

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

Report of National Focus Group Meeting - Jamaica

Hotel Four Seasons, Ruthven Road, Kingston 10, Jamaica

12 June 2013

1. Introduction

The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Caribbean programme is a joint initiative of l'Agence Française de Développement, Conservation International, 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 the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) for 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 for 2010-2015. 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 and Nevis and St. Vincent and the Grenadines. Small and large grants have been issued. A mid-term evaluation of the CEPF Caribbean island programme is required. This evaluation is conducted by CANARI in collaboration with the CEPF Secretariat during the period May – September 2013. As part of this mid-term evaluation process, national focus group meetings were held in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica in June 2013 with CEPF applicants, grantees, the GEF focal point and key government agencies, donors, RACC members, and mentors.¹ This is a report of the meeting that took place in Jamaica.

2. Objectives

The objectives of the CEPF mid-term evaluation national focus group sessions, focusing on both accountability and learning, are to:

- a. facilitate networking for knowledge sharing, enhanced coordination and collaboration among CEPF grantees;
- b. evaluate progress on achievement of CEPF Caribbean programme results at all levels – outputs (products/deliverables), outcomes and impacts;
- c. build awareness and commitment of CEPF grantees, synergies and coordination;
- d. develop recommendations on strategies to achieve all results by the end of the programme;
- e. identify unexpected positive and negative impacts of CEPF in the Caribbean;
- f. analyse lessons learnt on process of planning and implementation;
- g. develop recommendations for improvement of the process.

¹ CANARI has trained a pool of mentors across CEPF project countries to provide support to CSO applicants and grantees. This was supported by the MacArthur Foundation.

3. Participants

Fourteen participants attended the meeting, representing CEPF grantees, key government agencies, donors, CANARI-trained mentors and the CEPF Secretariat broken down as shown in Table 1. The list of participants is attached as Appendix 1. The workshop was facilitated by Nicole Brown, the RIT Country Coordinator for Jamaica, and rapporteured by Doreen Morgan.

Table 1 Participant Breakdown by Number and Type

Participant Type	Number of Participants	Number of Organisations
CEPF Large Grantee	3	3
CEPF Small Grantee	1	1
CEPF Large and Small Grantee	1	1
CEPF Sub-Grantee	2*	1
CANARI Mentor	2	2
Donor	2	2
Government Agencies	3	3
CEPF Secretariat	1	1
* Some participants fall in more than one category		

4. Method

The workshop and supporting session plans, as designed by CANARI, were developed for an activity with seven hours of contact time. Modifications were therefore made to the proposed programme to accommodate the 4.5 hours of contact time that were available for the Jamaica workshop. During the course of the workshop, an adaptive approach to facilitation was used, resulting in changes to the agenda, as noted in the summary discussion below.

The agenda is attached as Appendix 2 and the slides as Appendix 3. The meeting was facilitated using a mix of plenary presentation and discussions, individual reflection and sharing, and small group work. Sessions were designed to assess:

- a. **Relevance**, i.e. the extent to which the CEPF Caribbean Programme that was conceived and the activities that were planned were consistent with the needs, expectations and capacities of the various stakeholders and responded adequately to identified needs, goals and objectives.
- b. **Results** of the CEPF Caribbean Programme, i.e. what are the measurable (quantitative and qualitative) outputs and outcomes.
- c. **Efficiency and effectiveness**, i.e. the extent to which activities have been executed as planned and have produced the desired outputs, as well as the extent to which they have been implemented with the optimal use of financial, human and technical resources and in a timely fashion, looking also at the suitability of project management arrangements.
- d. **Sustainability**, i.e. the extent to which the outcomes and outputs have been, and are likely to remain, sustained beyond the time frame of the project and its various activities, as well as the requirements for future activities that can help build such sustainability.

5. Findings

Key points discussed in the meeting are organised under the focus areas for the evaluation identified above.

a. Relevance

The relevance of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme to the needs and priorities of Jamaica were discussed. Participants concluded that:

- *CEPF Caribbean fills a niche*: The CEPF Caribbean Programme has facilitated work in a number of areas not always supported by donors, for example, collecting baseline data, and supporting communication for development as part of a biodiversity conservation agenda (see Section B – Most Significant Change Stories for more of this discussion).
- *The KBA approach focuses attention on specific areas of biological importance*.

b. Results

Most Significant Change Stories

Participants were asked what they thought were the most significant (positive or negative) changes as a result of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme. By and large, participants felt it was too early in the life of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme in Jamaica to identify changes that could be attributed to the CEPF, given the relative youth of the Jamaica portfolio. (All but two of the grantees present were about to begin or had begun implementation in the past month.) Participants were, therefore, better able to comment on what they felt was significant about the CEPF Caribbean islands programme rather than on observed changes linked to the CEPF. The *Most Significant Change Stories* are presented in Appendix 4.

Key points that arose from participants' stories and from the ensuing discussion included the following:

- ***CEPF funding provides support for important needs***: The CEPF has made it possible for organisations to do work in areas of need, some of which are not always readily supported by other donors. For example:
 - collection of baseline data;
 - the application of communication for development theory and practice to biodiversity conservation;
 - enabling policy advocacy work related to conservation; and
 - support for institutional capacity building.
- ***New information from grants inform on the ground action***: The lack of up-to-date baseline data and other information about conditions in KBAs hampers the effectiveness of conservation activities. Where CEPF grants allow for the generation of new information, this has usefulness beyond the scope of the funded activity/suite of activities.
- ***Incipient civil society networking is being facilitated at national and regional levels***: The Action Learning Group (ALG) meeting hosted by CANARI in February 2013, with funds from the MacArthur Foundation to support CEPF implementation, represented a start towards national level networking. In addition, the CEPF is supporting regional level exchange through its various

information products and some of the grants e.g., The Panos Institute Caribbean (*Strengthening the Engagement of Caribbean Civil Society in Biodiversity Conservation Through Local and Regional Networking and Effective Sharing of Learning and Best Practices*) and Rainforest Alliance (*Connecting Conservationists in the Caribbean Islands Hotspot*). However, these projects are still relatively early in their implementation so, to date, there has been no resulting significant change.

- ***Time consuming proposal writing process is a drain on organisational resources:*** The CEPF application process is more involved than proposal writing processes for other donor agencies that grantees have been part of. In some cases, time spent on proposal preparation diverted staff resources away from field activities.
- ***The Ecosystem Profile is a resource and potential communication tool.***
- ***Support for civil society biodiversity conservation initiatives allows for work that adds value to the work of government agencies.*** CEPF support for activities in KBAs where government agencies are active, or have an interest, is a useful complement and supports national priorities.

Results under the Logframe

The Annual Report on the Logframe² December 2012 was distributed as a handout (see Appendix 5) and discussed. As participants were not privy to the source information that was used to compile the table in Appendix 5, they were unable to comment on the accuracy or completeness of the information provided. In addition, as implementation of the majority of projects that form part of the Jamaica portfolio has only recently started, specific results from these could not yet be identified. Participants were therefore asked to focus on the desired results (objectives and targets) of the CEPF Caribbean Logframe and indicate where they felt there was a need for particular emphasis in Jamaica over the remaining 2.5 years of the current CEPF Caribbean Programme.

Areas for action that were discussed included strengthening individual organisations and sharing of ideas/good practice. Networking of civil society organisations was also mentioned as an area where increased activity could enhance the effectiveness of groups; however, the lack of success of many past networking ventures in Jamaica has left participants uncertain about the usefulness of directing large sums of money towards networking. Key points set against the backdrop of the CEPF's results are noted in Table 2 below.

² CEPF's five year strategy (2010-2015) for the Caribbean islands is outlined in the *CEPF Ecosystem Profile: The Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot*, which includes the *Logical Framework for CEPF Investments* that lays out targets and indicators under each specific objective.

Table 2 **Comments on Areas of Focus in Jamaica (mid 2013 - 2015) Towards Achieving CEPF Caribbean Results**

CEPF Objective	Comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Overall objective:</i> Engage civil society in the conservation of globally threatened biodiversity through targeted investments with maximum impact on the highest conservation and ecosystem services priorities • <i>Target:</i> The Caribbean Ecosystem Profile influences and complements other donors' strategies. 	<p>CEPF Caribbean complements the work and strategies of the following donors that are supporting Jamaican organisations, including CEPF grantees.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International Association of Butterfly Exhibitors and Suppliers (IABES) • International Development Research Centre (IDRC) • Global Environment Facility (GEF) Small Grants Programme
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Outcome 1:</i> Improve protection and management of 45 priority key biodiversity areas. • <i>Outcome 3:</i> Caribbean civil society supported to achieve biodiversity conservation by building local and regional capacity and by fostering stakeholder collaboration. 	<p><i>Increased civil society capacity to influence policy and decision-making processes:</i> Many of the threats and challenges to biodiversity conservation have their roots in policy and decision-making processes that undermine conservation and sound environmental management. Policy influencing action needs to be taken and civil society capacity to take such action needs to be strengthened. One area highlighted by participants was that of legal capacity/environmental law and advocacy.</p> <p><i>Correction to text:</i> Under Outcome 1, sustainable financing target, the progress report should read as follows: “5 sustainable funding schemes promoted through 4 grants to support forest carbon and payment for water resources management in the Dominican Republic; payment for ecosystem services scheme to finance a reforested area in Haiti; and 1 grant to explore the feasibility of conservation agreements in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica.”</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Outcome 2:</i> Integrate biodiversity conservation into landscape and development planning and implementation in six conservation corridors 	<p><i>A focus on sustainable livelihoods as a link to conservation:</i> Enhancing livelihood opportunities for local people in the KBAs can be an important strategy towards achieving biodiversity conservation outcomes. It was noted that capacity at the local level is a concern, not just the availability of funding. Another constraint that combines with community/local level capacity to sometimes limit the prospects for sustainable livelihood projects and other initiatives in the KBAs is that of absorptive capacity of NGOs. The number and size of existing environmental and environment and development NGOs puts parameters around what can be reasonably done to a high standard within a given time frame.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Outcome 3:</i> Caribbean civil society supported to achieve biodiversity 	<p><i>Increased civil society collaboration around specific themes</i> to take advantage of economies of scale and skill-sets and</p>

CEPF Objective	Comment
<p>conservation by building local and regional capacity and by fostering stakeholder collaboration.</p>	<p>expertise across organisations. This point is linked to 1 above. It was noted that despite this acknowledged need, efforts at networking (one vehicle for collaboration) in the recent past have not always been successful. Where there is an immediate need or threat, e.g., Cockpit Country mining/boundary, there has been success but less so for ongoing networking. The experience of the Latin American and Caribbean Network of Environmental Funds (RedLAC) was highlighted as an example of successful networking and collaborating that could offer lessons to Jamaican civil society organisations.</p> <p>Increased capacity of individual organisations to strengthen systems and make them better able to do what they are mandated to do.</p> <p>Increased sharing of information within the region, not just with the Dominican Republic and Haiti, but also with the Eastern Caribbean. It was noted that organisations in Jamaica have been able to get information about the region through Panos and CANARI, but a desire was expressed for more information from/about the Eastern Caribbean in particular.</p>

Lack of activity/funding in selected Jamaican KBAs: It was noted that there had been no activity in some Jamaican KBAs for two reasons:

1. Nomenclature – a few of the KBAs as listed in the Ecosystem Profile and other CEPF documents are not “known” in Jamaica by the names used. It was suggested that most Jamaicans would be hard pressed to identify or locate Peckham Woods, for example.
2. Lack of a civil society advocate – Some KBAs have no civil society organisations working in or near them, so while the importance of some areas may be known or acknowledged, e.g. through the National Ecological Gap Assessment Report (NEGAR), the absence of a civil society organisation with a mandate to work in these areas and the absorptive capacity of existing organisations and the parameters of their interests and mandates mean that some KBAs are unlikely to see a wellspring of action by Jamaican civil society organisations. It was noted, however, that in the case of one KBA – Dolphin Head – there are researchers at the University of the West Indies, Mona Campus with an interest in the area and it would appear that information from previous calls for proposals had not reached them, even though Departments/individuals within the University have been on all the call for proposals dissemination lists.

Recommendation: The next call for proposals should target the UWI researchers and the Country Coordinator will follow up with the Urban Development Corporation (UDC) participant to get the contact details of these individuals.

Contextual issues affect CEPF results: A recurrent issue raised in this segment of the discussion and others was that there are a number of contextual issues and challenges that have implications for the ability of the CEPF to meet its objectives and ensure the sustainability of its investment. These have been compiled in *Section d* below.

Outcome Mapping results as changes in behaviour and relationships

This activity was omitted due to limited time available.

c. Effectiveness and efficiency of the process

The process areas broadly encompassing grant-making and grant administration and management and communication and relationship building were examined and effectiveness and efficiency were assessed as shown in Table 3:

Table 3 Participant Feedback on CEPF Process

<i>Process areas</i>	<i>Comments and recommendations</i>
Issuing calls for proposals	The process of getting information out about calls for proposals has been effective and participants adequately informed.
Supporting the application process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the application process from the Secretariat and the RIT has been good. The RIT/Country Coordinator has been very responsive and the process of working with the RIT/Country Coordinator and Secretariat/Grant Manager pleasant. • The proposal development process introduces a certain amount of rigour to project design and development. • The application/proposal development process is protracted and very time consuming, particularly for Phase II proposals. The process has diverted staff resources away from the field for a longer period of time than anticipated by applicants. In one instance, conflicting information was received from the RIT/Country Coordinator and the Secretariat/Grant Manager. • Working in GEMs/Grant Writer is difficult and tedious because the screens of the form do not allow for a full view of the entire proposal. At times GEMs has been unstable and applicants have lost information uploaded. • There is a disconnect between the LOI and GEMs word limit stipulations and the CEPF’s need and desire for detailed information. • The proposal review process is not well understood. For example, it was not initially understood, in at least one case, that requests for additional information in the review process required changes to the proposal and not merely emailed responses to the queries. • CEPF’s detailed budget requirements and the focus on precise dollar amounts are not always realistic or reasonable. For example, instances where grantees have not been allowed to round up to the nearest 10 seem unnecessarily exacting where the difference is \$1.00 or \$2.00. • Donor funding can weaken organisations by the requirements placed on them for proposal development and reporting. Lack of coordination among donors and differing accounting and reporting requirements can be particularly burdensome to small organisations.

Monitoring projects, supporting project implementation (including financial management), supporting project evaluation and reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process has been constructive and supportive. • CEPF does a good job of communicating with applicants and grantees and is responsive.
Communication about CEPF and the work being achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CEPF and RIT do a good job of sending out information about the portfolio, but newsletters are not always read. This is a reflection on the information overload that organisations face and the internal capacity of organisations to “consume” information, rather than on the quality of the communication products. • Information sent in the body of an email rather than with a link or an attachment has a greater chance of being read.
Catalysing and facilitating networking amongst grantees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incipient networking at the national level through the ALG session (see <i>Most Significant Change</i> above). • Networking and new relationships likely to outlive project implementation facilitated through some grants (e.g., Panos and Rainforest Alliance). • <i>Recommendation</i>: Establish a CEPF Grantee list serv for information sharing. Look to the GEF SGP “Best Practice Skype Group” for an example of how information and communication technologies can be used to support networking among grantees.
Facilitating relationship building between CSOs and government, other key partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal development process and participatory planning has facilitated government CSO relations (e.g., C-CAM and the UDC). • Networking has been facilitated through the CEPF grants (e.g., Panos and government agencies in the Cockpit Country). • <i>Recommendation</i>: Establish a formal mechanism to take the CEPF’s work government agencies/policy makers and keep them abreast of developments through its grants.
Building capacity of civil society organisations for sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Recommendation</i>: Organise a proposal writing seminar for applicants.
Policy influence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Recommendation</i>: CEPF should use its donors, particularly those that are very influential nationally (e.g. The World Bank) to leverage influence towards changing some of the government policies and practices that are inimical to biodiversity conservation and sound environmental management.

d. Sustainability

Participants examined the extent to which the results (outcomes and outputs) of CEPF in the Caribbean have been achieved, and the extent to which they are likely to remain and be sustained beyond the time frame of the project and its various activities. They noted that there were a number of contextual issues and challenges that have implications for the CEPF’s ability to meet its objectives and have sustained results over the long term. These included:

- *National policies and practices that work against biodiversity conservation, including in protected areas.* Economic development imperatives continue to trump longer term environmental concerns, resulting in such things as proposals for large port development, quarrying, and the granting of prospecting licences for mining in KBAs.
- *Policy and decision-making advocacy/influencing are important complements to field-based conservation work.* Unless there is concerted action to bring about changes in policy and decision-making, the work of organisations like the CEPF in support of improved biodiversity conservation will remain limited.
- *Civil society organisations face capacity constraints* both in terms of their absorptive capacity and the skills and competencies of their staff, particularly in the area of advocacy. At the community level, the issue of capacity is also a concern. In many instances capacity precludes community organisations from preparing proposals for funding agencies, even though they may have the ability to carry out work on the ground.
- *There are now fewer civil society organisations working on environment and biodiversity conservation than before.* Over the past 15 years, the number of active environmental/conservation civil society organisations in Jamaica has decreased.

Participants also discussed what future activities are required to help build such sustainability. They felt that in the remaining 2.5 years of the CEPF Caribbean Islands Programme, support should be given to:

- *Advocacy programmes and building the advocacy capacity* of civil society organisations.
- *Activities that target decision and policy makers and technocrats*, for example, translating scientific information into language that these groups can understand and then use to inform their work.
- *A multi-level national biodiversity conservation communication campaign* to raise awareness of key issues among various audiences as well as to increase public demand for conservation and environmental protection outcomes in the national interest.
- *Projects need to have strong communication components* in order to share information about results and good practices, as well as to build the body of knowledge available to shape and influence public debate.
- *Focus on ecosystem services/payment for ecosystem services* as a vehicle to translate the importance of biodiversity conservation into economic terms.
- *Strengthening the capacity of individual organisations* to enhance their efficiency and effectiveness.

6. Evaluation of the meeting

The participants completed a written evaluation form at the end of the meeting. A compilation of their responses is attached as Appendix 6. Nine evaluation forms (out of 13 non-CEPF Participants) were returned at the end of the workshop, giving a 69% response rate.

A majority of participants indicated they found the workshop useful, noting the benefits of the exchange that took place during the meeting and the opportunity to learn about and from others. They valued, in particular, the opportunity for exchange and learning about the work of the CEPF nationally and regionally. Participants appreciated the frank and open nature of the discussions and the constructive tone of the workshop.

Approximately half of the respondents specified what they liked least about the meeting. While two respondents felt the workshop was too long, one felt more time was needed. One respondent felt too much time was spent on the CEPF's overall grant history, while another disliked that tangential issues were being aired during the workshop.

Respondents found various sessions of the workshop most useful, perhaps reflecting their own particular interests. The session on relevance and sustainability, however, was listed by two respondents as being the most useful.

Suggested improvements to the meeting included: dedicating more time to the activity; inviting policy-makers and other government stakeholders; and distributing handouts in advance of the meeting.

On a scale of "Poor" to "Very Good", in the main the workshop was rated "Good" in the areas of clarity of objectives, content, materials, facilitation, and practical sessions. Opinion on the relevance of the meeting was more divided, with four respondents respectively finding it "Good" and "Fair" and one "Poor."

7. Additional comments

- *Mid-term evaluation:* While participants recognised the importance and utility of the mid-term evaluation, a number of people at the meeting expressed concern about the large demand on their time that this process was making and in some cases, suggested that the CEPF was asking a lot of the grantees.
- *Jamaican mentors underutilised:* The CANARI trained mentors in Jamaica feel underutilised and lament the lack of resources to support community-level engagement.

8. Conclusion and recommendations

The meeting made strides towards meeting its objectives as follows:

- a. Networking for knowledge sharing, enhanced coordination and collaboration among CEPF grantees took place. Many participants appreciated the opportunity to learn more about the work of other grantees nationally and regionally.
- b. Progress on achievement of CEPF Caribbean programme results was evaluated in the Jamaican context, noting that the youth of the Jamaican portfolio made it difficult to analyse the impact

of most of the grants in the country at this stage; however, the grants awarded are relevant and meet needs. Notwithstanding, there are a number of contextual issues in Jamaica, particularly relating to civil society capacity and national policies and decision-making that will potentially limit the long term-sustainability of the CEPF's work. While the CEPF's support may not be able to fully resolve all of these issues, the Fund can certainly make a contribution to addressing them.

- c. Awareness and commitment of CEPF grantees was built and areas of potential synergies and coordination identified on an informal basis. The need for continued information sharing among grantees and networking in a manner that is not burdensome to organisations was noted.
- d. Recommendations on strategies and actions that can contribute to achieving all desired outcomes by the end of the programme were identified. Participants noted the importance of addressing some of the contextual challenges in Jamaica as an important part of the strategy towards achieving the CEPF's results and contributing to the sustainability of its investment in Jamaica. They similarly highlighted the importance of building the capacity of individual organisations to enhance their performance and developing competency in the area of advocacy and policy-influencing within organisations. Activities that target decision-makers and technocrats are useful complements to field-based conservation work. Information exchange, sharing of good practice models from across the region, strong communication, and civil society networking are all elements of the strategy needed for the next 2.5 years.
- e. Unexpected positive and negative impacts of CEPF in the Caribbean were identified, as highlighted in the most significant change stories shared by participants. For the most part, participants emphasised what was significant about the CEPF rather than observed changes, noting in particular that the CEPF has provided critical support in a number of areas of need, but that the CEPF proposal development process is overly long and burdensome on the staff resources of small organisations.
- f. Key issues related to the process of planning and implementation were highlighted, suggesting a need for a more streamlined and less burdensome application process. As few of the organisations present had extensive experience at the implementation phase, this aspect was not discussed in great detail. However, the two organisations with the most implementation experience noted that the interaction with the CEPF during implementation had been helpful and constructive and no specific needs or suggested changes to current practice were identified.
- g. Recommendations for improvements to the application process that were identified include: adding specific targets to the call for proposal dissemination lists; developing the capacity of organisations to prepare proposals; and outlining to applicants at the start of the process what Phase II proposal development entails.

Findings from this meeting will be discussed in the regional meeting in Jamaica in July 2013 as part of the mid-term evaluation process, and included in the full report that will be produced by CANARI.

Appendix 1

Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot

Mid-term Evaluation: Jamaica Focus Group Meeting

Hotel Four Seasons, 18 Ruthven Road, Kingston 10

12 June 2013

Participants

	Name	Organisation	Contact Number	Email
1	Ms. Danielle Andrade	Jamaica Environment Trust(JET)	(876) 960-3693	dandrade.jet@gmail.com
2	Ms. Donna Blake	The Nature Conservancy-Caribbean Programs	(876) 754-4579	dblake@tnc.org
3	Mr. Bernard Blue	National Environment and Planning Agency (NEPA)	(876) 754-7540	BBlue@nepa.gov.jm
4	Ms. Hyacinth Douglas	Global Environment Facility (GEF) Small Grants Programme Jamaica	(876) 978-2390 to 9	hyacinthd@unops.org
5	Ms. Marilyn Headley	Forestry Department	(876) 924-2125	mheadley@forestry.gov.jm
6	Ms. Velve Lawrence	Local Initiative Facility for the Environment (LIFE)	(876) 908-1714 (o) (876) 920-9183 (m)	lifejamaica@cwjamaica.com
5	Ms. Diana McCaulay	Jamaica Environment Trust(JET)	(876) 960-3693	dmccaulay@cwjamaica.com
8	Ms. Karen McDonald Gayle	Environmental Foundation of Jamaica (EFJ)	(876) 960-6744	kmcdonaldgayle@efj.org.jm
9	Ms. Ingrid Parchment	Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation(C-CAM)	(876) 986-3344 (876) 383-2184	iparchment@yahoo.com
10	Mr. Michael Schwartz	Windsor Research Centre Limited (WRC)	(876) 997-3832	windsor@cwjamaica.com

	Name	Organisation	Contact Number	Email
11	Ms. Charmaine Webber	Environmental Foundation of Jamaica (EFJ)	(876) 960-7125 (o) (876) 960-6744 (m)	cwebber@efj.org.jm
12	Ms. Petre Williams Raynor	The Panos Institute (Panos Caribbean)	(876) 920-0070 to1	petre@panoscaribbean.org
13	Mr. Damion Whyte	Urban Development Corporation Natural Resource Management and Environmental Planning Department	(876) 922-8310 to 4	DWhyte@udcja.com
CEPF Secretariat and RIT				
14	Ms. Nicole Brown	CANARI/Regional Implementation Team for the CEPF	(876) 818-4285	nabrown@btinternet.com
15	Ms. Michele Zador	Conservation International (CEPF Secretariat)	(703) 341-2635 (o) (202) 203-9633 (m)	mzador@conservation.org

**Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Caribbean Islands
Biodiversity Hotspot
Mid-term Evaluation: Jamaica Focus Group Meeting**

**Hotel Four Seasons, 18 Ruthven Road, Kingston 10
12 June 2013**

Agenda

10.00 – 10.30	<i>Session 1.</i> Welcome, Introductions, Overview of the Meeting	<i>(Large group discussion)</i>
10.30 – 10.45	CEPF Caribbean Portfolio Update	<i>(Presentation)</i>
10.45 – 11.40	<i>Session 2.</i> Big Impacts – “Most Significant Change” to date	<i>(Individual work and large group discussion)</i>
11.40 – 12.15	<i>Session 3.</i> Achieving Desired Results	<i>(Large group discussion)</i>
12.15 – 1.15	<i>Session 4.</i> Outcome Mapping – Results as Changes in People	<i>(Large group discussion and small group session)</i>
1.15 – 2.00	Lunch	
2.00 – 3.00	<i>Session 5.</i> Assessing the CEPF's Process(es)	<i>Large group discussion</i>
3.00 – 3.20	<i>Session 6.</i> Relevance and Sustainability of the CEPF Caribbean Programme in Jamaica	<i>Large group discussion</i>
3.20 – 3.30	<i>Session 7.</i> Wrap up and Next Steps	<i>Large group discussion</i>

Appendix 3

**Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Caribbean Islands
Biodiversity Hotspot**

Mid-term Evaluation: Jamaica Focus Group Meeting

Hotel Four Seasons, 18 Ruthven Road, Kingston 10

12 June 2013

Presentation Slides



Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Caribbean Programme

Mid-term evaluation
National focus groups
June 2013



Session 1

INTRODUCTION



Objectives - results

- evaluate progress on achievement of CEPF Caribbean programme results at all levels – **outputs** (products/deliverables), **outcomes and impacts**;
- develop **recommendations** on strategies to achieve all results by the end of the programme;
- identify **unexpected positive and negative impacts** of CEPF in the Caribbean;



Objectives - process

- analyse **lessons** learnt on process of planning and implementation;
- develop **recommendations** for improvement of the process;



Objectives – sharing and synergies

- facilitate **networking** for knowledge sharing, enhanced coordination and collaboration among CEPF grantees;
- map **relevant initiatives**, funding development, **synergies**, etc;
- build awareness and **commitment** of CEPF grantees, synergies and **coordination**.



The mid-term evaluation process

- Three national focus group sessions with grantees and key partners (June 2013)
- Desk review of key reports (June 2013)
- Survey Monkey (open to public June-August 2013)
- A regional workshop with grantees and key partners (July 2013, Jamaica)
- Interviews RACC members & mentors (August 2013)
- Interviews with Grantees (August 2013)
- Focus group RIT & CEPF Secretariat (August 2013)



Transparency!

Reports of each activity on CANARI website

Final report on CANARI website (September 2013)

Summary report in 3 languages on CANARI website (September 2013)



Session 2

THE BIG IMPACTS






The Most Significant Change

- What do you think has been the most significant change in terms of engaging civil society in the conservation of globally threatened biodiversity in the Caribbean due to the CEPF Caribbean programme since it started in October 2010?




Session 3

ACHIEVING DESIRED RESULTS




Desired results = Targets

- Is the information accurate? Does anything need to change?
- Is the information comprehensive? Is there anything to add?
- NB: Focus on the contribution of the CEPF Programme (you can note if other initiatives are making a positive or negative contribution)




The “full” story

- What do these numbers (quantitative measures) really mean?
- What is the picture of results being achieved (the qualitative story)?
- Option: rank
 - No progress made
 - A little progress made
 - Significant progress made




Session 4

RESULTS AS CHANGES IN PEOPLE!



Outcome Mapping

- Focuses on one type of **result / outcome** = changes in behaviours, relationships, actions, and/or activities of the people and organizations with whom you work **directly**.



Outcome Challenge Statements

- Vision of positive behaviour – We intend to see [target group] who [description of behaviours in the active present tense].
 - Behaviours
 - Relationships
 - Activities
 - Actions
 - Interactions



Indicators of change – progress markers



- Love to see**
Truly transformative. Set quite high.
- Like to see**
More active learning, engagement.
- Expect to see**
Early response to programme's activities.

Credit: IDS



Groups assess progress markers

For your target group and focus area, assess:

- if the target group already demonstrated a behaviour before the Programme **✓**
- if it has been a change because of the Programme **☺** and rank 1-3 (and noting any other initiative also making a contribution)
- if the change has not yet been achieved **X**



Session 5

PROCESS: EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY



Effectiveness and efficiency

- To what extent have activities been executed as planned and have produced the desired outputs?
- To what extent have activities been implemented with the optimal use of financial, human and technical resources and in a timely fashion, looking also at the suitability of project management arrangements.



Process areas 1

- Issuing calls for proposals
- Technical review and selection of proposals
- Supporting the application process
- Monitoring projects
- Supporting project implementation (include financial management)
- Supporting project evaluation and reporting
- Evaluating strategic impact



Process areas 2

- Communication about CEPF and the work being achieved
- Catalysing and facilitating networking amongst grantees
- Facilitating relationship building between CSOs and government, other key partners
- Building capacity of civil society organisations for sustainability



Process areas 3

- Evaluating strategic impact
- Managing portfolio investment
- Catalysing additional support
- Providing strategic leadership on how civil society can play a role in biodiversity conservation
- Policy influence
- Internal learning and improving performance within the CEPF



Session 6

RELEVANCE AND SUSTAINABILITY



Is the CEPF Caribbean Programme relevant?

- To what extent is the CEPF Caribbean Programme that was conceived and the activities that were planned consistent with the needs, expectations and capacities of the various stakeholders and responds adequately to identified needs, goals and objectives?



Are the results sustainable?

- To what extent have the results (outcomes and outputs) been, and are likely to remain, sustained beyond the time frame of the project and its various activities
- What future activities are required to help build such sustainability?



Session 7

NEXT STEPS



The mid-term evaluation process

- Three national focus group sessions with grantees and key partners (June 2013)
- Desk review of key reports (June 2013)
- Survey Monkey (open to public June-August 2013)
- A regional workshop with grantees and key partners (July 2013, Jamaica)
- Interviews RACC members & mentors (August 2013)
- Interviews with Grantees (August 2013)
- Focus group RIT & CEPF Secretariat (August 2013)

**Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Caribbean Islands
Biodiversity Hotspot**

Mid-term Evaluation: Jamaica Focus Group Meeting

Hotel Four Seasons, 18 Ruthven Road, Kingston 10

12 June 2013

“Most Significant Change” Stories

- “The awarding of grants allows for the up-scaling of initiatives. The idea of allowing the CSO direct access to funds in conserving biodiversity thereby empowering civil society. However, the problem that comes up is the issue of sustainability (both for conservation and funding the CSO), which donors etc. need to seriously consider.”
- “The award of a grant to the Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation in seeking to address threats to three KBAs in the Portland Bight protected area, which will allow for direct intervention in these areas geared towards sustainable management of the resources in these areas.”
- “I believe there was no significant change *per se* with the CEPF project, however we got the opportunity to provide new information on things we thought we knew and the current status of what’s going on to engage civil society with the information.”
- “None known. Participated in mentorship programme but no resources to build capacity of member groups. Networking mentors in the Caribbean, but limited tangible output.”
- “Targeting only KBAs; Allowing for data collection was different; Funding for institutional capacity building is also significant.”
- “The Fund operates in a similar manner to many other donors in Jamaica. There are limitations to the engagement due to capacity requirements of the NGOs, and geographic limitations of KBAs. It is very early to “see” impact.”
- “Availability of the Ecosystem Profile that can be used as a communication resource and around which you can get CSOs talking and collaborating. Communication provision/element as part of the provision under engagement/availability of baselines.”
- “ALG – networking of CSOs started; not familiar with much other change, but some activities are in progress.”
- “Another source of funding for the civil society to assist in conservation of biodiversity. This has led to additional work done in the areas of interest to the FD *et al.*”

- “Provision of funds for NGOs to sustain their work; can’t say anything about a specific change. JET is a new grantee; providing access to funds to do policy advocacy work related to conservation.”
- “I can’t say about engagement of civil society in biodiversity conservation – no idea. For myself, I have spent too much time and staff time in CEPF proposal development – an unwelcome change for me that has not helped Biodiversity conservation.”
- “Generally: too soon to say. CC [Cockpit Country] took 15 years;
Personally: Time spent on CEPF actually reduced interactions with civil society (124.1 hours).
NB: With regard to NGO capacity, the answer is **NOT** more workshops. It’s finding the person to run the NGO who already has the basic capacity or motivation. As I have said to CEPF, funding is not the issue: it is finding the individuals [to do the work].”

**Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Caribbean Programme Mid-Term Evaluation
Caribbean Islands Hotspot - Annual Report on the Logframe
January 2012 – December 2012**

Objective	Targets	Progress
<p>Engage civil society in the conservation of globally threatened biodiversity through targeted investments with maximum impact on the highest conservation and ecosystem services priorities.</p>	<p>NGOs and civil society actors from CEPF eligible countries, with an emphasis on the six priority conservation corridors and 45 key biodiversity areas, effectively participate in conservation programs guided by the ecosystem profile.</p>	<p>33 civil society organizations are directly engaged and benefiting from CEPF support in Antigua and Barbuda, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines.</p>
	<p>Development plans, projects and policies which influence the six conservation corridors and 45 key biodiversity areas mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem services, with a focus on tourism, mining and agriculture.</p>	<p>8 grants are integrating ecosystem services and biodiversity into key development plans, projects and policies, focusing on water resources management, reforestation, forest carbon, and sustainable tourism in Grenada, St. Vincent, Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Jamaica.</p>
	<p>At least 20 percent of under-protected priority key biodiversity areas (at least six) brought under new and/or strengthened protection status.</p>	<p>13% of under-protected key biodiversity areas (6 priority KBAs in the Dominican Republic, Grenada and Haiti) to be brought under new protection status from 5 grants.</p>
	<p>Strategic areas of the production landscape of six conservation corridors under improved management for biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services.</p>	<p>6 grants contributing to improved management in the production landscape in 3 conservation corridors, through forest carbon, reforestation, integrated management plans, agroforestry and sustainable tourism.</p>
	<p>The Caribbean ecosystem profile influences and complements other donor's investment strategies.</p>	<p>Current activities complement MacArthur Foundation projects, and grants are complementing the following donors: Global Environment Facility (GEF), Forest Conservation Fund, Environmental Foundation of Jamaica, Conseil Général des Hauts de Seine (CG 92) [French Local Government], U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, BBC Wildlife Fund, Disney Worldwide Conservation Fund, The Forestry and</p>

Objective	Targets	Progress
		National Parks Department (FNPD) of Grenada, U.S. National Science Foundation, Darwin Initiative.
Outcome 1. Improve protection and management of 45 priority Key Biodiversity Areas.	Number of hectares in key biodiversity areas and number of key biodiversity areas (and percent) with demonstrable improvements/strengthening in their protection and management as guided by a sustainable management plan.	599,400 hectares in 8 high priority KBAs undergoing management improvements in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica as a result from 6 grants. 68,309 hectares in 8 medium priority KBAs undergoing management improvements in the Dominican Republic, Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada and Saint Lucia as a result from 5 grants.
	Number of hectares brought under new or upgraded protection.	404 hectares in the Dominican Republic being registered as a private reserve through a grant to Consorcio Ambiental Dominicano. 30 hectares proposed as a municipal wildlife reserve in Haiti under a grant to International Iguana Foundation. 115 hectares in Grenada proposed to be legally gazetted under a grant to the Grenada Dove Conservation Programme. 20,000 hectares proposed as a Locally Managed Marine Area in northern Haiti under a grant to Fondation pour la Protection de la Biodiversité Marine
	Number of sustainable financing mechanisms established and/or strengthened with initial capital secured.	5 sustainable funding schemes promoted through 5 grants to support forest carbon and payment for water resources management in the Dominican Republic; payment for ecosystem services scheme to finance a reforested area in Haiti; and conservation agreements in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica.
	Number of co-management arrangements established or supported.	1 co-management arrangement being developed and supported for the Bahoruco Oriental KBA in Dominican Republic. 1 co-management arrangement being developed for Caracol Bay in the Lagons du Nord-est KBA in Haiti.

Objective	Targets	Progress
	Percent and number of grants that enable effective stewardship by local communities for biodiversity and ecosystem conservation.	79% and 27 grants that enable effective stewardship by local communities for biodiversity and ecosystem conservation.
Outcome 2. Integrate biodiversity conservation into landscape and development planning and implementation in six conservation corridors.	Number of policies, projects and plans incorporating ecosystem services, climate change and biodiversity conservation.	4 grants in the Dominican Republic and Jamaica integrating climate change, forest carbon and water resource management into policies, projects and plans.
	Number of hectares in production landscapes with improved management for biodiversity conservation.	132,779 hectares undergoing management improvements through 6 grants, in reforestation, sustainable tourism and livelihood development and sustainable agriculture.
	Number of policies formulated and adopted to strengthen public and private protected areas systems.	1 grant to support the development of private protected areas in the Dominican Republic.
	Number of public-private partnerships that mainstream biodiversity in the agriculture, tourism and mining sectors.	6 grants in the Dominican Republic, Grenada and Jamaica contributing to public-private partnerships that mainstream biodiversity in the tourism sectors. 1 grant focused in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica promoting private sector engagement in local conservation initiatives through conservation agreements.
	Number of co-management arrangements established or supported.	No progress to date.
	Number of projects located outside protected areas that integrate biodiversity conservation in management practices.	2 grants in Haiti and 2 grants in the Dominican Republic.
Outcome 3. Caribbean civil society supported to achieve biodiversity conservation by building local and regional institutional capacity and by fostering stakeholder	Number of civil society organizations with strengthened institutional capacity.	25-30 civil society organisations to benefit from institutional capacity building in strategic planning, financial management, development of sustainable financing strategies, improvement of governance structures, development/improvement of websites, training and mentoring in proposal development and scientific writing, and effective communication, networking and

Objective	Targets	Progress
collaboration.		outreach.
	Number of local and regional initiatives supported to strengthen stakeholder involvement in biodiversity conservation	7 grants supported local initiatives focusing on networking for biodiversity conservation in Haiti and the Dominican Republic. 5 regional initiatives focusing on sustainable tourism development, amphibian conservation, communications and networking for biodiversity conservation.
Outcome 4. A Regional Implementation Team provides strategic leadership and effectively coordinates CEPF investment in the Caribbean Islands Hotspot.	Regional Implementation Team performance in fulfilling the approved Terms of Reference.	The RIT is fulfilling performance targets.
	Number of groups receiving grants that achieve a satisfactory score on final performance scorecard.	No final performance scorecards completed during this period.
Outcome 5. Emergency support provided to Haitian civil society to mitigate the impacts of the 2010 earthquake.	# of actions taken to prevent destruction of forests in Massif de la Selle and Massif de la Hotte.	No progress to date.
	Environmental Network Resource Centre established.	An environmental network resource centre has been established with detailed activities and an implementation plan for conservation efforts in Massif de la Selle and Massif de la Hotte developed in consultation with the Haitian NGO sector.
	# of reconstruction and development policies and plans that incorporate environmental concerns.	No progress to date.

**Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Caribbean Islands
Biodiversity Hotspot**

Mid-term Evaluation: Jamaica Focus Group Meeting

Hotel Four Seasons, 18 Ruthven Road, Kingston 10

12 June 2013

Summary Evaluation Results

1. Did you find the meeting useful as a means to provide feedback, discuss and evaluate the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF)'s investment to date in Jamaica, including results achieved and the process of grant making and supporting civil society involved in biodiversity conservation and development in the country?

Response	Number
Yes	8
No	0
No response	1
<i>Total</i>	<i>9</i>

Please explain:

- a) The work and operations of the CEPF was clearly explained
 - b) Opportunity to provide feedback (positively and negatively) and recommendations for improvement
 - c) It was useful to hear how older CEPF grantees had implemented a project
 - d) Understanding better how CEPF works and its contribution to conserving our biodiversity
 - e) No response
 - f) Marginally
 - g) The meeting was useful because I learned about the projects that CEPF is doing on the country
 - h) Got a sense of other projects being implemented in Jamaica and the linkages with our own project. Served to inform next steps
 - i) Was able to articulate the positives and challenges of the grant writing process and approval process
2. What is the most important thing that you learned / understood / felt from this meeting?
- a) The purpose of the CEPF in funding organisations working in the KBAs
 - b) The working of the CEPF
 - c) To go through issues (concerns with obligations in the grant agreement)
 - d) Willingness to work with CSO and the flexibility to CSOs in use of funds
 - e) What other groups were doing
 - f) Meet other recipients

- g) I learned about the projects carried out in Jamaica. It also provides information on CEPF projects
- h) The value of communication and networking among CSOs
- i) Other projects in JA and regional CEPF project areas, the metrics proposed to measure the success

3. What did you like about this meeting?

- a) Very interactive
- b) The frankness and openness with which the participants expressed their opinions on issues related to CEPF and other areas
- c) The interaction with grantees
- d) Being a part of a group that seems determined to ensure change. The exchanging of ideas towards sustainability of CSOs
- e) Some discussions lively
- f) Friendly, frank
- g) I like the group discussions
- h) The constructive exchange of views
- i) Frank and very useful discussion

4. What did you dislike about this meeting?

- a) No response
- b) No response
- c) Too much time spent on CEPF's overall grant history etc.
- d) Issues being aired that were not the focus of the workshop
- e) Too long
- f) Nothing except too long
- g) Needed more time to review several of the points in the meeting
- h) No response
- i) No response

5. Which sessions did you find particularly useful:

- a) All the sessions were useful
- b) Session 3
- c) The session on what new grantees need to know
- d) Last sessions – relevance and sustainability
- e) The one on process
- f) No response
- g) No response
- h) Relevance and sustainability of the CEPF Caribbean Programme in Jamaica and next steps
- i) No response

6. How could the meeting have been improved?

- a) Meeting would be more extensive if was conducted over 2 days
- b) No response
- c) No response
- d) Maybe other key stakeholders could have been invited i.e. policy makers/government
- e) No response
- f) No response
- g) No response
- h) No response
- i) No response

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

	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	NR
Clarity of objectives	1	7	1		1
Content	1	7	1		
Materials		8	1		
Facilitation	4	5			
Practical sessions	1	7	1		
Relevance to your needs		4	4	1	

Any additional comments on the above:

- Handouts could have been circulated prior to event. Especially info on the projects being funded and omit allocated/committed to Jamaica to date.

8. What would prevent you from applying the ideas discussed in this meeting?

- Lack of support (financial/partnership
- Exhaustion
- Absence of cooperation among players. Otherwise, we should be good to go.

9. Any other comments:

- Develop a mechanism to engage the policy makers re how the work of CEPF is connected to the government conservation programmes.
- This type of session could be held maybe twice per year.