



**GEF INTER-FOCAL REGIONAL CONSULTATIVE PROCESS WITH  
EXISTING AND PIPELINE GEF PROJECTS IN THE WIDER CARIBBEAN  
REGION, 1-2 June, 2009**

**DRAFT WORKSHOP REPORT**

**Background**

1. The Global Environment Facility's (GEF) International Waters Learning Exchange and Resource Network, IW: Learn aims to strengthen International Waters Management (IWM) by facilitating structured learning and information sharing among stakeholders. In pursuit of this global objective, IW:LEARN improves GEF IW projects' information base, replication efficiency, transparency, stakeholder ownership and sustainability of benefits.
2. This GEF IW:LEARN Activity, implemented by the Caribbean Environment Programme, supports the mandate of the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena Convention) and in particular the Protocol to the Convention Concerning Pollution from Land-Based Sources and Activities (LBS Protocol). It was planned as a case study, to test cross focal area networking within the Wider Caribbean Region, based on concern that as the GEF portfolio grows, projects may overlap, opportunities for synergies maybe lost, even antagonistic linkages may develop, and that major gaps may still exist, notwithstanding the many projects.
3. The approach that GEF IW:LEARN aimed to test is a regional consultative process, including support for networking and knowledge-sharing, leading to a face to face meeting, and producing a series of at least ten experience notes, recommendations and conclusions to be disseminated within the GEF and beyond.
4. The results will be a UNEP-IW LEARN contribution to GEF's effort towards integration. Cross focal area networking has become even more critical within the new GEF allocation framework.
5. The project objectives were:

- Test cross-focal area networking among GEF projects in the Wider Caribbean Region, in order to improve the effectiveness of project implementation through strengthening of linkages across GEF focal areas;
- Discuss case studies and recommendations for cross-focal area collaboration to be disseminated within the GEF and beyond.

6. The objectives of the workshop were:

- Share experiences and lessons learned in the development and implementation of GEF projects and identify case studies, best practices and lessons for further elaboration;
- Explore concrete opportunities for cross-focal synergies among GEF projects; and
- Identify tools and mechanisms to support intra-regional cross-focal area collaboration in the future development and implementation of GEF projects in the Wider Caribbean Region.

7. The agenda of the workshop is presented in Annex I. Participants included representatives from seven GEF projects at regional and national levels. The list of participants is listed as Annex II.

## **Opening of the Workshop**

8. The workshop was opened 9.15am 1 June 2009. Mr. Christopher Corbin welcomed the participants to Jamaica and to the workshop. He stressed the importance of this initiative and wished for a fruitful discussion. Mr. Sean Khan, Task manager further elaborated upon the GEF IW Learn initiative and invited participants to provide feedback on the initiative throughout the course of the workshop.

9. Following an introduction of participants, Mr. Corbin gave a presentation on the activities and mandate of the Caribbean Environment Programme and well as the relationship with the GEF IW: Learn project.

10. Ms. Heidi Savelli provided some background on the inter-focal initiative and the workshop objectives. She outlined the activities of the project which included: Project inception/initiation including recruitment of an IW: Learn; Groundwork and outreach: In order to determine the prospective participants in the virtual consultative dialogue, an online inventory of GEF initiatives, GEF Implementing Agencies, and key GEF affiliated partners in the WCR was developed, including project managers and other contacts as relevant. An information note (English, and Spanish) with invitation to participate in the regional consultative process was

disseminated. While the focus will be on GEF projects, other major relevant projects will be listed in a brief document and a donor profile will be developed; **Electronic forum discussions:** An E-forum was set up and discussions were moderated by the consultant. In order to better guide the E-forum and to facilitate more focused and structured discussions, a list of thematic areas and questions was prepared and approved by the RCU and GEF IWTF. The discussions have so far focused on issues related to the impact of the project, and cover topics such as management, communication, stakeholder involvement, indicators, etc. For each topic, the consultant will prepare a summary of outcomes of discussions, recommendations, proposals, etc., which will be used in the final report. These topics could also form the basis for the case studies. The importance of the e-forum as a tool for information exchange was highlighted and feedback sought from the participants in order to improve these tools and develop additional ones that would meet the needs of the managers. In conclusion she also highlighted the need to take into consideration not only collaboration between GEF projects, but also other large projects in the region and informed the meeting that the outcomes of the regional consultative process will be incorporated in a guidance document, which will also include experience notes.

## **Inter-focal networking and collaboration among GEF projects (plenary discussion)**

11. Following this initial introduction to the workshop, a plenary discussion proceeded on informal or formal collaborative arrangements and initiatives with other projects/partners. Mr. Alex Cooman, Project Manager of the GEF Project "REPCar" made reference to technical collaboration with the United Nations University on training activities and managerial collaboration with GEF. Mrs. Levy from BirdLife indicated that increased collaboration with other agencies had taken place gradually and more closely linked i.e. working with wetland project. The Meeting noted that the GEF secretariat is encouraging new GEF project with several focal areas which could open up more opportunities for collaboration. While it was acknowledged that "Turf wars" might exist between organization, it was clarified that collaboration can still be ongoing in particular on an operational level. Mr. Ramon Baez, National Coordinator of the Sabana Yegua Project, indicated that the implementation of the land degradation project had been progressing with about 85% implemented by an NGO. He highlighted this as an interesting component. One of the key factors was related to education and awareness with activities approved by the Ministry of Education. Fifteen 15 development plans - early stage decision making several development plan but lack of management. Ms. Sally Edwards, PAHO, noted that the REPCar Projects and the

DDT project were covering similar focal areas which their project had been unaware of.

## **Presentation on GEF experience notes and guidelines**

12. Mr. Sean Khan presented some IW: Learn initiatives making particular reference to the IW Learn website featuring a project map for IW:Learn projects, the E-bulletin combining information from all websites with monitored links from which user statistics are produced. He informed the meeting that experience notes for various projects are available from the website and that a template for the development of these existed as a guide. He also highlighted the GEF document database and its project database. Questions from the meeting related to the experience to date of managing a blog and forum and highlighted the need of a “community of practice”, which should create an environment where everybody feel free to speak. The meeting also stressed the need of a top-down instruction from e.g. the GEF secretariat for projects to actively seek collaboration and information exchange with projects in other focal areas. An example of a existing forum for exchange of articles and scientific information for environmental journalists was mentioned which worked very well in Latin America but failed in the Caribbean. This could be attributed to the lack of capacity and specialists within journalists in Caribbean but also that the needs are different in the Caribbean than in Latin America and that the uniqueness of the Caribbean must be taken into account when developing projects related to information exchange.

13. Limited human resources in countries makes knowledge sharing an extra "burden" and there must be clear incentives for a manager to take the time to share information and knowledge. These could be monetary ( reward for best experience note) or purely through recognition of some sort. The option of having additional human resources for writing and editing information was discussed however the most important was considered to have someone responsible and dedicated to the knowledge sharing task taking into account the prohibitively heavy workload of the project staff leaving little time to produce additional information not already listed as a project output. In some cases countries are also very sensitive on what information to share. In addition there is a need to ensure that the knowledge shared is in fact used. A key element for a tool, site or document to be used is that it must respond a user's need - here a needs assessment could be useful. A bottom-up approach could also be useful by looking into what can be prepared for new project managers.

## **Summary of E-dialogue to date**

14. Mrs. Sherry Heileman presented the document "Summary of E-dialogue - **GEF Inter-focal Regional Consultative Process with existing and pipeline GEF Projects in the Wider Caribbean Region**" as outlined in Annex III. She noted that the process of identifying and inviting participants for the e-forum had been challenging due to the time needed to obtain contact information for the project managers of the various GEF projects in the region. She also highlighted the need to have someone dedicated to the management of the e-forum in order to invite additional people to the forum, but also to stimulate discussions, in particular in its initial stage. Participants indicated that it would be beneficial to know more about the various persons participating in the forum and suggested that an update of each person's profile be done including links to the various project websites.

### **Project presentations on experiences in implementation**

15. Mr. Alex Cooman presented the REPCar project. Objectives are to implement comprehensive management practices and specific measures to control the use and application of pesticides in the agricultural sector, and to support countries with the implementation of the Land Based Sources of Marine Pollution Protocol (LBS), as part of the Cartagena Convention. As impact is difficult to estimate directly by use of environmental status indicators the project uses Process Indicators and Environmental Stress Reduction Indicators, applied to sub-sectors and regions where project is active aiming to decrease toxicity per ha with 20%; 20% Increase in number of farmers applying Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) in the region; and to reduce runoff of pesticides on pilot farms with 20%. The project includes demonstration projects with set of validated GAP for major crops of the region: environmentally sound, economically feasible and socially accepted and where farmers accept and implement GAP: training and follow-up of some 500 farms per country. Additional components include coastal monitoring for various pesticides and public awareness and strengthening the capacity for reduced pesticide run off. Positive experiences included selection of projects according to national priorities and increased sustainability (private sector participation) although the time needed for selection, and consensus varied. Effectiveness also depended on national structures. Relating to time frame for start up it was noted that the project proposal was developed from 1998 to 2001 (PDF-B) however start-up was initiated in end of 2006 when organisational arrangements were no longer valid, there had been extensive developments in the project's issues and proposed that a second PDF would have been convenient to establish baselines, select demos, etc.

16. Additional experiences related to the benefits of networking with GEF and non-GEF projects and with various organizations such as IAEA, UNU-INWEH, and projects such as the Know Why Network, IWCAM, IW-Learn. Additional collaboration on a national level included several projects

on capacity building for GAP resulting in concrete inter-project collaboration for training to prevent duplication and improve management of information.

17. Mr. Ramnanan presented "Lessons Learnt in Developing a FSP on Mitigating the Threats of Invasive Alien Species in the Insular Caribbean" Components of the Full-size Project include: Development of National IAS Strategies; Establishment of Caribbean-Wide Cooperation and Strategy; Knowledge Generation for Managing IAS and its Dissemination; Prevention of New IAS Introductions in Terrestrial, Freshwater and Marine Systems; and Early Detection, Rapid Response and Control of IAS Impacts. The main project issue related to the long gestation (6 yrs) to FSP - inadequate / no funding for management. CABI CLARC drew down on CABI's CDF funding to invest in the FSP, promoted full collaboration among stakeholders and donor agencies and decided to hire national expertise. The four 4 year FSP is now to be rolled out by June 2009. Lesson Learn were that despite initial delays, project was delivered on time and within budget, trust and interaction between participating countries has increased substantially and proactive networking by CABI was (and is) very well received. CABI has also developed a strong working relation with UNEP, building on that developed in Nairobi and collaboration on MIS with UNEP CEP.

18. What went badly: Technical staff were not trained to the required level of financial management, which affected expenditure as well as reporting; Lack of funding to hire persons with the mix of management and scientific training to undertake the necessary planning and financial analysis. Lacking was a comprehensive picture of the outputs and formal requirements expected by UNEP/GEF with sufficient anticipation to allow proper planning and briefing; GEF financial support for project management; and Back-up staff to cover absence of key staff at critical times. Adjustments would relate to more intensive and practical training on reporting requirements, especially financial, provided these are known in time; Implementation of communication plans require closer monitoring; and put the lessons learnt from this workshop to good use in implementing the IAS project in the region.

19. Ms Lisa Kirkland, National Project Coordinator for the IWCAM demonstration project in Jamaica **"An Integrated Approach to Managing the Marine, Coastal and Watershed Resources of east-central Portland"** and summarized some of the experiences of the project. She emphasized that for projects to have quick and visible impact "Marketing" plays a critical role. **Objectives of the project were to** capture existing best practices and lessons learned through other relevant Projects in order to create an effective Watershed Management mechanism for Eastern Portland and to develop transfer methodologies to allow for the

replication of these lessons to neighbouring Watershed Management Units (WMU), and to other Caribbean SIDS. Due to the major problem of solid waste in the Watershed with no means of collection, 20 Community members trained in water sampling techniques. Samples were analyzed and results presented at Town Meeting where relevant Agencies were invited to reinforce the implications of results while the communities agree on solutions to ensure maximum participation and “buy in” from others. Solid waste is now collected regularly, and Income was generated from scrap metal collected. There is benefit to be had from the concerted effort of Agencies. The link between action, impact on the environment and livelihood has to be made. Presentation should be made in such a way that if actions are not stop NOW!!!, what the scenario will be shortly. She concluded that this experience is significant as most of the SIDS have a solid waste problem and this is a simple method that yields maximum result and it also involves community oriented solutions.

20. Mrs. Donna Spencer from the IWCAM Project presented on the St. Lucia Demonstration Project: *“Protecting Watershed Services and Developing Management Incentives in the Fond D’or Watershed area of St. Lucia”*. Primary aim of demo project was to demonstrate a strategic approach to participatory watershed management, which would integrate principles relating to sustainable natural resource and environmental management. Chronic water shortages resulting in constraints to the development of agriculture, economic growth sectors such as tourism, domestic hardship, and other livelihood and health enhancement activities. Non-participation of stakeholders in problem solving (“WASCO seen as source of water and responsible for all problems related to water”). Aimed to demonstrate RWH as a simple, low-cost water supply technology which can provide water at an acceptable quality standard; augmenting the current water scheme and provide water to households during dry season and periods of induced and natural drought. Began in mid-2007; officially launched in May 2008. By September 2008 all systems had been installed. RWH harvesting systems were designed for installation in private homes and public institutions. Simpler systems in households; slightly more complex systems for public facilities (schools and health centre). Stakeholders were involved as the community based Watershed Management Committee (WMC) had responsibility for selection of sites for installation. Used an explicit set of selection criteria. Site visits were made to proposed households and facilities to assess. Cooperation agreements signed between MAFF and the beneficiaries. Local contractors were trained in construction of systems. People receiving systems were trained in maintenance of systems and proper disinfection using household bleach. Results were positive feedback from beneficiaries – systems installed running well; householders pleased with availability and quality of water and ease of maintenance, stakeholders felt empowered and could see direct and tangible benefits to the community.

Lessons Learned included: Use of appropriate and accessible technology (easy to install and to maintain) helped with implementation, uptake and sustainability; Cooperation with other projects / initiatives enabled Project to do more by leveraging additional funds and resources; Project's strong links with MAFF and other resource agencies is important for the sharing of information, initial and ongoing support (efficiency); Immediate benefits to the community earned the project much goodwill from them early in the project; Engaging stakeholders early minimized criticism, made them more supportive and helped them to feel empowered; Visibility of demonstration sites was increased by using signage, supported by willingness to demonstrate systems. A total of 31 systems were installed (21 households; 10 public facilities including schools and health centres) and continue to be well-maintained demonstrations of RWH which are visible to the community and attract wider interest. Stakeholders feel more empowered. Leveraging of additional funds made it possible to have more demonstration sites and helped build partnerships. The training of local contractors in construction of the systems built capacity. Transparency was enhanced by early involvement of stakeholders and the use of stated criteria for selection of demo sites. Use of signs gave both approach and project visibility. This initiative with its quick results solved an immediate problem and bought the demo project more time to implement other activities (e.g. CES) which take longer to "bear fruit".

21. Mr Ramon Baez, National Coordinator for the project "Demonstrating Sustainable Land Management in the Upper Sabana Yegua Watershed System" (Major Thematic: Land Degradation) presented the objective of the project which are: to promote the sustainable land management (SLM), in the Watershed system of high Sabana Yegua, to obtain global benefits of the environment in the context of sustainable development and reduction of the poverty. Expected Outcomes are: Policies, programs and planning frameworks and tools favorable to Sustainable Land Management (SLM), being applied; Capacity of stakeholders at diverse levels to improve application of SLM in the project area developed; Sustainable long-term financing schemes generate funding for SLM activities and SLM institutional infrastructure in the upper SY watershed; Livelihood and wellbeing of population in the Watershed System improved; and Learning, evaluation and adaptive management. The project have had the support of all publics and privates institutions with influence in the zone, and the communitarians organizations and a School Curriculum Proposal and Postgraduate for Teachers has been approved by the Ministry of Education. With regard to replication and lessons learnt it is important: To count on the support of the national government and the municipal governments; That the unit executor counts on acceptance and credibility in the communities; To define potential financial instruments to maintain the investments. In conclusion he emphasized that it is one of the few projects of the GEF executed by a NGO that is demonstrating that it can coordinate action with the

government, private enterprise and the communities for a sustainable land management.

22. Ms. Sally Edwards presented the project "Regional Program of Action and Demonstration of Sustainable Alternatives to DDT for Malaria Vector Control in Mexico and Central America" (International Waters). The Project's general objective was to demonstrate that the methods for malaria vector control without DDT or other persistent pesticides are replicable, cost-effective and sustainable preventing thus the reintroduction of DDT in Mesoamerica as it is estimated that during the last 40 years around 85,000 tonnes of DDT were sprayed in the households and surrounding areas in malaria endemic areas. The indiscriminate use of DDT in public health programs and for agricultural purposes caused resistance in the vector which, along with high operational costs, weakened said programs and at the same time undermined the strategies used. The objectives were achieved through the promotion of integrated vector control approaches and the substitution of persistent toxic substances by environmentally friendly strategies using community empowerment and education resulting in a 63% reduction of cases without using DDT or other pesticides in 202 demonstration communities.

23. The project was based on the methodology on the "Roll Back Malaria" strategy and the Mexican experience and extended to 7 other countries. Sustainability was deemed high due to the high social perception reached in relation to the success in the marked reduction of malaria cases without using DDT or other pesticides, through the active participation of the national malaria control programs, the inter-sectoral action among health, environment and education, mobilization of communities, municipal governments and the indigenous populations. The Project's four components were: Execution of nine demonstration projects with the objective to implement, evaluate and disseminate alternative strategies of malaria vector control without DDT; Strengthening of the countries' institutional capabilities to control malaria without releasing in the environment DDT or other persistent pesticides; Elimination of 135 tonnes of DDT reserves found in an ecologically sound manner compatible with the Stockholm and Basel Conventions; and Project coordination and management. Timeframe: from September 2003 to December 2008. Experiences gained were that community participation was an essential component of the strategy to clean up the breeding grounds. However it was found to have mainly been the women and children who participated. It was not expected that the project would get the commitment and buy-in of the local authorities in such a big way. They mobilized resources and carried out education campaigns in order to move the project along in their communities.

24. In addition to the reduction of cases without using DDT or other pesticides there was an 86.2%

reduction of cases caused by *Plasmodium falciparum* as well as a strengthening of institutional capabilities of the countries to control malaria without DDT through a sustained trained program in epidemiological surveillance, entomology, social participation, participative planning, risk factors due to exposure to DDT and other POPs, geographic information systems. Within the framework of the Basel Convention, progresses were made towards the final and adequate elimination of 200 tonnes of persistent organic pollutants (POPs) found inadequately stored and with high risk for the environment and human health, from which 136.7 tonnes are DDT and 64.5 of other POPs . As this project focused on community action and education, each cultural setting will have different experiences however this is an example of a win-win project whereby by targeting the reduction in use of POPs in combating Malaria, there is a benefit to international waters by not polluting them with run off from the application of POPs.

25. Ms Edwards further presented the project "**Piloting climate change adaptation to protect human health**" (Barbados, Bhutan, China, Fiji, Jordan, Kenya, Uzbekistan) implemented with GEF funding through UNDP over a period of five years (Submitted 2006). The objective of this first global project on public health adaptation to climate change is to "increase adaptive capacity to respond to climate-sensitive health risks" in seven countries with a range of vulnerable ecosystems (highland, water-stressed, and low-lying developing regions). The countries were chosen because of different priority vulnerabilities to climate change so that the results of the project will be directly relevant to decision-makers in other vulnerable countries. Studies in the Caribbean have suggested that the incidence of dengue fever is higher when the weather is dryer and warmer, particularly during El Nino years (Amarakoon et al. 2004; Chen et al. 2004; Taylor et al. 2006) and the incidence of dengue fever could increase with projected dryer and warmer weather, particularly if there is inappropriate storage of water. Barbados is ranked among the world's ten most water scarce countries. The 1996/98 Water Resources Management and Water Loss Studies determined, based on data from 1947 to 1994, that an average annual rainfall of 56 inches represents the most reliable rainfall figure for Barbados.

### **Review of e-summary(break out groups)**

26. Participants reviewed the e-summary in two breakout groups, suggested amendments as well as introduced additional points related to the respective projects under the different thematic areas (Annex IV). Discussions following the presentations emphasized the following: the importance of capturing informal communications; that with small capacity, skills such as database management tends to be missing; the need to include non-demo countries in activities to built bigger capacity; the importance of accurately selected and realistic indicators for monitoring and evaluation to be useful and to have specific indicators for demonstration

projects which also should be used to measure the impact of the project and not only the implementation of it; the importance of addressing data management at an early stage; and the value of including NGO community. In terms of database management it was pointed out that sometime it is not equipment that is lacking but human input.

27. The Meeting also sought an active encouragement from GEF for increased interaction across focal areas and for opportunities for project proposals that are cross focal in nature. The GEF database was mentioned, with a focus on project categorization/ key terms and a need to facilitated the way to search the database was requested. Suggestions to operationalize the concept of “cross focal linkage” were to increase the capacity for implementation supported by appropriate human resources. The allocation of human resources and sizes of the project teams for the management of the projects varied and the meeting noted the challenge that some projects are facing with limited funding for human resources. Co-financing in general with sourcing and reporting.

28. Mr. Dale Rankine presented the Small Grants Programme in Jamaica and indicated that it currently covered 50 projects with over 1 million US dollars committed in Jamaica including funds for community based climate program, which is only implemented in the Caribbean. The Meeting indicated that there may be a need for more corporate engagement between small and medium sized grant.

## **Feedback on E-forum**

29. Mr. Ron Wade-Megghross presented the e-forum tool powered by Nabble, and indicated that with the current structured it served as a tool for information exchange, as well as an archive for postings. Options included posting messages which are sent out to subscribers via email to alert them of the new posting and that can be replied to without having to log into the forum. Members are either invited by an administrator or "owner", or they can register on the site itself. Currently there was no moderation for registrants which was seen as a potential security risk and was to be adjusted. The viewing format can be modified to three different views: Classic, List or Threaded. Subscribers can share information with public by entering email addresses of people that are not registered. It is also possible to register and not subscribe to the emails, or to receive an automatic daily digest of the discussions. Feed options for these were discussed and would be further explored. He encouraged the participants to personalize their profiles

through e.g. their signature and add project websites to them to further facilitate targeted information exchange.

## **Tools and mechanisms to support intra-regional and cross-focal area collaboration and coordination**

30. Mr. Richard Cooper from IW:Learn presented some of the tools and mechanisms used by IW:Learn to promote information exchange. The e-bulleting was highlighted and feedback was sought from participants on the potential usefulness of such a tool in the Caribbean. Comments related to accessibility of the e-bulleting in a pdf file and the need for updated information to include in the e-bulleting itself. An advantage of this is that it can be translated into various languages and that it can analyze usage statistically. Currently the IW:Learn e-bulleting registers visitor statistics such as number of views per pages fourteen days following publication. The surveys can be exported as excel files providing an analysis of subscribers. The e-bulletin could also include informatio like vacancies and requests for proposals in addition to project articles and updates. Currently the newsletter was created in Kompozer, a free software which gives templates. Twitter and facebook updates are also currently in use as well as Youtube and Google video, streamed through the IWLearn website. GIS data is also available.

31. The meeting thanked Mr. Cooper for his presentation and noted that initial useful tools for the Wider Caribbean Region may be a List server and a regional bulletin as well as additional layers for non-IW projects added to the interactive map and the database.

## **Identification of follow-up activities and opportunities for strengthening cross-focal synergies in development and implementation of GEF projects**

32. The initial slow response to the inter-linkage initiative and the e-dialogue a continuous useful tool for knowledge sharing was discussed and it was noted that there is a need to promote this initiative and attract a larger number of participants posing questions that motivates people to participate. The role of a moderator would be to guide the forum toward a bigger market. The importance of authoritative information provided through the forum was stressed. Information has to be reliable. The form was seen as a potential tool to establish a mechanism for more meaningful interactions within different communities related to GEF projects such as focal points. An expansion of the forum to other communities would however mean that the forum must be managed all the time and be pointed toward people in more definitive way. The UNDP

“community of practice” was mentioned as an example involving thousands of participants, divided in categories where members can choose to ask specific people or entire community. There is a need of a forum that keep people connected and that is not limited to English only.

## **Workshop Recommendations and Conclusions**

33. The Meeting reviewed the various recommendations that had been forthcoming during the two days of the workshop and proposed the following:

### **GEF Secretariat**

- Promoting inter focal areas collaboration during project development and implementation;
- GEF should continuously encourage inter linkages through the IAs and EAs;
- Inclusion of funds for collaboration;
- Provision of templates in other languages;
- Standardization of reporting formats across agencies and focal areas;
- Maintenance of reporting formats over longer periods of time;
- Acceptance of project documents in other languages;
- Periodic Forum for all GEF focal areas modeled along the IW meeting held every two, possibly at the regional level;
- Strongly consider ways of improving feedback from its stakeholders;
- Provide capacity building opportunities to improve/facilitate cross focal area collaboration and information exchange (surveys);
- Capacity building to address weaknesses in e.g. project development, database management;
- Improve communication between GEF and the project proponents to ensure that project implementation is initiated promptly following approval (shifting baselines);
- Strongly recommend continued support to the GEF IW:Learn Initiative;
- Suggesting that the time between notice of funding availability and deadline for submission of project proposals is increased to allow for preparatory mandatory activities to take place;
- Promote and strengthen synergies between GEF Medium/Full Size and Small Grants Programmes;
- Consider the uniqueness of the Caribbean Region when evaluating this initiative.

### **IW: Learn project / UNEP-CAR/RCU**

- Promotion/marketing of the IW : Learn site and its resources using various mechanisms and establish networks;
- Expansion of membership and ongoing promotion/launch of the e-forum beyond the "test-run" to increase number of users/resource persons (needs driven);
- Promotional material e.g. brochures/poster/calendar/e-signature etc.
- Provide material incentives to foster collaboration, dialogue, and contribution;
- Continue to evaluate project needs related to cross focal area collaboration and information exchange (surveys);
- Development of regional e-bulletin to facilitated information exchange and dissemination
- Incorporation of other focal areas to the IW map/database and/or CEP interactive map
- Build upon the existing project database (updating, addition of project profiles)
- **As the regional initiative was considered a positive and useful experience it was recommended that this initiative be replicated at the national level involving national and regional projects at a national level and GEF Focal Points.**

### **Closure of the Workshop**

Closing remarks were brought forward from Mr. Christian Severin, GEF International Waters focal area thanking the participants of the Workshop for undertaking these important discussions on the opportunities that exists for sharing experiences and lessons learned for both development of project proposals as well as for the actual implementation of GEF projects. It was further highlighted that it that there is a need to prioritize better coordination among projects (not only from one focal area, but also between different focal areas) to improve efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. This can be particularly useful at the sub-regional level and especially in the Wider Caribbean where many small island states (SIDS) and a number of small developing countries are involved in a large number of projects that impact water resources management. In conclusion he noted that the forum had proved to be an excellent tool to catalyze knowledge sharing and looked forward to see the compiled and edited E-forum outputs as well as learn more on the accomplishments of the present Workshop and the actions proposed for further activities to see to what extent the experiences from the E-forum and the inter focal area learning between projects can be applied to other regions. Mr. Corbin and Mr. Khan also thanked the participants for their valuable input to this pilot project and encouraged them to continue sharing experiences amongst their projects. The Workshop was closed at 5.15pm.

## Annex 1. Workshop Programme

<b>DAY 1</b>		
<b>TIME</b>	<b>SESSION</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE</b>
<b>9:00 - 9:15</b>	Welcome and Opening	UNEP CEP
<b>9:15 - 9:20</b>	Introduction of participants	All
<b>9:20 - 9:30</b>	Presentation on UNEP CAR/RCU	CC
<b>9:30 - 9:45</b>	Presentation on GEF (including IWLEARN)	GEF
<b>9:45 - 10:00</b>	Background on Inter-focal initiative Workshop objectives	HSS
<b>10:00- 10:20</b>	Inter-focal networking and collaboration among GEF projects (plenary discussion)	Plenary
<b>10:20 - 10:40</b>	- Presentation on GEF experience notes and guidelines	SK/RC
<b>10:40 - 11:00</b>	- <b>BREAK</b>	
<b>11:00 - 11:30</b>	- Summary of e-dialogue to date	SH
<b>11:30 - 12:30</b>	- Project presentations on experiences in implementation	Participants
<b>12:30 - 13:30</b>	- <b>LUNCH</b>	
<b>13:30 - 15:30</b>	- Break out groups	
<b>15:30 - 15:50</b>	- <b>BREAK</b>	
<b>15:50 - 16:45</b>	- Break-out groups continue	
<b>16:45 - 17:00</b>	- Plenary: Progress of break out groups and wrap up of Day 1	Plenary
	<b>Cocktail</b>	
<b>DAY 2</b>		
<b>9:00 - 10:30</b>	Break out groups report to plenary	
<b>10:30 - 10:50</b>	- <b>BREAK</b>	
<b>10:50 - 11:15</b>	- Feedback on e-forum experience (Plenary discussion)	SH/RWM
<b>11:15 - 12:30</b>	- GEF IW:LEARN Tools and mechanisms to support intra-regional and cross-focal area collaboration and coordination	SK/RC/RWM
<b>12:30 - 13:30</b>	- <b>LUNCH</b>	
<b>13:30 - 14:30</b>	- Tools and mechanisms (cont'd)	SK/RC/RWM
<b>14:30 - 15:00</b>	- Required Promotional materials for continued networking and collaboration  Identification of Opportunities for further promotion	Plenary

<b>15:00 - 15:20</b>	<b>BREAK</b>	
<b>15:20 -16:30</b>	Identification of follow-up activities and opportunities for strengthening cross-focal synergies in development and implementation of GEF projects  Workshop Recommendations and Conclusions	Plenary
<b>16:30</b>	<b>Close of workshop</b>	UNEP/GEF

## Annex II. List of Participants

	Name	Titel	Contacts
1	<a href="#">Donna Spencer</a>	Communications, Networking and Information Specialist	IWCAM Project Coordinating Unit (PCU), Caribbean Environmental Health Institute (CEHI), The Morne, P.O. Box 1111, Castries, Saint Lucia Tel: 758 452-2501, 452-1412 Fax: 758 453-2721
2	Lisa Kirkland	Project Manager	IWCAM Demo Project, Jamaica, 10 Caledonia Avenue, Kingston 5, Jamaica, Tel: (876) 754-7540 ext. 2318
3	<a href="#">Sally Edwards</a>	Regional Advisor, Environmental Epidemiology Office for Caribbean Program Coordination	Regional Program of Action and Demonstration of Sustainable Alternatives to DDT for Malaria Vector Control in Mexico and Central America, Pan American Health Organization/World Health Organization, Dayrall and Navy Garden Roads, Christ Church, Bridgetown, Barbados
4	<a href="#">Sherry Heileman</a>	Consultant, E-forum Moderator	Science Writer & Editor 60 Rue Emeriau, Paris 75015, France Tel: +33140590834
5	<a href="#">Sean Khan</a>	UNEP/IWLEARN Project Manager	P.O.Box 30552 Nairobi Tel: (254) [20] 762-3271
6	Alex Cooman	<del>Project Manager</del>	Reducing Pesticide Runoff to the Caribbean Sea (REP-Car), UNEP-CAR/RCU, 14-20 Port Royal Street, Kingston, Jamaica
7	Ramon Baez	<del>National Coordinator</del> Sabana Yegua Project	Fundacion Sur Futuro, Ave. 27 de Febrero, esq. Abraham Lincoln, Edif. Unicento Plaza, 3er. Nivel, Santo Domingo, Republica Dominicana
8	Richard Cooper	IW:Learn Regional Coordinator/Environmental Specialist	Southeast Asia START Regional Centre (SEA START RC), Chulalongkorn University, 5th Floor, Chulawich 1 Building, Henri Dunant Road, Bangkok 10330, THAILAND
9	Mr. Naitram Ramnanan	IAS Coordinator	Mitigating the Threats of Invasive Alien Species in the Insular Caribbean, CABI 361 St. Julien Road, New Grant, Republic of Trinidad and Tobago. Tel: 1 (686)-6624173/645
10	<a href="#">Christopher Corbin</a>	Programme Officer	Assessment and Management of Environmental Pollution, UNEP-CEP
11	Kisei Tanaka	Intern	Assessment and Management of Environmental Pollution, UNEP-CEP
12	Ron Wade Megghross	Web assistant	UNEP-CEP
13	Nadia Deen Ferguson	APO	Assessment and Management of Environmental Pollution, UNEP-CEP
14	Heidi Savelli	CETA consultant	Communication, Education, Training and Awareness, UNEP-CEP

15	Catherine Levy	National Coordinator BirdLife	2 Starlight Ave, Kingston 6, Tel: 927-8444 Email: bluequit@gmail.com
16	Dale Rankine	National Coordinator	GEF Small Grants Programme, c/o UNDP Country Office, 1-3 Lady Musgrave Road, Tel:(876) 978-2390, ext. 2030 Cel: (876) 883-9772, Fax. (876) 946-2163, dale.rankine@undp.org
17	Kumiko Yatagai	Administrative Officer	UNEP-CEP

## **Annex III. Summary of E-dialogue**

# **GEF Inter-focal Regional Consultative Process with existing and pipeline GEF Projects in the Wider Caribbean Region**

## **Summary of E-dialogue (as at 29 May 2009)**

### **Aims of E-forum**

1. To test a mechanism for cross-focal area linkages among GEF projects in the WCR; and
2. To facilitate interaction and exchange among projects in the different GEF focal areas, especially in project implementation and management.

### **Expected outputs**

1. Recommendations for an appropriate tool/mechanism for cross-focal area linkages among GEF projects; and
2. Guidance document for GEF and its partners, containing experiences, lessons and best practices in project implementation and management.

**E-forum website:** <http://cep.unep.org/iwlearncaribbean/e-forum/>

**Initiation of e-dialogue:** 5 May, 2009

**Number of persons registered (as at 29 May):** 32

The dialogue focused around 11 major topic areas. A summary of the contributions by topic (as at 29 May 2009) follows.

### **1. Cross-focal area linkages**

- \_ It would be very valuable if we could showcase how GEF projects in the Caribbean region are undertaking collaboration and developing linkages. This might make it easier to foster more cross-focal area interventions in the project cycle.
- \_ Maybe it would be possible to have an experience note coming out on cross-focal area linkages and how successful the Caribbean region has been.

- \_ Exchanges among project personnel are very useful in identifying what information exists and who can point you in the right direction.

## **2. Capacity, education and knowledge management: *Capacity for project implementation and management***

- \_ The GEF-IWCAM project is currently planning a Project Management training course for GEF projects, using best practices and case studies.
- \_ One of the key elements in capacity building is identifying what the specific capacity building needs are, who should be trained and how would the training contribute both to the immediate project deliverables but also long-term sustainability. Other key considerations include the importance of using suitable regional agencies/consultants in capacity building and developing support documentation so that the training can be replicated.
- \_ Personnel from executing agencies that support development of new GEF Projects should be trained in GEF Project development.
- \_ In the OPAAL project, training is an ongoing aspect of the project. Similar training needs have been merged as regional capacity building initiatives. Training in specific areas such as proposal writing, protected areas management, etc. is also conducted (by the OPAAL team or agencies such as The Nature Conservancy). The project has financially supported the participation of Member States in international or regional training opportunities.

## **3. Data management: *Data and information management and dissemination***

## **4. Demonstration project selection/start up/implementation: *Engagement of Non-Demo countries***

- \_ It is critical to ensure that non-demo countries feel engaged and a part of any regional project. Extra effort will be required to keep them involved.
- \_ The GEF-IWCAM and OPAAL projects have prepared a set of guidelines for selection of Demos.

- \_ One of the key considerations in selecting and/or demo projects is the ability of that project or some of its elements to be upscaled and/or replicated.
- \_ In the GEF-REP Car Reducing Pesticides Runoff to the Caribbean Sea Project, selected Implementing Agencies were “invited” to make a proposal, although a “call for proposals” would have been preferred.

## **5. Financial reporting: *Consistency in reporting requirements***

- \_ With multiple Executing and/or Implementing Agencies, it helps to have consistent financial reporting requirements. In the GEF-IWCAM project, the level of scrutiny of Demo Projects (by UNOPS) seems far lower than that of CEHI and the Regional Project Coordinating Unit (by UNEP).

## **6. Monitoring and evaluation**

- \_ Monitoring and evaluation, including development and tracking of indicators, are essential components of GEF projects. It is impossible to track the progress / success of interventions without baseline data.
- \_ In order to address the capacity constraints in relation to environmental labs in the region, the GEF-IWCAM project has conducted a regional lab training workshop in St. Lucia, with focus on Quality Assurance and Quality Control in relation to ISO17025.

## **7. Partnership and linkages: *sustainability issues***

- \_ Jamaica Demo Project (GEF-IWCAM): It is not a good idea to form new Groups but to use existing Groups and to build their capacity so at the end of the Project these Groups are able to stand on their own - whatever exists use it! Sustainability of the Project's initiative will also be achieved at the state agencies' level.

## **8. Partnerships and linkages**

- A matrix that looks at constraints faced by the OPAAL project since its inception and the measures put in place to address the constraints was uploaded.
- GEF-IWCAM project has established an Informal Working Group on Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM). Efforts have focused on electronic exchange of information among and meetings at regional conferences and workshops. We have seen an increase in coordination of activities and collaboration among the group members, which helps to eliminate duplication of effort and makes all of our work more effective and meaningful. The responsibility for it will be passed on to one of the partners upon the project's conclusion.

## **9. Project management and implementation**

- GEF-IWCAM Project Execution – a number of important lessons learned were shared with the forum (see forum for details).
- OPAAL: Mid Term Review of OPAAL: Document outlines some of the challenges and recommendations made by the contracted consultants. The OPAAL project is in a continuous process of taking mitigative measures to improve implementation and overcome challenges. Country representatives have proposed a number of strategies (Table provided).
- Details on the OPAAL project was provided.

## **10. Project reporting: *Standardized formats for APR/PIR Reports***

- UNEP and UNDP did not have a common reporting format for the MOST IMPORTANT reporting instrument to the GEF. Bearing in mind the expanded number of IAs now, GEF may wish to prepare a COMMON Template for ALL Implementing Agencies.

## **11. Stakeholder participation**

- Both the GEF-IWCAM and the OPAAL projects made very informative and interesting contributions on stakeholders engagement- means, challenges, etc. (see Forum).

- \_ The participatory approach is a guiding principle to ensure transparency in the planning and execution of project activities.
- \_ There are also informative contributions on awareness and public education (see forum).

## **Annex IV Group work**

### Group work A

#### 1. Cross focal area linkages

- GEF vs Non-GEF linkages – equally important but emphasis mainly on GEF
- GEF structure doesn't reflect cross focal linkages
- No way to search properly reflecting cross focal linkages. Each project categorized.

#### 2. Capacity for implementation

- Capacity available but not always bilingual
- GEF should accept other language submissions and create templates in other languages
- GEF should not approve projects with unrealistic personnel demands – people on project need full or part time dedication including payment to project, not added on to current job.

#### Capacity building, education within project

- Capacity building taken into account in projects
- Need to plan for communication / information and knowledge management specialist within projects to complement work of project manager

#### 3. Data management

- Issues of information sharing between countries
- Even with pre-existing agreements, difficult to manage

#### 4. Demo project selection

- Selection based on set criteria defined by project manager / project designer, not open
- National entity collaboration sought based on pre defined area selection
- Use of pre-existing local structures aids selection

#### 5. Financial reporting

- Clear instructions and forms needed from beginning and need not to be changed throughout project duration

## 6. Monitoring and evaluation

- Need to be clearer in requirements
- Need for good baseline in order for efficient use of indicators
- Baselines should be stipulated to be defined during PPG phase

## 7. Partnerships and linkages

- Local partnerships only way to sustain project actions / to continue to achieve results
- Provide both money and time which is essential for success of project
- No GEF partnerships to date

## 8. [same as 7]

## 9. Project management and implementation [same as 2]

- Gap between PPG and FSP can be years resulting in both delays in starting and changes institutions. Need either intermediate phase or recognition of inevitable delays

## 10. Project reporting [same as 5]

- Log framework matrix for 3 month reporting including % execution useful – both from projects to Project manager and from project manager to GEF

## 11. Stakeholder participation [same as 7]

- Technical vs political in many situations difficult to manage. Influence participation and site selection as well as implementation.

### **Group Work B**

#### 1. Cross-focal area linkages

- Comment: bullet one “how” should we showcase GEF project in the Caribbean. We need to share experiences of the most cost effective way of doing this.

#### 2. Capacity, education and knowledge management: capacity for project implementation and management

- Comment: (1)when is the project management training – please get target audience input into development of content; GEF Manuals/guidelines to guide support agencies.

- Addition:

1. Development and communication of strategies e.g. communication strategies for success; orientation meeting; mid term review; financial reporting.

2. Use of informal networks can result in improved decision making therefore opportunities for this should be maximized.

3. Data management: data and information management and dissemination

- Comment: GEF funding needs to consider not only the development of platforms of website but needs to provide for building skills such as in database management.

Addition: IW: LEARN makes a wealth of resources available which should be promoted to all GEF projects e.g. databases and Plone Toolkit. A major constraint to data collection is the lack of equipment, transport and trained personnel for use by demo projects. The earlier that decisions can be made about indicators , data collection systems and meta data the more efficient this process will be.

4. Demonstration project selection/ start up/ implementation: engagement of non demo countries

- Comment: Available project resources could be used for capacity building initiatives in non demo countries e.g. IWRM

Addition: Strengths of countries without demos can be used to pilot regional level components e.g. indicators and Barbados in IWCAM project.

5. Financial Reporting: consistency in reporting requirement

- Addition: Guidance documents and templates help and should be located in an accessible central repository such as IW:LEARN website

6. Monitoring and evaluation

- Comment: Evaluations should include regional reviewers as part of review team.

Addition: Early development of the indicators mechanism is a useful guide to projects as they select their indicators. Monitoring and evaluation of information activities and materials should be conducted and budgeted for to ensure relevance and efficacy.

## 7. Partnership and linkages: sustainability issues

Addition: the development of systems and mechanisms for the dissemination of data and information into decision making is not automatic but needs special attention/strategy. Identify and incorporate all relevant partners from the onset is very important including NGO and CBO community.

## 8. Partnerships and linkages

- Comment: Initiatives such as IWRM informal working group should be emulated to develop collaboration with other GEF and other projects/initiatives.

## 9. Project management and implementation

Addition: Defining the ideal skill set of a project manager will be useful to identify the skills gaps and training needs. On the ground activities with quick, tangible benefits to the community and stakeholders increase receptiveness to project approaches/efforts that may take longer to implement as well as increase buy-in to wider project objectives.

## 10. Project Reporting: standardized formats for APR/PIR Reports

No comments

## 11. Stakeholder Participation

Addition: stakeholder identification must take place early; where conducted in PDF phase might need to be reviewed. Stakeholders Knowledge, Attitudes and Practice (KAPS) survey is essential to establish baseline and guide Pub Ed and awareness activities. Ongoing stakeholder fora should be evaluated periodically e.g. Checklist for Meaningful Evaluation developed by IWCAM