CEPF Final Project Completion Report

Instructions to grantees: please complete all fields, and respond to all questions, below.

Organization Legal Name	*Grenada Dove Conservation Programme*
Project Title	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Ecosystem Services Action for Climate Change Adaptation in Grenada's Priority Dry Forest KBAs
CEPF GEM No.	64202
Date of Report	Nov 28, 2015
Report Author	Bonnie L Rusk (with University of Chester input)
Author Contact Information	Blrusk1@gmail.com

CEPF Region: Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot

Strategic Direction: Strategic Direction 2. Investment Priority 2.1 Mainstream biodiversity conservation and ecosystem service values into development policies, projects and plans, with a focus on addressing major threats such as unsustainable tourism development, mining, agriculture and climate change.

Grant Amount: 101,890

Project Dates: 2014/4/1 to 2015/10/30

1. Implementation Partners for this Project *(list each partner and explain how they were involved in the project)*

Sub-Grantee: University of Chester. The University of Chester's (UoC) Department of Biological Sciences, Biodiversity Conservation Team including Dr. Howard P Nelson, Dr. Matt Geary and Professor Andrew Lawrence, will provide core technical support for the development of the project, providing 10%, 5% and 5% of their times, respectively, to support the project. Dr. Ellie Devenish was contracted by UoC as the PostDoc contracted for the Project. Dr Nelson was the Team Lead.

The Forestry and National Parks Department (FNPD) was the primary in-country collaborator for this project. The FNPD is responsible for all national parks and protected areas, forests, watersheds, and wildlife in Grenada and collaborates with GDCP on KBA and biodiversity related issues. For this project, the FNPD provided in-kind staff time, office space and use of utilities for project activities. The FNPD acted in a liaison role between the project and other national actors, in the development of policy & administrative recommendations arising from project and its outputs. The FNPD provided the following technical, logistical and support services to the project: Chief Forestry Officer (CFO), Mr. Aden Forteau (retired July 30, 2016), contributed approximately 10% of his time to the Project. Mr. Forteau is also Financial Officer, Grenada Dove Conservation Programme. His role in the project included managing, supervising, and participating in all FNPD collaboration of project activities, including KBA on-site activities, media and outreach activities, community outreach, and meetings as needed. He also acted as liaison with the Ministry of Agriculture as needed, for official approvals and documentation. As the GDCP's Financial Officer, he was responsible for approving all payments and financial reports, including payments to Project Manager, Project staff, and technical-support contractors, while ensuring financial

oversight during initial project Implementation. He also provided support and mentoring for GDCP project actions to mainstream biodiversity among government agencies. Upon his retirement, Mr Anthony Jeremiah replaced him as CFO and continued those responsibilities outlined above. Mr Forteau retained his position and role as Financial Officer.

BirdLife International: As a BirdLife Species Guardian for the Grenada Dove, Grenada Dove conservation activities are carried out in collaboration with BirdLife's Caribbean Programme.

St George's University (SGU): The Program Chair and Assistant Dean, Dr. Andrea Easter-Pilcher, a Conservation Biologist, provided her expertise to the project, primarily in its development.

Conservation Impacts

2. Describe how your project has contributed to the implementation of the CEPF ecosystem profile

This project supported Strategic Direction 2. "Integrate biodiversity conservation into landscape and development planning and implementation in six conservation corridors." Specifically, this project addressed the Investment Priority 2.1 Mainstream biodiversity conservation and ecosystem service values into development policies, projects and plans, with a focus on addressing major threats such as unsustainable tourism development, mining, agriculture and climate change". The project contributed to the CEPF Caribbean island portfolio by addressing the issue of integration of climate change and biodiversity conservation policy and planning.

This project primarily supported the intermediate indicator for the CEPF's activities in the Caribbean by addressing policy that incorporates climate change, biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services of tropical dry forests. In doing so, this project addressed improving protection of Grenada's 2 priority KBAs (Strategic Direction1, Investment Priority 1.2), the Mt Hartman National Park KBA and the Beausejour/Grenville Vale KBA.

Summarize the overall results/impact of your project

3. Planned Long-term Impacts - 3+ years (as stated in the approved proposal)
List each long-term impact from Grant Writer proposal

1. Adaptation strategies which are critical to ensuring that ecosystem services and biodiversity within Grenada's dry forest ecosystems in the Mt Hartman National Park Beausejour/Grenville Vale KBAs and other dry forest fragments are mainstreamed in national policy, spatial planning, economic strategy, development planning and budgeting.
2. Key stakeholders (including government agencies, NGOs and CBOs) will be supportive of implementation of the adaptation policies, plan and programmes arising from the prioritization process for actions to ensure conservation of dry forest biodiversity and ecosystem services.
3. Knowledge and awareness fostered during the project leads to explicit inclusion of climate change adaptation in the design of future protected area boundaries, buffer zones, corridors and management plans.

Actual progress toward long-term impacts at completion

As a result of this project, there was the willingness of the senior policy makers to incorporate the recommendations from the policy document in budgetary planning and decision-making for Grenada. This project's impact may well extend beyond Grenada to the region. Recognizing the importance of changes to dry forest in response to climate change both for Grenada and other islands, one senior policy advisor advised that the learnings from Grenada would be shared with other senior policy makers at future regional climate change adaptation meetings of Permanent Secretaries, highlights the impact of this project and sustained influence of the project on regional climate change discussions.

4. Planned Short-term Impacts - 1 to 3 years (as stated in the approved proposal)
List each short-term impact from Grant Writer proposal

1. Key stakeholders in government (including the Physical Planning Unit of the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Agriculture) and civil society (such as local private landowners adjacent the KBAs) are aware of the outcomes of the stakeholder prioritization process for actions to ensure conservation of dry forest biodiversity and ecosystem services within Grenada's KBAs;
2. Explicit integration of stakeholder selected priorities for adaptation actions relevant to the dry forest KBAs of Grenada, in national policy development affecting the use of dry forest ecosystems in Grenada.
3. Explicit integration of stakeholder selected priorities for adaptation actions relevant to the dry forests of Grenada, in the annual budget and workplans of the FNPD and Environment Department of Grenada. This impact will be measured through stakeholder surveys, and will be reflected through the inclusion of dry forest adaptation strategies in the nearterm work plans of key government agencies (such as FNPD, Ministry of Agriculture, and Ministry of Finance and Planning), and in the communications messages among relevant NGOs and CBOs involved in dry forest conservation and management .

Actual progress toward short-term impacts at completion

1. Key stakeholders were involved in various aspects of the project, including the stakeholder prioritization process including its outcomes. Key stakeholders were made aware through participation of the stakeholder workshop, dissemination of its outputs, consultations and/or participation in the webinar. As stated in 4 (above), there was the willingness of the senior policy makers to incorporate the recommendations from the policy document in budgetary planning and decision-making for Grenada. The Forestry and National Parks Department, and key project stakeholder, is also supportive or project outputs and their incorporation into planning for Grenada's dry forests and the KBAs. The participation of key NGOs and CBOs in the prioritization of strategies increases likelihood of ongoing communication of these strategies that demonstrate the importance to their and other sectors in Grenada.

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

The successes of the project toward achieving its short-term and long-term objectives are outlined above in the actual progress toward long-term impacts at project completion (3 and 4 above). In addition, sustainability developed through this project further increases the likelihood of achieving the

project's identified objectives. Also, a key success was the ability of the project to identify the wider implications of the ecological modelling to the agricultural sector on Grenada, and by sharing model outputs with the GIS unit/Land use division, these predictions of climate change impacts on dry forest can be used to inform future research and planning for agricultural land use and crop selection. Increased capacity within forestry is also a success of this project. In addition, interest in the project throughout the Caribbean, generated primarily through the webinar project deliverable, has already led to discussion about conducting similar work in other islands, highlighting the wider success of the project and the potential for replication across the region.

One challenge was find/access some historic data for input into the model.

6. Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

The ability of the project to identify the wider implications of the ecological modelling to the agricultural sector on Grenada. By sharing model outputs with the GIS unit/Land use division, these predictions of climate change impacts on dry forest can be used to inform future research and planning for agricultural land use and crop selection.

Project Components and Products/Deliverables

7. Describe the results from Component 1 and each product/deliverable

Component 1 (as stated in the approved proposal)
List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer

Vulnerabilities of Grenada's dry forest biodiversity and ecosystem services to the effects of climate change, which comprises Grenada priority KBAs, are assessed. (Sub-grant to University of Chester).

Component 1 Actual at Completion:

1.1 A detailed desk-top review of all available information on climate change and its impacts, vulnerabilities and adaptation approaches for dry forest ecosystem biodiversity and services.
1.2 Re-sampled 2004 vegetation plots and report written.
1.3 A report on the outcome of modelling of climate change projections for dry forests in Grenada based on data collected in 1.2 above.
1.4 A GIS database prepared of relevant raster and vector data maps relevant to the project and archived using cloud-based storage, to allow for free access where possible (within constraints of copyright and confidentiality associated with the relevant data sources), including protected areas boundaries, species distribution, vegetation data, watersheds, land uses, communities, as available.
1.5 A report of the outcome of site-based biodiversity and ecosystem services vulnerability assessments for the remaining dry forests on Grenada. Report for this deliverable (1.5) and deliverable 1.3 (report on outcome of climate modelling) were combined to improve the clarity and cohesion of the reports.

8. Describe the results from Component 2 and each product/deliverable

Component 2 (as stated in the approved proposal)
List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer

Biodiversity conservation action to address vulnerabilities to the effects of climate change are recommended and prioritized. (Sub-grant to University of Chester).

Component 2 Actual at Completion:

2.1. A detailed desk-top review of relevant literature/studies evaluating the success of conservation/ adaptation action that address vulnerabilities to the effects of climate change in dry forest ecosystems.
2.2 Report by technical experts on potential conservation actions which could form a series of conservation actions to adapt to climate impacts on dry forests, based on outputs of Component 1. (See 3.1 below)
2.3. A workshop of stakeholders and technical experts held to explore adaptation measures and address implications for livelihoods.

9. Describe the results from Component 3 and each product/deliverable

Component 3 (as stated in the approved proposal)
List each component and product/deliverable from Grant Writer

Mainstreaming conservation action into national policy and strategy. (Sub-grant to University of Chester).

Component 3 Actual at Completion:

3.1. Review of existing and proposed national policy, strategy and programmes related to climate change to identify policy and strategy gaps related to conservation of dry forest biodiversity. Report for this deliverable (3.1) and deliverable 2.2 (conservation actions report) were combined to improve the clarity and cohesion of the reports.
3.2. Document outlining proposed policy recommendations and strategies for dry forest biodiversity conservation related the impacts of climate change, based on outputs on Components 1, 2 and 3.1. Report for this deliverable (3.2) was combined with reports for deliverables 3.1 and 2.2, in order to produce a comprehensive stand-alone document for use by stakeholders in national policy decision-making.
3.3. Stakeholder consultation to rank proposed policy and strategy recommendations.
3.4. Participation in, and provision of technical outputs of Project for, 2 workshops with government, particularly senior government officials, to highlight the key outcomes and implications of the prioritization process for the adaptation options that could lead to resiliency of dry forests and their ecosystem services (carried out with GDCP, Deliverable 5.2, who facilitated workshop).

10. Describe the results from Component 4 and each product/deliverable

Component 4 (as stated in the approved proposal)

Biodiversity conservation action to address vulnerabilities to the effects of climate change are recommended and prioritized.

Component 4 Actual at Completion:

4.1. GDCP signed the sub-grant agreement with the UoC, and UoC provided reports, both programmatic and financial.
4.2. A workshop of stakeholders and technical experts was held to explore adaptation measures and address implications for livelihoods.
4.3. There were ongoing consultations with government stakeholders, private and community stakeholders throughout the project, and reports prepared for key consultations.
4.4. One project audits are carried out for the period May 1, 2014 – April 30, 2015. This is our annual auditing period, and followed the prior audit carried out through the prior CEPF project #60932. Through discussions with L. Johnson, it was decided that 2 audits, given the only 18 month project period and the GDCP auditing period, were not required.
4.5. Historic data was searched for and some key documents obtained that can both be inputted into the climate change model and/or used to address payment for ecosystem services, one prioritized adaptation action.

11. Describe the results from Component 5 and each product/deliverable

Component 5 (as stated in the approved proposal)

Biodiversity conservation action to address vulnerabilities to the effects of climate change are recommended and prioritized.

Component 5 Actual at Completion:

5.1. Stakeholder consultations were carried out with multiple stakeholders, including repeat meetings with stakeholders engaged during UoC 2nd and 3rd mission to Grenada both prior to the 2 workshops and when in country to carry out field work. The consultations carried out prior to the 2nd workshop included stakeholder meetings to discuss ranking of proposed policy and strategy recommendations.

5.2. Two (2) workshops were facilitated with government, particularly senior government officials, to highlight the key outcomes and implications of the prioritization process for the adaptation options that could lead to resiliency of dry forests and their ecosystem services Both workshops were arried out with UoC, (Deliverable 3.40, who provided technical project outputs.

5.3. A final Project report that includes the reviews, fieldwork, modelling, and policy and adaptation recommendations as well as workshop reports and presentations demonstrating the stakeholder consultation procedure was completed. National, regional and international final outputs have taken place through the webinar, with national report dissemination and upcoming regional report dissemination pending final approvals from senior government officials.

12. If you did not complete any component or deliverable, how did this affect the overall impact of the project?

All deliverables were completed. The webinar was conducted 8 days past the end of the project (Nov 8, 2015) at no cost to the project/CEPF. The webinar was hosted by UoC on their Webex service.

SurveyMonkey was used to prioritize adaptation strategies by stakeholders. It was not used to assess project in achieving-short term impacts. Support for integration of project outputs by the Ministry's Permanent Secretaries and other key government and private sectors was outlined as a key success of the project.

13. Please describe and submit any tools, products, or methodologies that resulted from this project or contributed to the results

Project documents for deliverables for project components 1, 2 and 3, submitted with this report, describe the literature review methodologies, field survey techniques, modelling methodologies and stakeholder consultation procedures that contributed to the results of the project.

CEPF Global Monitoring Data

Respond to the questions and complete the tables below. If a question is not relevant to your project, please make an entry of 0 (zero) or n/a (not applicable).

14. Did your organization complete the CEPF Civil Society Tracking Tool (CSTT) at the beginning and end of your project? (Please be sure to submit the final CSTT tool to CEPF if you haven't already done so.)

	Date	Composite Score
Baseline CSTT	n/a	
Final CSTT	Nov 20, 2015	67

15. List any vulnerable, endangered, or critically endangered species conserved due to your project

Conservation of tropical dry forests in Grenada, including implementation of adaptation strategies to address climate change, as identified in this project, will further conserve the dry forest habitat of the critically endangered Grenada Dove *Leptotila wellsi.*

Hectares Under Improved Management

Project Results	Hectares*	Comments
16. Did your project strengthen the management of an existing protected area?	**	***Adaptation strategies identified to improve tropical try forest management, though not implemented in this project. This would pertain to:* *Mt Hartman National Park* *Perseverance Protected Area*

17. Did your project create a new protected area or expand an existing protected area?	n/a	
18. Did your project strengthen the management of a key biodiversity area named in the CEPF Ecosystem Profile (hectares may be the same as questions above)	**	***Mt Hartman National Park KBA Beausejour/grenville Vale KBA*
19. Did your project improve the management of a production landscape for biodiversity conservation	n/a	*List the name or describe the location of the production landscape*

** Include total hectares from project inception to completion*

20. In relation to the two questions above on protected areas, did your project complete a Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), or facilitate the completion of a METT by protected area authorities? If so, complete the table below. *(Note that there will often be more than one METT for an individual protected area.)*

n/a

Protected area	Date of METT	Composite METT Score	Date of METT	Composite METT Score	Date of METT	Composite METT Score

21. List the name of any corridor (named in the Ecosystem Profile) in which you worked and how you contributed to its improved management, if applicable.

n/a

Direct Beneficiaries: Training and Education

Did your project provide training or education for . . .	**Male**	**Female**	**Total**	**Brief Description**
22. Adults for community leadership or resource management positions				
23. Adults for livelihoods or increased income				
24. School-aged children				
25. Other				

26. List the name and approximate population size of any "community" that benefited from the project.

n/a

27. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

Based on the list of communities above, write the name of the communities in the left column below. In the subsequent columns under Community Characteristics and Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit, place an X in all relevant boxes.

n/a

Community Name	Community Characteristics								Nature of Socioeconomic Benefit												
									Increased income due to:												
	Small landowners	Subsistence economy	Indigenous/ ethnic peoples	Pastoralists / nomadic peoples	Recent migrants	Urban communities	Communities falling below the poverty line	Other	Adoption of sustainable natural resources	Ecotourism revenues	Park management activities	Payment for environmental services	Increased food security due to the adoption of	More secure access to water resources	Improved tenure in land or other natural resource	Reduced risk of natural disasters (fires, landslides,	More secure sources of energy	Increased access to public services, such as	Improved use of traditional knowledge for	More participatory decision-making due to	Other

If you marked "Other", please provide detail on the nature of the Community Characteristic and Socioeconomic Benefit:

Lessons Learned

28. 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

See 30 & 31 below. Though successfully completed, the project deliverables were ambitious given the timeframe. Successful and effective collaborations and institutional relationships with government enabled the collection of field data and acquisition of existing GIS data, which contributed to the successful implementation of the project. Realistic availability of historic data should be incorporated into project design.

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

The design of project deliverables was ambitious given the short duration of the project, and although all deliverables were implemented successfully, the time required to complete some components (e.g. field surveys) was underestimated and thus some delays did occur.

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

Collaboration with key stakeholders, including FNPD and the GIS unit of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, lands and the Environment, enabled the collection of field data and acquisition of existing GIS data, which contributed to the successful implementation of the project. Plant identification took longer than expected, resulting in the delay in the implementation of some project components (e.g. deliverable 3.1).

31. Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community

Continued capacity building and close communication with departments such as FNPD was critical to the success of this project. The project highlighted the value of sustained data collection (vegetation and climate) by stakeholders will be critical to future climate modelling and subsequent implementation of adaptation actions.

Sustainability / Replication

32. Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated

The success of increased capacity development for FNPD resulting from the training component of the project has already been demonstrated. One individual from the FNPD who trained in this project applied the techniques learnt during the project to another collaboration between FNPD and external researchers on a separate project. Sustaining the benefits of the project will require the continued motivation and training of the FNPD personnel involved in the project, and the long-term monitoring of

the sample sites surveyed during this project. Such sustained commitment by the Grenada Government will be reflected by the human and financial resources allocated in future budgeting by the ministry.

A key success of the project was the ability to identify the wider implications of the ecological modelling to the agricultural sector on Grenada. By sharing model outputs with the GIS unit/Land use division, these predictions of climate change impacts on dry forest can be used to inform future research and planning for agricultural land use and crop selection (e.g. agriculture land suitability).

Another success with the project was the willingness of the senior policy makers (i.e. Permanent Secretaries in Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries, Lands and the Environment) to incorporate the recommendations from the policy document in budgetary planning and decision-making for Grenada. Similarly, the link between the expectations for dry forest shifts in response to climate change and the impacts of such a shift on other islands in the Caribbean was identified by one of the Permanent Secretaries as a valuable lesson. This senior policy maker advised that the learnings from Grenada would be shared with other senior policy makers at future regional climate change adaptation meetings of Permanent Secretaries. This willingness of the PSs involved in the current project to act as advocates for learnings on the project, highlights the impact of this project and sustained influence of the project on regional climate change discussions.

Interest in the project throughout the Caribbean, generated primarily through the webinar project deliverable, has already led to discussion about conducting similar work in other islands, highlighting the wider success of the project and the potential for replication across the region.

33. Summarize any unplanned activities that are likely to result in increased sustainability or replicability

n/a

Safeguards

34. If not listed as a separate Project Component and described above, summarize the implementation of any required action related to social, environmental, or pest management safeguards

n/a

Additional Comments/Recommendations

35. Use this space to provide any further comments or recommendations in relation to your project or CEPF

n/a

Additional Funding

36. 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 CEPF investment

n/a

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes

** Categorize the type of funding as:*

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 investm*ent or successes related to this project)

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:

37. Name: Bonnie L Rusk
38. Organization: Grenada Dove Conservation Programme
39. Mailing address: c/o Forestry and National Parks Department, Queen's Park, Grenada, W.I.
40. Telephone number: (473) 403-3361
41. E-mail address: blrusk1@gmail.com