

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

Organization Legal Name:	Conservation International
Project Title:	Assessing the Potential for Conservation Agreements to Contribute to Community-Based Conservation and Socioeconomic Development in the Caribbean Islands
Date of Report:	April 9, 2014
Report Author and Contact Information	Eduard Niesten, eniesten@conservation.org

CEPF Region: Caribbean Islands

Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 1. Improve protection and management of 45 priority key biodiversity areas.

Grant Amount \$64,565

Project Dates: Oct 1, 2012-Jan 31, 2014

Implementation Partners for this Project (please explain the level of involvement for each partner):

This project did not involve implementation partners as such. We worked with consultants in each of the three countries (Dominican Republic, Haiti, Jamaica) to organize workshops attended by numerous NGO representatives. We then did further joint work with interested NGOs in each country: Dominican Institute for Integral Development (IDDI)/Hispaniolan Ornithological Society (SOH) and Pronatura in DR; Organisation des Paysans pour le Développement de l'Unité II de la Forêt des Pins, Mare Rouge (OPDFM) in Haiti, and; Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation (C-CAM) in Jamaica. This joint work consisted of developing initial feasibility assessments for the use of conservation agreements at particular sites in each country, as well as follow up plans and fundraising concepts.

Conservation Impacts

Please explain/describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile.

This project related to the CEPF ecosystem profile's Strategic Direction 1: Improve protection and management of 45 priority KBAs. It did so by working with local implementing NGOs, to introduce to them the Conservation Agreement model as a means to achieve community-based conservation and development in the KBAs in which they are working. Following training, we worked with interested local NGOs in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica to apply the first step of the model (feasibility assessments), and define plans for next steps and fundraising.

Please summarize the overall results/impact of your project.

The overall results of the project are:

1. Groups of NGOs and other institutions (government, academia, community-based organizations) in the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Jamaica have been introduced to CSP's conservation agreement model
2. Initial feasibility assessments were performed with local NGOs for 1 site each in Haiti and Jamaica, and 2 sites in the Dominican Republic
3. Follow-up plans were formulated with local NGOs in each of the three countries

4. Concept notes and funding proposals were developed with the interested NGOs in each of the 3 countries.

Project Approach (500 words)

Our approach was to adapt the conservation agreement (CA) model to the Caribbean context by identifying sites in KBAs where it can contribute to biodiversity conservation and socioeconomic development and working with current CEPF grantees to explore this potential. First we conducted a desk study to identify candidate sites and partners. Second we organized workshops in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica to introduce the CA approach, refine the desk study, and invite CEPF grantees to consider collaboration with CSP.

Desk study: CSP analyzed the potential for CAs to advance conservation and development in the 17 KBAs already identified as CEPF priorities in the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and Jamaica. The analysis evaluated these sites with respect to suitability of the CA model based on criteria including policy, legal, and land issues as well as implementer capacity, community governance, cost-effectiveness, and prospects for sustainable financing.

Outreach and refinement of the desk study: CSP held workshops with local NGOs in each country, with current CEPF grantees as key participants. These workshops had three purposes: introduce the CA model; refine the desk study analysis with local implementers interested in further exploring the potential for CAs at their sites, and; if CEPF grantees wished to collaborate with CSP, formulate plans for joint fundraising and next steps. This involved working together to draft feasibility assessments for specific sites, as well as to identify and approach potential donors.

The expected results of these activities were:

1. Conclusions regarding suitability of the CA approach in 17 CEPF priority KBAs.
2. Conservation Agreement model introduced to Caribbean conservation NGOs, particularly to current CEPF grantees.
3. Collaboration between CSP and CEPF grantees on feasibility assessments, next steps and fundraising plans for applying the CA model in at least three priority sites

These expected results were achieved. CSP never envisioned an implementation role for itself in the Caribbean. Instead, CSP sought to introduce the Conservation Agreement approach and then be available to support CEPF grantees who wished to use this model. The degree of CSP involvement in any initiative is dictated by need and desire on the part of local implementers.

Link to CEPF Investment Strategy

As noted above, the project related to the CEPF investment strategy in several ways, but most directly to Strategic Direction 1, "Improve protection and management of 45 key biodiversity areas", particularly in investment priority 1.4. "Support the establishment and strengthening of sustainable financing mechanisms". The Caribbean CEPF ecosystem profile notes that innovative local solutions involving closer arrangements between communities and business sectors are needed to ensure sustainability of conservation initiatives. This involves promoting new schemes, such as payment for ecosystems services (PES) and market-based incentives. The profile also notes that there are few examples of conservation incentive mechanisms in place in the Caribbean. The CA model is an innovative approach that can help structure PES and market-based incentives. CAs already have been used as a tool to ensure that benefits provided under financing options such as water funds, carbon offsets, and tourism levies are used to improve living conditions of local populations engaged with conservation. Moreover, the approach itself is a vehicle for advancing collaboration between stakeholders, including private sector enterprises interested in supporting conservation initiatives in the long term.

Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal):

Stewardship by local resource users protects key biodiversity areas (KBAs) throughout the Caribbean hotspot, due to conservation incentives that improve human wellbeing and maintain natural capital.

Actual Progress Towards Long-term Impacts at Completion:

At completion of the project, feasibility assessments have identified the potential for using CSP's conservation agreement model at 4 sites in the Caribbean: Hellshire Hills in Jamaica; Massif de la Selle in Haiti, and; Parque Nacional Montaña La Humeadora and Monumento Natural Padre Miguel D. Fuertes (Bahoruco Oriental) in Dominican Republic. CSP is working with the local implementer NGOs at each of these sites to pursue funding to move to the next steps of the conservation agreement model, which will involve creating incentives to encourage stewardship by local resource users.

Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal):

1. By August 2013, at least 80% of existing CEPF grantees in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica understand the concept and role of conservation agreements as a tool to structure incentives for biodiversity conservation.
2. By August 2013, 3 current CEPF grantees in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica have identified next steps for applying the conservation agreement model as a tool to provide incentives to local resource users in at least 1 KBA site per country
3. By August 2013, feasibility assessments and draft implementation and fundraising plans produced in collaboration with CEPF grantees, for at least three priority sites

AMENDMENT

For impacts 2 and 3 above, date extended from August 2013 to January 2014. Accordingly, end dates for products/deliverables below changed from month 11 to month 15 (December 2013).

Actual Progress Toward Short-term Impacts at Completion:

All planned short-term impacts have been achieved, as indicated by submitted documents (feasibility assessments, next steps plans).

Please provide the following information where relevant:

n/a

Hectares Protected:
Species Conserved:
Corridors Created:

Describe the success or challenges of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term impact objectives.

The project successfully achieved its short-term impact objectives. In doing so, the CSP team has forged ongoing collaborative relationships with NGOs in Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica, and looks forward to working together to ensure progress on the long-term impact objective.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

There were no unexpected impacts.

Project Components

Project Components: *Please report on results by project component. Reporting should reference specific products/deliverables from the approved project design and other relevant information.*

Component 1 Planned:

Desk study completed to prioritize 10-17 KBAs according to potential suitability for conservation incentives using the conservation agreement model.

Component 1 Actual at Completion:

Completed (Matrix document submitted to CEPF)

Component 2 Planned: Conservation agreement model introduced as an incentive mechanism for community conservation to local implementers in Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica.

Component 2 Actual at Completion:

Completed (Workshop reports submitted to CEPF)

Component 3 Planned:

Site-specific follow-up plans with next steps for applying the conservation agreement model drafted and agreed-upon with local implementers

Component 3 Actual at Completion:

Completed (follow-up plans submitted to CEPF)

Were any components unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?

All components were realized.

Please describe and submit (electronically if possible) any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results.

All products mentioned above, as well as feasibility assessment documents, have been submitted electronically.

Lessons Learned

Describe any lessons learned during the design and implementation of the project, as well as any related to organizational development and capacity building. Consider lessons that would inform projects designed or implemented by your organization or others, as well as lessons that might be considered by the global conservation community.

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

Structuring the project around a clearly defined model (the conservation agreement approach) led to a clarity of objectives and approach that made for easy identification of objectives, activities, and outputs.

Consultation with CEPF (particularly RIT) was of enormous value in ensuring that the approach was practically feasible as well as regionally relevant.

Were it possible (in terms of time and budget constraints), learning more about the information availability (or lack thereof) might have been useful to better define the proposed desk study.

Project Implementation: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/shortcomings)

In each of the three countries, use of a local consultant to prepare and manage the workshops proved extremely efficient and effective; using the CEPF network (RIT and local grantees) as a source of guidance and advice to identify suitable consultants worked very well.

A key element of the project was collaboration between CSP and local NGOs to pursue funding for follow-up steps. That collaboration is ongoing and we are optimistic that it will bear fruit, but the time horizon of the project itself was too short to achieve concrete results in the form of secured funding before the end of the CEPF grant.

Other lessons learned relevant to conservation community:

Additional Funding

Provide details of any additional funding that supported this project and any funding secured for the project, organization, or the region, as a result of the CEPF investment in this project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
Mulago Foundation	A	\$34,089	

**Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:*

- A Project co-financing (Other donors or your organization contribute to the direct costs of this project)*
- B Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF funded project.)*
- C Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

Sustainability/Replicability

Summarize the success or challenge in achieving planned sustainability or replicability of project components or results.

Several NGOs in the region are interested in using the conservation agreement model, which is a form of sustainability/replication in terms of adoption of an approach, thereby contributing to the tool set for conservation actors in the region. CSP remains available to work with any interested parties on applying the model.

With respect to sustainability of applications of the model in the Caribbean, it is too early to comment.

Summarize any unplanned sustainability or replicability achieved.

n/a

Safeguard Policy Assessment

Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.

n/a

Additional Comments/Recommendations

Information Sharing and CEPF Policy

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned, and results. Final project completion reports are made available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Eduard Niesten

Organization name: Conservation Stewards Program, Conservation International

Mailing address: 2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 500, Arlington, VA 22202, USA

Tel: +1.703.341.2000

Fax: +1.703.271.0137

E-mail: eniesten@conservation.org

*****If your grant has an end date other than JUNE 30, please complete the tables on the following pages*****

Performance Tracking Report Addendum

CEPF Global Targets

(Enter Grant Term)

Provide a numerical amount and brief description of the results achieved by your grant.
Please respond to only those questions that are relevant to your project.

Project Results	Is this question relevant?	If yes, provide your numerical response for results achieved during the annual period.	Provide your numerical response for project from inception of CEPF support to date.	Describe the principal results achieved from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008. (Attach annexes if necessary)
1. Did your project strengthen management of a protected area guided by a sustainable management plan? Please indicate number of hectares improved.				
2. How many hectares of new and/or expanded protected areas did your project help establish through a legal declaration or community agreement?				
3. Did your project strengthen biodiversity conservation and/or natural resources management inside a key biodiversity area identified in the CEPF ecosystem profile? If so, please indicate how many hectares.				
4. Did your project effectively introduce or strengthen biodiversity conservation in management practices outside protected areas? If so, please indicate how many hectares.				
5. If your project promotes the sustainable use of natural resources, how many local communities accrued tangible socioeconomic benefits? Please complete Table 1 below.				

If you answered yes to question 5, please complete the following table

