

Payment for ecosystem services and sustainable financing

- Economic evaluations are expensive.
- The system of doing economic evaluation must be married to the purpose.
- Capacity at the local level must be built to perform economic valuations of natural resources.
- Economic valuation of natural resources is an important tool but it can't be used for everything. There is still a place for cost-benefit analysis.
- Economists must accept/use economic valuation tools for decision making.
- Valuation of ecosystem services needs to be promoted to investors to encourage them to engage in formalised programmes (such as taxes and fees from guests) to conserve biodiversity.

b. Evaluating the progress on achievement of CEPF Caribbean programme results - outcomes and impacts

Most Significant Change Stories

After a presentation on the method of evaluating using "Most Significant Change Stories" (Appendix 3), each of the participants identified what they thought were the most significant (positive or negative) changes as a result of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme under the following themes. These were shared in small groups. Individual stories were selected by the groups for presentation to the plenary and are provided in Appendix 4. Key themes identified from the results reported and the subsequent discussions included:

- ***Partnerships***: CEPF funding provided opportunities to strengthen partnerships for biodiversity conservation within countries and across the region – among civil society organisations (CSOs), between CSOs and government agencies, public-private partnerships and other partners, and among government agencies and other partners. CEPF funding also enabled local CSOs to enter into

¹The Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC) has a regional framework and an implementation plan for achieving development resilient to climate change for the period 2009-2015.

alliances with partners from outside the region to conduct scientific research that they did not have the capacity to perform themselves. This contributed to informing plans for protection and effective management of biodiversity in their islands.

- **Putting biodiversity conservation on the agenda:** CEPF funding:
 - contributed to ongoing initiatives to raising awareness on biodiversity conservation in the Caribbean;
 - enabled research to be conducted which supported advocacy for valuing natural resources in national economic deliberations;
 - provided support for biodiversity conservation in protected areas that had little support from other sources.
- **Local empowerment:** CEPF funding contributed to empowering local groups by:
 - enabling them to assume roles in the governance of protected areas;
 - building their capacity to play instrumental roles in achievement of conservation goals;
 - giving them tools to effect change and promote collaboration and the exchange of ideas;
 - increasing their knowledge and awareness of biodiversity conservation issues
- **Innovative methods in biodiversity conservation:** CEPF funding provided an opportunity to explore new methods, such as:
 - conservation methods such as payment for ecosystem services, private protected areas, development of participatory management plans for protected areas and integration of climate change elements in protected area management planning;
 - action learning, which enabled the sharing of ideas and experiences among groups involved in biodiversity conservation.
- **Knowledge sharing / exchange:** CEPF funding gave grantees the opportunity:
 - to produce and disseminate communication products to target audiences on their work;
 - to share knowledge on biodiversity needs in the region;
- **Capacity building of CSOs:** CEPF funding contributed to building the capacity of CSOs through strengthening organisational and technical capacity of the grantees, including through:
 - providing funds to pay for personnel time needed to engage in partnerships with the private sector for biodiversity conservation;
 - providing information and funds for personnel time for members of CSOs to support developing alternative livelihood opportunities in rural communities;
 - improving the prominence and credibility of the CSOs to policy makers;
 - improving technical skills and expertise in biodiversity conservation; and
 - building CSO capacity in project development and management through their experience in managing the CEPF grants.

Outcome mapping to analyse changes in behaviour and relationships

The outcome mapping methodology was introduced as a monitoring and evaluation approach that emphasises that achieving change is really about changing the behaviour of people. Using this methodology, an “Outcome Challenge Statement” is developed for each target group to describe a vision of what successful change in the behaviour and relationships of the specific target group would look like. The evaluation then assesses progress towards achieving this change in behaviour and relationships. Participants were divided into groups and asked to evaluate the change in the main target groups for the CEPF Caribbean islands programme (CSOs and donors). They examined a draft Outcome

Challenge Statement prepared for each target group and discussed what progress had been made, if any, towards achieving this.

The presentation on the outcome mapping concept and the Outcome Challenge Statements for the key target groups for the CEPF Caribbean islands programme are in Appendix 3.

The results of the group discussions are presented in Table 1 and 2 below.

Table 1: Outcome Map with reported changes in behaviours and relationships of CSOs

Target group 1: CSOs working in biodiversity conservation in the Caribbean		
Outcome challenge statement:		
<p>CSOs in the Caribbean are effectively managing or contributing to management of protected areas for biodiversity conservation. They are identifying strategic priorities for biodiversity conservation action and working to address these. They are working in partnership with other civil society organisations and government to share information, coordinate and collaborate. They are developing strategic relationships with donors and other partners. They are practicing effective financial management and human resource development; developing and implementing strategic plans; writing strong proposals and securing funding to implement projects; effectively implement projects; evaluating project results; communicating project results and lessons.</p>		
BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION	PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT	NETWORKING
<p>The group believed that the strongest influence was that CEPF helped CSOs to access funding to implement needed actions for priority conservation initiatives. The group also indicated that accessing a CEPF grant contributed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ improving their prominence and credibility with government authorities; ○ enhancing previous advocacy for biodiversity conservation; and ○ evaluating and reporting on conservation impacts in Dominican Republic, Saint Lucia and Grenada. <p>The group noted that CSOs in the region had provided the information to identify the strategic priorities for the CEPF programme during the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Using the logical framework to apply for a CEPF large grant allowed CSOs to build capacity to use a helpful tool to develop a proposal which they can then submit to other donors. ○ CSOs support/appreciate the approach to jointly develop project proposals with the CEPF Secretariat and the RIT as it allowed for consideration of interests of the donor and the grantee. ○ CANARI acting as the RIT serves as a conduit for clarifying donor guidelines and also as an advocate for grantee positions. ○ CSOs are delivering projects within the deadlines. ○ Additional support is needed for CSOs to 	<p>This group graded the progress markers on a scale of 1-5 (1 being the lowest and 5 the highest).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The progress marker, "Identifying potential partners", received the highest rank. The group felt that CEPF had allowed CSOs to identify partners not only among other CSOs but also with other various stakeholders in biodiversity conservation in the region and globally. ○ The group assigned a score of 4.36 to the progress marker, "Identify potential synergies and areas for collaboration with partners", and explained that the CEPF programme has brought CSOs together in the Dominican Republic and this has allowed them to identify synergies among themselves. The group noted that there has been some progress in Haiti but felt the initiatives under CEPF have contributed to identifying potential synergies and

<p>Ecosystem Profiling process in 2009.</p>	<p>evaluate and communicate project results and lessons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CSOs are incorporating lessons learnt into future work. 	<p>areas for collaboration among CSOs within countries and among countries in the region overall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In terms of "Collaboration on implementation where there are synergies" the group expressed some concern in attributing some observed actions strictly to CEPF. Fondation pour la Protection de la Biodiversité Marine (FoProBiM) of Haiti shared that their organisation has been approached by prominent reputable organisations to partner but they were not comfortable to attributing this to executing a CEPF grant. The group assigned this progress marker a score of 3. ○ The progress marker referencing sharing information was also given a score of 3. The group felt that the CEPF Secretariat, CANARI and Rainforest Alliance were doing a good job of getting the word out about CEPF in the region but noted that there was a need to encourage grantees to contribute information. ○ The group allocated a score of 2 to "CSOs initiating contact with other CSOs" and indicated that it is not customary in some countries for CSOs to approach one another and ask to work on projects together. ○ A score of 1 was given to "CSOs developing formal and informal partnership agreements" as they believed that not much has been done in this area although there is a lot of interest in the region.
---	--	---

Table 2: Outcome Map with reported changes in behaviours and relationships of donors

<p>Target group 2: Other donors working in biodiversity conservation in the Caribbean</p>
<p>Outcome challenge statement: Donors working in biodiversity conservation in the Caribbean are contributing to achieving CEPF conservation priorities.</p>

Indicators of behaviour change (progress markers):

This group allocated the highest scores to being aware of CEPF priorities and results and collaborating with CEPF to support conservation initiatives. All other progress markers received a score of 1. The key points of the discussions are given below.

- Donors are taking into consideration work being done in KBAs to guide investment portfolios.
- Regional and global policy initiatives need to be aware of CEPF and the contribution that CEPF is making to these initiatives.
- It is now the right time to formulate and launch a systematic approach to conveying results about CEPF to donors.
- There needs to be better coordination among donors to improve the effectiveness of efforts in biodiversity conservation in the region.
- There is a need to document which donors CEPF grantees are working with and where to guide investment in biodiversity conservation in the region.

Completing the CEPF Global Goal Matrix

The CEPF Global Goal Matrix was presented, which is a tool that the CEPF Secretariat uses to track the status of biodiversity conservation at the country and regional levels which feeds into the CEPF's global monitoring framework. Participants were concerned about their capacity to complete the matrix given the knowledge requirements and the importance of eliciting various perspectives. While they felt the analysis could be useful if it was properly done by countries, they were also concerned as to how this information could be misinterpreted by governments and external partners and have deleterious effects on a country's international status and donor relations. Representatives of seven countries completed the matrices. The meeting agreed that these results were subjective and were the opinion of the workshop participants and merely a product of a workshop exercise and not a representation of the state of biodiversity conservation in the CEPF target countries. Most participants indicated no change in status of criterion evaluated from 2009 to present.

Results achieved under the Logical Framework for the CEPF Caribbean islands programme

Summary results achieved under the Logical Framework were presented as compiled by the RIT based on grantee reports and national focus groups held in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica (Appendix 5). There was also a discussion on the gaps identified in CEPF meeting the targets in the logframe and a plenary discussion about this. There was agreement on the recommendations that the RIT put forward in terms of priority areas for CEPF to support in moving forward, in order to meet all the logframe targets. The five recommendations made and agreed upon were:

- mainstreaming biodiversity conservation at the policy level;
- bi-national cooperation and coordination in the Dominican Republic and Haiti;
- reinforce and consolidate current and past investments to ensure sustainability;
- strategic capacity building support and networking for local civil society organisations; and
- support for conservation efforts in the high priority KBAs that are currently under-represented in the portfolio.

c. Building awareness and commitment of CEPF grantees, synergies and coordination

Presentations on CEPF grants by grantees

CEPF grantees each presented their projects and responded to questions in very rich information sharing sessions. The presentations are available in Appendix 6. Some grantees proposed themes to summarise their experiences on implementing the grants. These are presented below.

Organisation	Summary phrase
Grenada Dove Conservation Programme (GDGP)	Innovative collaboration
Bahamas National Trust (BNT)	Local engagement
Saint Lucia National Trust (SLNT)	Partnerships
Jamaica Environment Trust (JET)	Truth to power
Sociedad Ornitológica de la Hispaniola Inc. (SOH)	Environmental awareness
The Zoological Society of Philadelphia	Regional collaboration
Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation(C-CAM)	Partnership/stress
Instituto Dominicano de Desarrollo Integral, Inc. (IDDI)	Union of efforts
Instituto Tecnológico de Santo Domingo (INTEC)	Innovation
Grupo Jaragua	Hope
Consortio Ambiental Dominicano (CAD)	Governance

d. Developing recommendations on strategies and priorities to achieve all results by the end of the programme

A proposed listing of priority areas for the next and possible final call for proposals was presented. This presentation is available in Appendix 7. The plenary agreed that the following should be the focus areas for the call:

- Including climate change issues into actions to mainstream biodiversity conservation
- Bi-national cooperation and coordination between the Dominican Republic and Haiti
- Reinforcing and consolidating current and past investments to ensure sustainability in the highest priority KBAs
- Strategic capacity building support and networking for local groups and CSOs including in areas such as developing financial sustainability of CSOs

- Support for conservation efforts in the highest priority KBAs that are currently under-represented in the portfolio
- Knowledge management

e. Map relevant initiatives, funding development, synergies, potential areas of collaboration

Participants proposed that CEPF establish links:

- with the implementing body of the SPAW and Cartagena protocol for the region, the United Nations Environmental Programme's (UNEP) regional office **to communicate CEPF initiatives.**
- International Union of Conservation and Nature's (IUCN) Global Business and Biodiversity Programme **to stimulate further funding for biodiversity conservation**
- International Development Bank (IDB) and other potential donors **to coordinate conservation efforts for greater effectiveness.**

f. Identify unexpected positive and negative impacts of CEPF in the Caribbean

Participants did not identify any unexpected impacts of CEPF on biodiversity conservation. However, several participants did mention unexpected impacts on their organisations during the processing of large grants application. Participants shared that the process for the development of the large grants was time consuming and took time away from implementing conservation action.

g. Analysing the lessons learnt on CEPF processes of planning and implementation

Effectiveness and efficiency were assessed under various CEPF Caribbean programme process areas to identify lessons learned and recommendations for improvement:

i. Issuing calls for proposals:

- More effort is needed to reach community groups and small organisations.
- The six week duration of the call is sufficient.
- The call for proposals document needs to be more widely disseminated.

ii. Technical review and selection of proposals:

- The review process for the initial submission of proposals (the letter of inquiry) is too long.
- The process of proposal development from acceptance of the letter of inquiry to contracting the grantee is too long.
- The lengthy review process obstructs implementation of projects which are strongly influenced by seasons, other weather conditions and time-dependent variables
- The proposal development form, the "Letter of Inquiry" (LOI), is not conducive to logical project design or review.
- The RIT needs to feedback results of the review process to RACC members.

iii. Supporting the application process:

- The CEPF Secretariat and the RIT need to ensure that the support given to the CEPF applicants does not distort the proposal to such an extent that the final proposal does not respond to the initial need identified by the applicant.
- The CEPF Secretariat and the RIT should share a full description of the application process with applicants to qualify their expectations on processing times.

- The review process should be streamlined as applicants feel that different reviewers impose their perspectives, which are sometimes contradictory, at different stages in the processing of the application and this makes the process onerous and lengthy.
- The small grant process in some instances may be as intricate and requires the same amount of time for proposal refinement as the process for large grants. There should be a differentiation in the level of information needed for small and large grants, with small grants requiring less information based on the much smaller scope of the project.

iv. Monitoring projects:

- The terms are difficult to understand on the reporting form for large grants. Sections on the form need explanation on what is needed.
- Grantees do not know who in the RIT to reach out to for advice on large grant reporting.
- Grant Writer does not have any feature to submit additional information on the large grants (such as supporting documents, reports, photos, etc).

v. Supporting project implementation (including financial management):

- The contracts for large grants need to be presented in French and Spanish to French and Spanish speaking grantees.
- The RIT should host induction sessions for grantees to present guidelines on reporting and financial management.

vi. Communication about CEPF and the work being achieved:

- Communication and dissemination of results is not being effectively achieved under the grants. More can be done by grantees as well as the RIT and the CEPF Secretariat.
- There is no focused linkage of the CEPF programme to existing regional initiatives.

h. Developing recommendations for improvement of the process

Participants proposed the following actions to improve the management of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme. These are organised under themes below.

Donor engagement:

- Strengthen coordination with other donors to improve effectiveness of interventions.
- Document where CEPF grantees are working with donors.
- Systematise how CEPF reaches out to donors and how donors are engaged to partner with CEPF.

Calls for proposals:

- Improve the reach to local community groups and small organisations.

Application process:

- Inform applicants of the stages in the application process and the time required.
- Speed up the processing of large grant applications.
- In the CEPF proposal development process, distinguish the detail needed for projects based on the amount of funds being requested. The level of detail needs to be relative to amount requested.

- Projects need to be linked with national policies and plans (e.g. National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans, sustainable development plans) and regional policies and plans.

Monitoring reports:

- Sections of the report template need an explanation of exactly what is needed.
- Streamline roles and responsibilities in the RIT and the CEPF Secretariat so applicants/ grantees are clearer on who to go to for a specific need/request.

Contracting:

- Improve communication of expectations to grantees by providing guidelines on implementation of projects inclusive of procurement processes and reporting requirements.
- Translate the large grant contract template into Spanish and French.

Implementation:

- Explore possibilities other than banks for transfer of funds as there are considerable losses from currency conversion.
- Increase the pool of mentors on each island and encourage an active role in supporting grantees.

Communication:

- Allocate a small amount in each grant to communication and dissemination of results for each grantee.
- Provide a communication specialist to support grantees.
- Make Spanish web pages more user friendly.
- Put links in articles in CEPF publications to grantee organisation's webpage.
- Promote the results of CEPF projects to government and other stakeholders.
- Interface with the UNEP Caribbean office to link the CEPF Caribbean islands programme with other regional initiatives (for example the SPAW protocol and the Global Plan for Biodiversity) to make them aware of CEPF and the contribution CEPF is making to these initiatives.
- Present the results of the evaluation to key target groups and at regional fora.
- Circulate the midterm evaluation report to the donor community and follow up with a meeting.
- Translate documents that are in Spanish to French and Creole to contribute to supporting bi-national work between Haiti and the Dominican Republic.

Networking and sharing of information:

- Establish a more direct means of sharing information with key partners on what is being done in the region.
- Facilitate grantee to grantee communication and sharing through grantee exchange visits.
- Support the establishment of networks among grantees and non-grantees on the themes identified (see section 5a).
- Formulate a database of skills among CSOS to support implementation of projects.
- Include the knowledge created from research conducted under CEPF projects in the national biodiversity clearing houses.

Other:

- Have an emergency fund for unforeseen risks and threats that impact conservation of biodiversity (the CEPF secretariat reported that precedence was established in other regions by using small grants for these types of issues).
- Feed lessons and recommendations into the SIDS global policy process. Take advantage of the SIDS conference to promote for the work of NGOs in biodiversity conservation.

6. Evaluation of the meeting

Five participants completed a written evaluation form which was sent to the participants via email the week after the workshop. A compilation of their responses is attached as Appendix 8. All respondents found the workshop useful in contributing to the overall project results. They shared that the most important thing they got from the workshop was the exchange of experiences among the participants and an improved understanding of CEPF's operations and procedures. Responses also indicated that only a few CEPF Jamaican grantees were present at the workshop (although all Jamaican-based CEPF grantees had been invited). Respondents indicated that they found several sessions useful. Recommendations to improve the workshop included improving the interactivity of sessions and increasing opportunities for informal exchanges.

7. Conclusion and recommendations

The meeting was successful in meeting its objectives:

- a. Networking for knowledge sharing, enhanced coordination and collaboration among CEPF grantees and with their partners took place through discussion of current and relevant regional issues, sharing about CEPF projects being implemented, and through many informal meetings which took place outside of workshop sessions.
- b. Progress on achievement of CEPF Caribbean programme results was evaluated using outcome mapping to analyse changes in behaviour and relationships, review of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme logframe as well as an assessment using CEPF's Global Goal Matrix
- c. Awareness and commitment of CEPF grantees was built and potential areas for synergies and coordination were identified. These included protected area management, payment for ecosystem services and sustainable financing.
- d. Recommendations on strategies and priorities to achieve all results by the end of the programme were identified and documented.
- e. Relevant initiatives, funding development, synergies, and potential areas of collaboration were identified and documented.
- f. An unexpected negative impact of CEPF in the Caribbean was identified and documented.
- g. Lessons learnt on processes of planning and implementation of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme were analysed and recommendations for improvement of the process were made.

Findings from this meeting will be included in the full report on the mid-term assessment that will be produced by CANARI and the CEPF Secretariat

Appendix 1- Participant list

No.	Name	Job title	Organisation	Address	Country	Contact Nos.	Email address
1	Sesar Rodriguez	Executive Director	Consortio ambient Dominicano (CAD)	Avenida Republica de Columbia, Edif.. 1 M8, Apto. 2-2. Los Rios. Santo Domingo	Dominican Republic	1 809 385 0480 1 829 979 4300 (cell)	sesar_rodriguez@yahoo.com
2	Francisco Arnemann	Executive Director	Fondo Pronaturaleza Inc. (PRONATURA)	Avenida J.F. Kennedy km 6 1/2 Edif. No. 3, UNPHU, Santo Domingo	Dominican Republic	1 809 687 5609 1 829 962 9071 (cell)	farnemann@pronatura.org.do
3	Juan Manuel Diaz	Sustainability Director	Instituto Dominicano de Desarrollo Integral, Inc. (IDDI)	Calle Luis F.Thomén # 654 El Millón, Santo Domingo	Dominican Republic	1 809 534 1077	jm.diaz@iddi.org
4	Jorge Brocca	Executive Director	Sociedad Ornitológica de la Hispaniola Inc. (SOH)	Gustavo Mejia Ricart 119B Galarias Residencial Aptdo. 401, Santo Domingo	Dominican Republic	1 809 753 1388	jbrocca@soh.org.do
5	Solhanlle Bonilla	Project Coordinator	Instituto Tecnológico de Santo Domingo (INTEC)	Av. Los Proceres Gala, Jardine del norte, P.O. Box 342-9 y 249-2, Santo Domingo	Dominican Republic	1 809 567 9271 ext 272 1 809 919 7083 (cell)	solhanlle.bonilla@intec.edu.do
6	Sixto J. Incháustegui	Directiva	Grupo Jaragua Inc. (GJ)	Calle El Vergel 33, Ensanche El Vergel, Distrito Nacional	Dominican Republic		sixtojinchaustegui@yahoo.com
7	Aurelie Rakotofirnga	Technical Assistant	AVSF (Agronomes et Vétérinaires Sans Frontières)	11 rue Wilson 2 - Pacot, Port-au-Prince	Haiti	00 509 28 16 07 88	a.rakotofirnga@avsf.org
8	Jean-Edy Theard	Project Lead	Organisation pour le Développement de la Forêt des Pins-Mare Rouge (OPDFM)	Helvetas-Haiti Delmas 60 rue Mercier Laham et impasse Larose # 1 HT 6120-PO Box 15030, Petion Ville	Haiti	1 509 2513 2933	Jeanedy.Theard@helvetas.org
9	Jean Mary Laurent		Societe Audubon	218 Ave. Jean Paul II Turgeau (campus de l'Universite Quisqueya) Port-au-Prince	Haiti	011 509 372 6808	jml079@yahoo.fr
10	Jean Wiener	Director	Fondation pour la Protection de la Biodiversité Marine (FoProBiM)	6011 Henning Street, Bethesda, MD, 20817	USA	1 509 3701 3383	jeanw@foprobim.org
11	Vanessa Haley-Benjamin	Director of Science and Policy	The Bahamas National Trust (BNT)	P.O. Box N-4105 Nassau, New Providence	The Bahamas	1 242 393 1317	vhaley-benjamin@bnt.bs
12	Carlos C. Martínez Rivera	Amphibian Conservation Specialist	The Zoological Society of Philadelphia	3400 West Girard Avenue Philadelphia, PA	USA	1 787 237 2508 809 804 5111 (DR)	1 maritnezrivera.carlos@phillyzoo.org
13	Simeon Greene	Project Lead	Diamond Village Community Heritage Organisation	Diamond Village P.O, VC0250	St. Vincent	1 784 495 6701	simeon_green@hotmail.com

14	Shirlene Simmons	Conservation Manager	Saint Lucia National Trust	P.O. Box 595	Saint Lucia	1 758 452 5005	Conservationmgr@slunatrust.org
15	Ingrid Parchment	Executive Director	Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation(C-CAM)	P.O. Box 33 Lionel Town Clarendon	Jamaica	1 876 986 3344	iparchment@yahoo.com
16	Indi Mclymont-Lafayette	Regional Director	The Panos Institute (Panos Caribbean)	22 Westminster Road Kingston 10	Jamaica	1 876 920 0070/1	indidk@yahoo.com ; indi@panoscaribbean.org
17	Diana McCaulay	Chief Executive Officer	Jamaica Environment Trust (JET)	11 Waterloo Road, Kingston 10	Jamaica		jamentrust@cwjamaica.com
18	Donna Blake	Country Representative	The Nature Conservancy-Caribbean Programs	2 1/2 Kingsway, Unit 27 Devon House, East Kingston 10	Jamaica	1 876 754 4579 ext 21 1 876 577 9001 (cell)	dblake@tnc.org
19	Susan Otuokon	Consultant	Jamaica Conservation and Development Trust(JCDT)	Sherwood Content, P.O. Trelawny	Jamaica	1 876 363 7002	jamaicaconservation@gmail.com ; susanotuokon@yahoo.com
20	Herlitz Davis		Windsor Research Centre Limited(WRC)	Sherwood Content, P.O. Trelawny	Jamaica	1 876 412 0893	windsor@cwjamaica.com
21	Karen McDonald Gayle	Chief Executive Officer	Environmental Foundation of Jamaica (EFJ)	# 1B Norwood Avenue, Kingston 5	Jamaica	1 876 960 6744/8799	kmcdonaldgayle@efj.org.jm
22	Bernard Blue	Protected Areas NEPA	National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA)	10 and 11 Caledonia Avenue, Kingston 5	Jamaica	1 876 754 7540	bblue@nepa.gov.jm
23	Ms. Leonie Barnaby	GEF Focal Point, Jamaica/ Senior Director	Ministry of Land and Environment-GEF Focal Point	16A Half Way Tree Road, Kingston-5	Jamaica		leonie.barnaby@opm.gov.jm
24	Elaine Fisher	Independent Consultant			Jamaica	1 876 970 4166	cfishjam@yahoo.com
25	Owen Evelyn	Senior Director Forest Science and Technology	Forestry Department, Jamaica	# 173 constant Spring Road Kingston 8	Jamaica	(876) 924 2668 (876) 564 7473 (cell)	owenbevelyn@hotmail.com

26	Bonnie Rusk	Founding Director	Grenada Dove Conservation Programme (GDGP)	964 Lost Angel Road Boulder CO 80302 USA. C/O Forestry and National Parks Department, Queens Park. St. Georges	Grenada	1 303 517 1309 473 403 3361(Grenada)	1	mail@blrusk.com
27	David Smith	Coordinator, University Consortium of Small Island States, International Secretariat, Institute for Sustainable Development	University of the West Indies (UWI)	13 Gibraltar Road, University of the West Indies, Mona	Jamaica	1 876 977 1659		david.smith02@uwimona.edu.jm
28	Chris Cox	Technical Coordinator, Environmental Health, Environmental Management Unit	Caribbean Public Health Agency	P.O. Bo 1111 The Morne Castries	Saint Lucia	1 758 452 2501		ccox@cehi.org.lc
29	Cletus Springer	Director, Department of Sustainable Development	Organization of American States (OAS) Secretariat	1889 F Street N.W. Suite 795 Washington D.C.20006	USA	1 202 458 3148		Cspringer@oas.org
30	José Courrau Ph.D	Senior Protected Areas Advisor	IUCN - Regional Office for Mesoamerica and the Caribbean	P.O. Box 607-2050, Montes de Oca	Costa Rica	1 506 2283 8449		Jose.COURRAU@iucn.org
31	Nick Cox	Programme Manager BIOPAMA Global Protected Areas Programme	IUCN - Regional Office for Mesoamerica and the Caribbean	28 rue Mauverney, CH-1196 Gland	Switzerland	41 22 999 0706 / 41 79 388 3420 (cell)		Nicholas.COX@iucn.org
32	Christiane Delfs	Coordonnatrice Programme d'Assistance Technique	(GIZ) Deutsche Gesellschaft für International Zusammenarbeit	# 52, rue Mangones Pétion-Ville	Haiti	011 509 3748 3908		christiane.delfs@giz.de
33	Audrey Fowling	Finance Officer	C-CAM	Bustamente Drive, Lionel Town	Jamaica	1 876 986 3344 / 3327		aif03@yahoo.com
34	Lloyd Gardner	Regional Vice Chair Caribbean	IUCN-WCPA	P.O. Box 305031, St. Thomas, VI00803	USA	1 340 714 0936 340 513 3562(cell)	1	lsg_jr@hotmail.com
35	Ir. Paul Stokkermans	Directeru (Director)	Caribbean Research and Management of Biodiversity (CARMABI Foundation)	Piscaderabaai z/n P.O. Box 2090	Curacao, N.A.	011 5999 462 4242		p.stokkermans@carmabi.org

36	Allison Rangolan McFarlane	Programme Manager	Environmental Foundation of Jamaica (EFJ)	# 1B Norwood Avenue, Kingston 5	Jamaica	1 876 960 6744 (office) 1 876 451 0944(cell)	allison.mcfarlane@efj.org.jm
37	Yogani Govender	Manager	Conservation Trust of Puerto Rico (Para La Naturaleza)	# 155 Calle Tetuan, San Juan PR 00902	USA	1 787 505 8385	yogani@paralanaturaleza.org
38	Juan Rodriguez		Conservation Trust of Puerto Rico (Para La Naturaleza)	P.O. BOX 9023554, San Juan, PR 00902-3554	USA		rodriguezj@fideicomiso.org
39	Michele Zador	Grant Director	Conservation International (CEPF Secretariat)	2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500 Arlington, VA 22202	USA		mzador@conservation.org
40	Pierre Carret	Advisor to the Executive Director	Conservation International (CEPF Secretariat)	2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500 Arlington, VA 22202	USA		pcarret@conservation.org
41	Mandy DeVine	Communications	Conservation International (CEPF Secretariat)	2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500 Arlington, VA 22202	USA		mdevine@conservation.org
42	Nicole Leotaud	Executive Director	Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI)	Building 7, Unit 8, Fernandes Industrial Centre, Laventille	Trinidad and Tobago	868 626 6062	nicole@canari.org
43	Anna Cadiz	Senior Technical Officer/ RIT Manager	Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI)	Building 7, Unit 8, Fernandes Industrial Centre, Laventille	Trinidad and Tobago	869 626 6062	anna@canari.org
44	Neila Bobb-Prescott	Senior Technical Officer/ RIT Small Grants Manager	Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI)	Building 7, Unit 8, Fernandes Industrial Centre, Laventille	Trinidad and Tobago	870 626 6062	neila@canari.org
45	Nicole Brown	Country Coordinator	Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI)		Jamaica		nabrown@btinternet.com
46	Leida Buglass	Country Coordinator	Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI)		Dominican Republic		leibuglass@gmail.com
47	Paul Judex Edouarzin	Country Coordinator	Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI)		Haiti		pauljudex.edouarzin@gmail.com



Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Caribbean islands Mid-term evaluation regional workshop

Kingston, Jamaica

10 – 12 July, 2013

8. Objectives

The objectives of the CEPF mid-term evaluation regional workshop, focusing on both accountability and learning, are to:

- i. facilitate networking for knowledge sharing, enhanced coordination and collaboration among CEPF grantees and with their partners;
- ii. evaluate progress on achievement of CEPF Caribbean programme results - outcomes and impacts;
- iii. build awareness and commitment of CEPF grantees, synergies and coordination;
- iv. develop recommendations on strategies and priorities to achieve all results by the end of the programme;
- v. map relevant initiatives, funding development, synergies, potential areas of collaboration;
- vi. identify unexpected positive and negative impacts of CEPF in the Caribbean;
- vii. analyse lessons learnt on process of planning and implementation;
- viii. develop recommendations for improvement of the process.

Draft agenda

TIME	AGENDA ITEM	FACILITATOR
Tuesday 9 July 2013		
6:30 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.	Cocktail evening for all workshop participants and Jamaican government partners	
DAY 1: Wednesday 10 July 2013		
8:30 a.m.	Registration and collection of per diems	Neila Bobb- Prescott
9:00 a.m.	Opening ceremony: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome from the Chair – CANARI, Nicole Brown • CEPF global programme – CEPF Secretariat, Michele Zador/ Pierre Carret 	Nicole Brown

TIME	AGENDA ITEM	FACILITATOR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme and portfolio – CANARI, Anna Cadiz Government perspectives on the value of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme – Ms. Leonie Barnaby, GEF Focal Point 	
10:00 a.m.	BREAK	
10:20 a.m.	Introduction to the workshop: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief participant introductions and expectations Review objectives and agenda Ground rules and housekeeping Introduction of Day 3 working groups and process for selection of topics for discussion Introduction of parking lot 	Anna Cadiz/ Nicole Leotaud
11:00 a.m.	5-minute presentations by 8 CEPF Grantees of projects they are implementing in the region	Leida Buglass
11:40 a.m.	Reactions, questions, comments on CEPF projects	Leida Buglass
12:00 noon	LUNCH	
1:00 p.m.	Introduction to the mid-term evaluation process and evaluation framework Review of CEPF global evaluation process	Nicole Leotaud Michele Zador
1:30 p.m.	Analysis of results achieved under the Logical Framework for the CEPF Caribbean islands programme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overview of key findings on logframe to date (15 mins) Questions and comments (15 mins) Plenary discussion to analyse gaps and priorities moving forward (60 mins) 	Anna Cadiz
3:00 p.m.	Break	
3:10 p.m.	5-minute presentations by 8 CEPF Grantees of projects they are implementing in the region	Paul Judex Edouarzin
3:50 p.m.	Questions and discussion	Paul Judex Edouarzin
4:10 p.m.	CEPF Communications	Mandy DeVine
4:30 p.m.	Thanks and close of Day 1	Anna Cadiz
DAY 2: Thursday 11 July 2013		
8:30 a.m.	Debrief of Day 1, lessons and recommendations	Anna Cadiz
9:00 a.m.	Analysing “Most Significant Change” due to the CEPF Caribbean islands programme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce method (5 mins) 	Nicole Leotaud (Anna Cadiz, Nicole Brown,

TIME	AGENDA ITEM	FACILITATOR
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual stories (5-10 mins) or review of stories already collected (from focus groups/Survey Monkey) Small group sharing, grouping under themes, and selection of top stories (45 mins) – mixed grantees, donors, partners, CEPF Secretariat and RIT – 5 groups of 6/7 Put all stories on the wall 	Paul Judex Edouarzin, Leida Buglass)
10:00 a.m.	Break	
10:20 a.m.	Plenary sharing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each group present top 2 stories Discussion 	Nicole Leotaud
11:10 a.m.	5-minute presentations by 6 CEPF Grantees of projects they are implementing in the region	Nicole Brown
11:40 a.m.	Reactions, questions, comments on CEPF projects	Nicole Brown
12:00 noon	Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	Outcome mapping to analyse changes in behaviour and relationships: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Present method, small group assignments and instructions (15 mins) – separate groups for grantees and others Small group work to review findings to date (from focus groups), add new information, discuss (45 mins) Small group debrief under topic areas Analysis 	Nicole Leotaud (Anna Cadiz, Nicole Brown, Paul Judex Edouarzin, Leida Buglass)
3:00 p.m.	Break	
3:10 p.m.	Analysis of lessons on process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduction to the method Overview of findings to date Discussion Analysis of recommendations for improving the process 	Anna Cadiz/ Leida Buglass
4:30 p.m.	Thanks and close of Day 2	Paul Judex Edouarzin
DAY 3: Friday 12 July 2013		
8:30 a.m.	Debrief of Day 2, lessons and recommendations	Leida Buglass
9:00 a.m.	Global matrix review and discussion	Anna Cadiz/ Nicole Brown
10:00 a.m.	Break	
10:20 a.m.	Working groups on key topics and themes focusing on lessons learned, best practices and recommendations for civil society and their partners (topics to be selected by participants but for example may include sustainable	Nicole Leotaud (Anna Cadiz, Nicole Brown, Paul Judex

TIME	AGENDA ITEM	FACILITATOR
	financing of civil society organisations, sustainable financing for PA management, networking, policy advocacy, communication, participatory protected area planning and management, community engagement, invasive species management)	Edouarzin, Leida Buglass)
11:20 a.m.	Plenary sharing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working group presentations of key lessons and recommendations 	Nicole Leotaud
12:00 noon	Lunch	
1:00 p.m.	Final pulling together and analysis of results and lessons learned from various evaluation tools: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity gaps (within civil society and in the enabling environment) for effective civil society participation in biodiversity conservation and policy influence Recommendations on areas of focus for CEPF 	Nicole Leotaud
2:00 p.m.	Presentations from donors and other partners and plenary discussion on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> other biodiversity conservation and sustainable development initiatives opportunities for synergies and collaboration reactions to the CEPF Caribbean islands programme 	Anna Cadiz
3:00 p.m.	Break	
3:10 p.m.	Areas to develop collaboration among grantees and partners (bi-national projects, thematic areas of work, regional initiatives, complementary work, etc.)	Anna Cadiz/ Paul Judex Edouarzin
3:40 p.m.	Next steps	Anna Cadiz
4:00 p.m.	Reflection and workshop evaluation	Nicole Leotaud
4:30 p.m.	Thanks and close	Michele Zador/ Pierre Carret

Appendix 3- Presentation on the concept of "most significant change" and outcome mapping

Appendix 4- List of most significant change stories and a significant change story documented and submitted by groups

Stories proposed by workshop participants

1. Historias que cantan y encantan

El Zorzal y la Rana

Canta:

- Obtener y a palacar fondos : CEPF y otras GET buscar parejas y otras
- Y alianzas
- Demarcar territorio “Caribe”

Encanta:

Conservación de habitat.

Al sector privado nacional e internacional

Zorzal: Sesar

Rana: Carlos

2. Biodiversidad – Plan de Manejo participativo en AP no tenían

3. Empodimento local

4. Apoyo significativo a areas protegidas que tenia poco apoyo

5. Advancing governance of PA’s through local empowerment

6. Empowering local-national environmental groups to play instrumental roles in advancing conservation/sustainable development goals

7. It has empowered NGOs from all kinds of backgrounds with the tools needed to effect change and promote collaboration and the exchange of ideas.

8. Red caribeña en acción con proyectos.

9. La Relación entre los proyectos con una visión de integración regional

10. Ser parte de programa Caribeño “en acción”

11. Poner en marcha methods inovativos de conservación pes, parques privadas, cambio climatico, plannes participativos.

12. Uso de metodologías de “action learning” que nos ayudan a compartir ideas en los grupos.

13. Articulación de sociedad civil, ONGs y gobiernos, sector privado

14. Articulación de ONGs y OSCs

15. ONGs afianzados por la biodiversidad

16. Fomento de alianzas public-privadas para la gestión y conservación de los RRNN y Biodiversidad.

17. Fondos para biodiversidad disponible

18. Facilitación de recursos a ONGs para trabajar en biodiversidad

19. Awarding of grants allows for scaling up of initiatives.

20. Time spent on CEPF actually reduced interactions with civil society

21. Targeting only KBAs

22. Knowledge sharing information about biodiversity needs in the Caribbean

23. Preliminary study on climate change in the Dominican Republic

24. Start / contribute to making biodiversity relevant to local communities

25. Improved communication between national environmental NGO’s

26. Governments more aware of work of environmental NGO’s in biodiversity / ecosystem management

27. Development and implementation of management plans in protected areas
28. Supported innovative approaches to conservation
29. Create linkages between Caribbean NGO's
30. Networking adding the efforts of different organisations with a common strategy
31. Union de diferentes ONG's en la región (partnership)
32. Collaboration across the region to protect biodiversity
33. Supported the creation of public-private networks
34. Networking
35. Creation of networks
36. New organizations getting involve in biodiversity conservation
37. Increase in community engagement
38. Development of alternative sustainable livelihoods
39. Coordinación excelente en el ministerio y las ONG's
40. Implementation through connecting people
41. Implication pro-gressive des communautés locales.
42. Fortalecimiento institucional
43. Fortalecer acciones de cara a la conservación de la biodiversidad
44. Contribuye a que el PSA sea intrumento de conservación de la biodiversidad
45. Meilleure Conscience de l'importance de la biodiversité (Rak bwa)
46. Creacion de conciencia a nivel nacional, se ha impulsado la voz de las organizaciones que trabajan en biodiversidad.
47. Le sujet "Biodiversité" est reconnu comme important en Haiti.
48. Historia de Tita: Confiar en el conocimiento local
49. Existe una mayor actitud para el intercambio de experiencias
50. Start of civil society networking
51. Networking
52. Access to funds for implementing programmes to address threats in hotspot areas
53. Apostles to lead the process-leaders
54. Access to funds and capacity to provide funding
55. Partnerships
56. Awareness and capacity building
57. A cadre of apostles willing to lead the process
58. Strengthened the capacity of NGO's to contribute to biodiversity conservation
59. Additional work done in the areas of interest of government agencies
60. Better understanding of where endangered biodiversity is found
61. Increased networking of civil society organisations and key partners working in biodiversity conservation across the Caribbean islands.
62. I have spent too much time on CEPF proposal development – an unwelcome change for me that has not helped biodiversity conservation.
63. We are beginning to see ourselves as Caribbean
64. New organisations started working on biodiversity conservation because funds available before only worked on environment
65. Accessing funds empowers civil society
66. Sharing experiences on biodiversity conservation across the Caribbean breaking the language barrier
67. Building synergies between public sector NGO's and local organisations. They have to work hand in hand in the process; local communities have to be considered

68. Increased awareness at all levels of the critical need to act (now!) on biodiversity conservation.
69. Financing enables/facilitates implementation – more direct and on the ground. Yet enables partnerships with government and effect change in policy
70. How committed and creative leadership can overcome the obstacles. Preserver to continue the march (Jamaica)
71. Building partnerships to overcome the funding deficit (St. Vincent)

Story presented to the plenary (documented and submitted to CANARI by group members)

The tale of the thrush and the frog

This is the tale of Bicknell's thrush and the frogs of Hispaniola. You see, frogs and birds often share the same habitat, and use the same trees and forests as their home. This is very true, especially in the cloud forests of the highlands of Haiti and the Dominican Republic. Frogs and birds have shared this wonderful and lush tropical paradise for many, many generations, but unfortunately their home is threatened and now their way of living is affected

Frogs all over the islands noticed that trees were being felled daily for various reasons in their homes. Some trees were being cut for timber, others for charcoal and other trees were cut so that humans may clear areas for farming, cattle and development. The frogs were especially concerned about this problem and started asking other animals around to see what was going on. Solenodons knew about it, Jutías knew about it and birds knew about it. However frogs quickly learned that these other animals were able to move to around and find new homes, something that frogs can't easily do.

The frogs had to act quickly! While everybody was running out of homes, frogs were even in more trouble because they were not able to move to new homes, which were already becoming too crowded by the rest of the animal forests. Frogs started to call to each other and to other animals, asking for help: 'Help us! Help us! Help us!' the frogs called.

Then suddenly, the Bicknell's thrush heard their call and he asked: "What happen? What happen?" The frogs told the thrush what was going on and, like the other animals he said he was able to simply find other patches of forest and that was it, but every year, he would migrate to the north to raise his family and when he came back he would find that his old home was now cow pasture, was completely cut down for a bean garden or was turned into a road or completely burned, so he simply moved to another patch of forest. But nowadays it was too hard for him to find a new patch of forest!

At that moment the frogs realized that if the thrush is able to migrate, he might be able to find help elsewhere and all of a sudden the thrush said: 'Yes! I remember a lady called Michele! She was here last year and she lives in Washington DC! I am going there in a few months and might be able to find her! I think I remember her voice! The frogs were happy about the prospect of this lady Michele being able to help them and off went the thrush calling: "Michele will help! Michele will help!"

It was March when the thrush left and by now hurricane season was almost over in Hispaniola, which means and the thrush should be back anytime. Frogs were hopping for news waiting for the thrush to arrive and were calling for him: "Where are you thrush? Where are you thrush? And he arrived! He had good news!

After a lot of searching the thrush finally found Michele in DC while she was having a phone conversation with one of her seven donors at a place called the Critical Ecosystem partnership Fund. The thrush was able to talk to Michele and she said that she knew Sésar from the Consorcio Ambiental Dominicano who could help them. And so it was that the thrush and the frogs got together and found help in local and international organizations.

Sésar and his team from Consorcio Ambiental Dominicano, joined efforts with Grupo Jaragua, INTEC, Sociedad Ornitológica de la Hispaniola, IDDI and ProNatura and all of them asked for help from CEPF to study and better protect the forests where the thrush and the frogs live. Many solutions arose while they were working on that. Consorcio Ambiental Dominicano began to work with local people and convince them to use the forests in better ways and now people instead of cutting the forest, they raise bees and release them so that they might feed off on pollen from the forest, now the farmers want to keep the forest. Consorcio Ambiental Dominicano went a step further and now they are teaming up with farmers in Hispaniola and farmers in the US and created an ice cream called Choco-Maple® from Helados BON®. This delicious ice cream blend chocolate from the island and maple syrup from the US. Both product require mature trees and serve as agroforestry systems a type of home that, if managed correctly, is good home for frogs, for the thrush and for the rest of the forest animals. INTEC developed a way in which people can put a monetary value to the water that the forest produces, which makes people want to protect the home of frogs and birds. Grupo Jaragua, IDDI, Pro-Natura and Sociedad Ornitológica de La Hispaniola were able to help protect the homes where the thrush and the frog live in other part of Hispaniola thanks to Michele and her seven donors. Finally, Grupo Jaragua was able to team up with Société Audubon Haiti and the Philadelphia Zoo, which is also in the US and were able to better understand the current status of the home of the frogs and develop strategies and tools that enable people to better protect the home of these beautiful animals.

FIN

The story was conceived by Sesar Rodríguez from Consorcio Ambiental Dominciano and Solhanlle Bonilla from INTEC. Carlos C. Martínez Rivera from the Philadelphia Zoo, edited and expanded the story, which was presented during one of the activities at CEPF's mid-term evaluation in Kingston, Jamaica 2013. The final version of the story will be used as a product available for all CEPF grantees, but more specifically as a product of Award 60950 as part of **Project Component 3**. (Build community and park service capacity and awareness of the importance of amphibian conservation in four KBAs and disseminate information regarding the amphibian crisis in Hispaniola within the countries and conservation community) and will be distributed to other CEPF grantees in Hispaniola.

Appendix 5 - Presentation of the Logical Framework of the Caribbean islands programme

Appendix 6- Presentations from CEPF grantees on their projects

Appendix 7 - Presentation of strategies and priorities to achieve all results by the end of the programme

Appendix 8 - Compiled responses to the workshop evaluation

**Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Caribbean islands
Mid-term evaluation regional workshop
Hotel Four Seasons; Kingston, Jamaica; 10 – 12 July, 2013**

Workshop evaluation form

1. Did you find the workshop useful in contributing to the overall project results? Please rank for each objective and explain your answer.

Objective	Rank on scale of 0 to 4 0 = not at all useful 1 = slightly useful 2 = moderately useful 3 = very useful 4 = extremely useful	Please explain your answer
facilitating networking for knowledge sharing, enhanced coordination and collaboration among CEPF grantees and with their partners	3,4,3, 3, 4	
evaluating progress on achievement of CEPF Caribbean programme results - outcomes and impacts	3, 2, 3, 3, 4	
building awareness and commitment of CEPF grantees, synergies and coordination	4, 3, 3, 2, 4	
developing recommendations on strategies and priorities to achieve all results by the end of the programme	4, 3, 4, 3, 4	
mapping relevant initiatives, funding development, synergies, potential areas of collaboration	4, 4, 2, 3, 3	
identifying unexpected positive and negative impacts of CEPF in the Caribbean	3, 2, 2, 3, 3	
analysing lessons learnt on process of planning and implementation	4, 2, 4, 3, 3	
developing recommendations for improvement of the process	4, 4, 3, 2, 4	

2. What is the most important thing that you learned / understood / felt from this workshop?
- Que aún hay mucho trabajo por delante para facilitar el intercambio entre las islas. La condición de isla representa en sí misma una barrera que requiere de un enfoque regional para ser salvada. (There is still much work ahead to facilitate the exchange between the islands. The condition of the islands is in itself a barrier which needs to have a regional approach in order to be saved)
 - How CEPF operates and why there are so many steps and procedures. It helped me understand the needs and benefits of such close communication between CEPF/CANARI staff and its grantees.
 - *Escuchar, sentir, intercambiar con los diferentes representantes de las organizaciones tiene más sentido que evaluar "a lo lejos" o bajo "un marco lógico". La lógica de una evaluación está también en ESCUCHAR ACTIVAMENTE lo que la gente te dice y PONER ATENCION en la manera que lo expresan.* (Listen, feel and exchange with the different representatives of organisations makes more sense to evaluate "the distance" or under the "logical framework". The evaluation logic of ACTIVE LISTENING is also what people say to you and PAY ATTENTION in the way they express).
 - *Des expériences se développant en République Dominicaine, par exemple, dont l'OPDFM pourrait apprendre, afin d'implémenter avec plus d'efficacité ses actions de protection de la biodiversité.* (The experiences developing in the Dominican Republic, for example, of which OPDFM could learn, to implement more effectively its measures to protect biodiversity).
 - Clear understanding of CEPF objectives and methods of operation
3. What did you like about this workshop?
- Que a pesar del aislamiento geográfico señalado en la respuesta anterior, así como las diferencias de idioma, la problemática del trabajo de la conservación de la biodiversidad es muy similar y existió un gran espíritu de colaboración inmediata y futura entre los representantes de cada país. (That despite the geographical isolation indicated in the previous answer, as well as of language differences, working problems for conservation of the biodiversity is very similar and there was a great spirit of immediate and future partnership among the representatives of each country)
 - The networking among CEPF grantees and the face time with CEPF and CANARI staff is what I liked the most. It was very valuable for me, especially the breakfast meetings held during the workshop that allowed me to continue with the progress of our grant. Also the opportunity to meet people like Herlitz Davis from Jamaica, and Yoganí and Juan Manuel from the Puerto Rico Conservation trust proved to be excellent and very beneficial for me, our current CEPF grant and future projects.
 - La oportunidad de ESCUCHAR lo que tenía que decir las organizaciones. INTERCAMBIAR sobre los proyectos y sobre el trabajo puntual. IDENTIFICAR otros resultados del proyecto CEPF, ver la gente en acción. Ver que el apoyo que se recibí del CEPF muestra esperanza, innovación, otras formas de hacer las cosas. EL desayuno Jamaíquino!! (The opportunity to LISTEN to what they had to say the organisations. EXCHANGE on projects and about the work time. IDENTIFY other CEPF project outcomes, see people in action. See that the support they received from CEPF shows hope, innovation, other ways of doing things. THE Jamaican breakfast!)
 - *Le travail en atelier sur les potentiels domaines de collaboration.* (Study work on the potential areas for collaboration)
 - The adequate opportunity given to the participants to contribute to the process.

4. What did you dislike about this workshop?

- Haciendo una revisión sincera, mi consideración es que el taller no tuvo desperdicio. (Doing a sincere review, my point is that the workshop was not wasted).
- The hotel. I think that like most other attendees, the hotel and its staff were not the best.
- La no presencia de los colegas jamaíquinos. La actitud de la gente representa la imagen de un país y este caso también del trabajo que realizan. Una de las presentaciones jamaíquina fue patética. Todos nuestros países y lugares de trabajo tienen problemas ambientales. El mensaje era NO HOPE! (The absence of fellow Jamaicans. The attitude of people representing is the image of a country and this case also the work they do. One presentation of a Jamaican was pathetic. All our countries and workplaces have environmental problems. The message was NO HOPE!
- Nothing

5. Which sessions did you find particularly useful:

- Encontré que fueron muy útiles la sesión sobre finanzas (aclaraciones sobre presentación y sustentación financiera) y la libertad de proponer discusiones en parqueo, entre las cuales considero muy útiles y que requieren un seguimiento real para su desarrollo las sesiones sobre intercambio Haití – R.D. y el tema de importantizar las áreas protegidas en los aspectos de adaptación al cambio climático. (I found that the session on finance was very helpful (presentation and clarification of financial support) and the parking lot. Discussions on proposing, from which I consider very useful and require actual monitoring for development sharing sessions on Haiti – Dominican Republic and the subject of protected areas important aspects of climate change adaptation).
- The 5 minute presentation was definitely very helpful as well as the “Most Significant Change” part and the story telling session. Lastly, towards the end of the workshop, the “Areas to develop collaboration” also proved very helpful. Visiting the Salt River and the PWD gun club was excellent.
- La presentación de muchos de los proyectos (The presentation of many of the projects).
- Los cambios más significantes (The most significant changes).
- Alcance de resultados (Scope of results)
- Visita al lugar de CCAM (Site Visit CCAM)
- La presentación recomendaciones de la GIZ (The presentation of recommendations from the GIZ)
- *Les échanges autour des actions mises en œuvre, avec le financement du CEPF, qui ont permis d’explorer des possibilités, dans le cadre de l’implémentation de notre projet. (Discussions on actions implemented with funding from CEPF, who have had the opportunity to explore the possibilities within the framework of the implementation of our project).*
- The presentations from the grantees and hearing from the donors

6. How could the workshop have been improved?

- Pequeños fallos en la traducción simultánea al español, que presentó una de las traductoras. (Small errors in the simultaneous interpretation into Spanish, which was done by one of the translators).
- Choosing a better location, or providing guests with more accessible options for places to visit after sessions ended. Being on an inner city venue like our hotel provides ample time to

promote interaction among attendants at the hotel, since there is nothing much to do, but if people wanted to venture out it could've been a bit challenging. Personally I had no real issues with the hotel and staff although I recognized both could've been better, but it seems other attendants had some issues and negative experiences.

- Tener sesiones de DINAMICAS. (Having DYNAMIC sessions).
- Haber realizado más intercambios informales (las tardes y noche se aprovecho muy poco para intercambios informales). (Have carried out more informal exchanges (evening and night I take very little for informal exchanges).
- PREGUNTAR a los participantes como evaluarían CEPF desde la perspectiva de sus organizaciones (ASK the participants how do the evaluate CEPF from the perspective their organizations).
- *Une meilleure planification logistique/ plus de visites sur le terrain. (Improved logistics planning / more field visits).*

7. How would you rate the following areas of the workshop structure and delivery? Please tick one for each area.

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Clarity of objectives	4	1		
Content	2	3		
Materials	1	4		
Facilitation	3	1	1	
Relevance to your needs	1	4		

Any additional comments on the above:

- I loved the reggae session the first day and seeing the folks from Voices of Climate Change was very inspiring.
- MUCHAS PREGUNTAS TIENE ESTA EVALUACION. (THIS EVALUATION HAS TOO MANY QUESTIONS)

8. What is one thing that you will apply from the workshop in your organisation's work?

- Las aclaraciones referentes a Finanzas. (The clarifications related to Finance).
- Procurar la definición de vías prácticas para un mayor intercambio o desarrollo de experiencias compartidas con Haití. (Provide the definition for practical ways to further exchange or development of shared experiences with Haiti).
- Las recomendaciones sobre difusión de informaciones. Mejorar los procesos y la agilidad de la diseminación de informaciones del proyecto y de la institución. (The recommendations on dissemination of information. Improve the processes and agility of the dissemination of information on the project and the institution).
- The Lessons Learned exercise and the mapping changes in behavior part. Of course also the collaboration aspects of the workshop will be applied to our project.
- CONTAR UN A HISTORIA (forma de explicar y evaluar un proyecto de manera dinámica). (TELLING AN A STORY (way to explain and evaluate a project dynamically)

- “QUE ALGUIEN DE AFUERA” de sus opiniones y recomendaciones (ejemplo de la presentación GIZ). (“SOMEONE FROM OUTSIDE” of their views and recommendations (e.g. presentation from GIZ).
 - *La communication des résultats du projet aux acteurs (locaux)/les échanges avec des bénéficiaires de projets en République Dominicain. (Communication of project results with the (local) stakeholders / exchanges with project beneficiaries in the Dominican Republic*
 - The financial accountability measures.
9. What would prevent you from applying the ideas discussed in this workshop?
- Hopefully we won’t have that problem, but if anything it would be not having enough funding or time.
 - Sobre la parte del marco lógico! (On the Logical Framework!).
 - *Ressources financières et temps. (Financial resources and the availability of time)*
 - Probably lack of funds.
10. What recommendations would you like to make for CEPF’s work?
- Continuar haciendo un gran esfuerzo en la reposición de fondos para continuar trabajando el hotspot del Caribe, ya que es uno de los pocos programas que apoyan proyectos de biodiversidad, en el nivel de investigación como de aplicación. (Continue working hard on replenishment of funds to continue working the Caribbean hotspot, as it is one of the few programs that support biodiversity projects in the level of research and application).
 - The team is excellent and definitely goes out of its way to help the grantees. I can’t think of a recommendation to make.
 - Que se pueda dar INTERCAMBIOS y EVALUACIONES de Proyectos in situ, en la misma KBA a nivel nacional Salir de “evaluaciones en salones cerrados” (That they can give EXCHANGES and Project Assessments in situ of the KBS at a national level. Exit from "assessments with closed doors"
 - *Horizon de développement des projets qui ne devrait pas être inférieur à 5 années, afin d’avoir le temps de consolider et pérenniser des acquis. (Horizon for the development of projects should not be less than five years, in order to have time to consolidate and sustain learning).*
 - An in county representative or some beefed up mentorship programme.