

## CEPF Final Project Completion Report

<b>Organization Legal Name</b>	Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI)
<b>Project Title</b>	CEPF Regional Implementation Team in the Caribbean Islands
<b>CEPF GEM No.</b>	57519
<b>Date of Report</b>	25 October, 2016
<b>Report Author</b>	Anna Cadiz-Hadeed
<b>Author Contact Information</b>	<a href="mailto:anna@canari.org">anna@canari.org</a> ; <a href="mailto:info@canari.org">info@canari.org</a>

**CEPF Region:** Caribbean islands

**Strategic Direction:** 4. Provide strategic leadership and effective coordination of CEPF investment through a regional implementation team.

**Grant Amount:** \$1,021,428

**Project Dates:** 1 October, 2010 – 30 July, 2016

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

The Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) did not have any implementation partners for this project.

**Conservation Impacts**

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

The [CEPF Ecosystem Profile for the Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot](#) was approved on 15 January, 2010 and CANARI was contracted to be the Regional Implementation Team (RIT) on 1 October, 2010 which also marked the start of the \$6.9 million CEPF investment in the Caribbean region. The **overall goal** of the RIT project was to support the work of civil society in developing and implementing conservation strategies, as well as in raising public awareness on the implications of loss of biodiversity.

The RIT worked closely with the CEPF Secretariat, civil society, government and donor agencies to help convert the plans in the Ecosystem Profile into a cohesive portfolio of grants. The RIT provided strategic leadership and effective coordination that helped civil society and local partners design, implement and replicate [77 grants](#) (30 small grants, 47 large grants) that were in line with CEPF's strategy as outlined in the Ecosystem Profile and that collectively achieved significant impacts for biodiversity conservation, climate resilience and sustainable rural livelihoods. To review a detailed report on the achievements of the CEPF Caribbean islands portfolio from 2010 – 2016 against the targets that were set out in the Ecosystem Profile, see

[here](#). In addition, final project completion reports of each grant can be downloaded from the [CEPF Caribbean islands project database](#)).

### **3. Summarize the overall results/impact of your project**

CANARI supported 68 civil society organisations (CSOs) to implement [77 grants](#) in eight countries: Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines. The CEPF Caribbean islands portfolio achieved concrete conservation results which are outlined in the [Final Report on the Logframe](#) which demonstrates achievements of CEPF's portfolio targets from 2010 – 2016.

Once a project concept was approved, CANARI coached CSOs to help them develop proposals that were well aligned to CEPF's strategy, met local needs and helped fulfil the individual CSO's mandates. CANARI worked with the CEPF Secretariat and grantees to make linkages between projects where appropriate to encourage a cohesive portfolio of projects that collectively achieved more than the sum of their parts.

CANARI conducted wide outreach to target beneficiaries across the hotspot, working across different institutional, political and cultural contexts and four languages (English, French, Haitian Kreyol and Spanish). Seventy-eight percent (78%) of the 68 organisations that received grant support were local and regional CSOs, reflecting CEPF's goal to support and build local capacity.

CANARI also ensured accountability of CEPF funds and adherence to CEPF's policies and procedures.

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

- Effective long-term conservation of the natural ecosystems of the Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot
- Contribution to global biodiversity conservation and improved livelihoods of people dependent upon natural resources.

#### **Targeted Outcomes**

- 1) Improved protection and management of 45 of the highest priority key biodiversity areas.
- 2) Biodiversity conservation integrated into landscape and development planning and implementation in six conservation corridors.

### **4. Actual progress toward long-term impacts at completion**

1) The RIT supported 68 grantees in meeting long-term conservation goals for improved protection and management in 32 of the 45 priority key biodiversity areas (14 high priority Key Biodiversity Areas [KBAs] and 18 medium priority KBAs).

2) The RIT supported grantees to integrate biodiversity conservation into landscape and development planning and implementation in five of the six conservation corridors in the Caribbean region, towards improving livelihoods of people dependent on these natural resources. The five conservation corridors include the Massif du Nord corridor in Haiti, Portland Bight Protected Area in Jamaica, Massif de la Selle – Jaragua–Bahoruco–Enriquillo binational corridor in Hispaniola, the Cordillera Central corridor in the Dominican Republic, and the Central Mountain Range in St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

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

- Provide strategic leadership and effective coordination of CEPF investment in the Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot
- Build a broad constituency of civil society organisations working effectively across institutional and political boundaries towards achieving shared conservation and ecosystem services priorities described in the ecosystem profile.

1.1. CEPF and other funding support for projects under all investment priorities, in all of the 45 highest priority key biodiversity areas and the six priority conservation corridors facilitated by the end of the project.

1.2. Civil society organisations actively working to promote integration of biodiversity conservation into landscape and development planning in the six priority conservation corridors by the end of project.

1.3. Civil society organisations actively engaging policymakers to mainstream biodiversity into other policy sectors in the 11 countries selected as CEPF priorities (Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines) by the end of the project.

1.4. At least 30 civil society organisations have demonstrably increased their capacity to develop and implement biodiversity conservation initiatives in the highest priority key biodiversity areas and conservation corridors in the 11 countries selected as CEPF priorities (Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines) by the end of the project.

1.5. At least US\$2 million in additional funding leveraged by CANARI, CEPF grantees, and other partners at the project or portfolio level towards CEPF investment priorities in the Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot by the end of the project.

1.6. Lessons on how to do effective grant making in the Caribbean islands identified and disseminated to key target audiences by the end of the project.

1.7. Demonstrated increase in informal and formal collaboration and networking among civil society organisations within and among the 11 countries selected as CEPF priorities and with international civil society organisations working in these countries (Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines) by the end of the project.

### **5. Actual progress toward short-term impacts at completion**

The RIT provided strategic leadership and effectively coordinated the CEPF investment in the Caribbean islands in collaboration with the CEPF Secretariat.

1.1. CEPF and other funding support provided for projects under all 12 investment priorities in 32 of the highest priority key biodiversity areas and five priority conservation corridors.

1.2. Civil society organisations actively worked to promote integration of biodiversity conservation into landscape and development planning in five priority conservation corridors.

1.3. Civil society organisations actively engaged policymakers to mainstream biodiversity into other policy sectors in the Bahamas, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Haiti, Jamaica and St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

1.4. Fifty-eight (58) civil society organisations benefited from institutional capacity building in strategic planning, financial management, development of sustainable financing strategies and feasibility action plans, improvement of governance structures, development/improvement of websites, training and mentoring in proposal development and scientific writing, and effective communication, networking and outreach.

1.5. \$458,815 in additional funding leveraged by CANARI at the portfolio level towards CEPF investment priorities in the Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot. Additional funding leveraged by grantees to support implementation of projects.

1.6. Lessons on how to do effective grant-making in the Caribbean islands identified and documented by the RIT and communicated to key government and donor partners.

1.7. Demonstrated increase in informal and formal collaboration and networking among civil society organisations within and among 8 of the 11 countries selected as CEPF priorities and with international civil society organisations working within these countries.

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

### **Successes**

As a regional technical institute with over thirty years' experience of research, policy influence and capacity building for participatory natural resource governance in the Caribbean, CANARI was well positioned to be the RIT. Building the capacity of CSOs working in natural resource management in the region is an important mandate of CANARI which is in line with CEPF's strategy to build local capacity for biodiversity conservation. CANARI is well networked in the Caribbean and this was also a key factor for success in its role as the RIT in terms of being able to mobilise key partners, leverage results and sustain efforts of CEPF's investment. See CANARI Policy Brief #23: Effective grant-making to Caribbean civil society: Lessons and innovation from CANARI's experience as an intermediary organisation which speaks to the value of having a regional coordinating mechanism such as CANARI to support grant management for civil society in the Caribbean (available in [English](#), [French](#) and [Spanish](#)).

### **Challenges**

In general, working across eight countries with various geopolitical spaces, four languages (English, French, Haitian Kreyol and Spanish), and diverse cultural backgrounds and political systems was at times challenging. The RIT supported 68 CSOs that accessed CEPF funding at the local, national, regional and international level working on conservation in the Caribbean. These groups represented different organisational models and had varying levels of capacity. In addition, each country that CEPF invested in has unique socio-economic landscapes and is faced with similar yet distinct biodiversity conservation challenges. These challenges were not new to

CANARI as a regional organisation that has worked in the Caribbean islands on participatory natural resource management for over twenty-five years, however, CANARI's experience of being the RIT still pushed the Institute's boundaries in terms of the size and scale of what CANARI worked on under a single initiative.

#### Confusion between roles and responsibilities of the CEPF Secretariat and the RIT

It was sometimes confusing for grantees and other stakeholders to understand the difference in roles and responsibilities of CANARI as the RIT and those of the CEPF Secretariat.

#### RIT staffing, structure and limited budget

All RIT members worked on CEPF on a part-time basis which was a challenge due to the demanding nature of the project and the level of capacity building support often required by applicants and grantees. Working in the Caribbean islands is costly and the RIT's budget had to be amended several times to add the resources that CANARI needed to fulfil its terms of reference as the RIT.

#### Initial lack of clarity of CEPF's investment strategy for the Caribbean

The RIT received a lot of requests from applicants and grantees for support in trying to develop proposals that were aligned to CEPF's strategy. The RIT took quite a while to develop a good understanding of what a project needed to incorporate to be a 'fit' for CEPF in the region as the Strategic Directions and Investment Priorities that were defined in the Ecosystem Profile for the Caribbean were communicated in a way that many found confusing and open to interpretation.

#### Management lines with the CEPF Secretariat

Two different CEPF Grant Directors were assigned to the Caribbean region – one for Haiti and another for the rest of the portfolio. This was challenging for the RIT as sometimes information and decisions on processes and procedures were not streamlined across the entire team causing inconsistencies.

#### Working in a post-disaster environment

The RIT launched the CEPF Caribbean programme in Haiti in January 2011 which was one year after the devastating earthquake that struck the country on 12 January, 2010. Frustration with ineffective donor assistance in Haiti had (and perhaps continues to have) implications for perceptions about other donor programmes in the region. The RIT was very sensitive to this and worked with CSOs in Haiti to try to address their priorities and needs. The capacity of CSOs in Haiti was severely stretched at this time and so the RIT was sensitive to this in its expectations when it came to grant-making and the length of time it sometimes took to develop full proposals.

#### Political instability in Haiti

Political instability and unrest in Haiti was a challenge for civil society to effectively engage the government on biodiversity conservation and sustainable development issues. With a high turnover of key staff in the Ministries as well as key agencies such as the National Protected Area Agency, any engagement was difficult to maintain.

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

### Positive impacts:

There were several positive impacts which built CANARI's capacity and enhanced its positioning as an effective regional organisations in the Caribbean to continue and expand its work on supporting civil society in biodiversity conservation. This will help to contribute to sustainability and enhanced impact of CEPF in the Caribbean islands hotspot.

#### Helping CANARI to advance its mission

Working as the RIT for the CEPF Caribbean Islands programme allowed CANARI to continue to advance its work in key areas including civil society and governance, capacity building and participatory protected area planning and management. All of which has helped contribute to CANARI achieving the actions set out in its [Strategic Plan 2011-2016](#).

#### Increasing CANARI's capacity in grant-making

CANARI increased its capacity to be more effective in grant-making and in particular to manage a large, multi-year, regional grant portfolio. The lessons learnt in this regard are documented in CANARI Policy Brief #23 which speaks to the value of having a regional coordinating mechanism to support grant management for civil society in the Caribbean.

#### Expanding CANARI's partnerships and reach throughout the region

Partnerships with CSOs, donors and government across the Caribbean islands were built and enhanced and CANARI's visibility in the islands of the Dominican Republic and Haiti was especially increased.

#### Building CANARI's capacity to carry out participatory monitoring and evaluation processes

Having the opportunity to lead on planning and facilitating the CEPF Caribbean mid-term evaluation process built CANARI's capacity to carry out participatory evaluation processes for regional programmes. CANARI can offer this service to other initiatives in the region. For example, CANARI was subsequently contracted by the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO) to serve as the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) expert to support the Government of Trinidad and Tobago in developing a proposal for submission to the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to support a national protected area project.

#### Helping CANARI to leverage opportunities with other donors and partners

The fact that CANARI has demonstrated capacity to coordinate and manage a large regional, multi-year project which has a focus on civil society capacity building, has helped position CANARI in a new light and has opened up more opportunities for the Institute to expand its work and achieve its strategic objectives.

For example, CANARI's role as the RIT likely contributed to demonstrating CANARI's experience and capacity and helped in CANARI securing contracts for other large projects including projects focused on protected area planning and management and civil society capacity building, including the following:

- [Strengthening Caribbean fisherfolk to participate in governance](#)
- [Climate ACTT: Action by Civil society in Trinidad and Tobago to build resilience to climate change](#)

- [Protected areas study tour for Haitian government agencies and key partners](#)
- [Design and delivery of a terrestrial protected area management training course](#)

## **Project Components and Products/Deliverables**

### **Component 1 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

#### **Component 1:**

Regional Implementation Team (RIT), Regional Advisory Committee, and a team of reviewers of Letters of Inquiry (LOIs) and proposals for the Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot functioning effectively

#### **Planned Products/ Deliverables:**

- 1.1. RIT fully staffed and resourced and functioning effectively to meet objectives and results identified in the project logframe
- 1.2. Regional Advisory Committee for CEPF (RACC) established and functioning - comprising 12-15 English-speaking representatives of government agencies, local and international civil society organisations, technical assistance agencies and donors actively working in conservation the Caribbean islands and with experience of civil society organizations.
- 1.3. Technical team conducting review of LOIs and proposals, drawn from members of the RACC and other experts as needed willing to volunteer time to review applications
- 1.4. Evaluation of performance of the RIT and RACC against the objectives in the ecosystem profile and logical framework conducted, and reports submitted in accordance with the CEPF Performance Monitoring Manual.

### **8. Describe the results from Component 1 and each product/deliverable**

#### **Actual Products/ Deliverables under Component 1:**

- 1.1. The RIT was staffed with an RIT Manager, three Country Coordinators (who were based in the CEPF priority countries of the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica), a Small Grants Manager, Financial Officer and Administrative Officer. In addition, CANARI's Executive Director formed part of the RIT to provide overall strategic advice and support and technical backstopping, especially in terms of donor outreach at the regional level. All RIT staff worked on a part-time basis on CEPF. Over the project period, changes were made to the RIT staffing structure to accommodate arising needs and increasing demands on staff time. This included adjusting staff levels of effort (e.g. increasing the RIT manager's and the Country Coordinators' time while decreasing the time of CANARI's Executive Director on the project) and addressing the need for a dedicated communications point person and small grants manager.

The RIT participated in four days of training conducted by the CEPF Secretariat during 8-11 November, 2010 to orient staff about CEPF's policies, procedures and investment strategy for the region. Roles and responsibilities and procedures for RIT liaison and coordination with the CEPF Secretariat were also clarified.

The RIT policies, procedures and systems were finalised and implemented based on CANARI's existing policies, procedures and systems (including CANARI's internal electronic filing system and financial systems) and the CEPF Operational Manual. The RIT staff in CANARI held regular team meetings to discuss workplans and progress. The RIT Manager also had regular meetings (via skype) with the three Country Coordinators to confirm workplans.

- 1.2.** CANARI established a Regional Advisory Committee for CEPF (RACC) comprising 17 experts who provided on a voluntary basis independent, technical reviews of proposals in order to increase transparency and accountability in the review process as well as overall strategic guidance. The RACC also helped ensure effective coordination of CEPF's investment with other national and regional initiatives. A matrix showing the collective capacity needed in the RACC was developed to aid in the selection process. Nominations for the RACC members were sought and feedback was provided. There were a total of 24 RACC member nominees of which the RIT selected and invited 17 to join the committee in March 2011. The RACC membership was confirmed between March - April 2011. See [here](#) for a news release that was issued on the establishment of the RACC. The RACC Terms of Reference is at [Attachment 1](#) and the report of the inception meeting of the RACC which was held on 17 May, 2011 is at [Attachment 2](#).

In addition to their review of LOIs, RACC members were also engaged in country-level strategic discussions as well as reviews of part 2 proposals. For example, the RIT held virtual meetings with the Haiti-based RACC members both before and after the Macaya stakeholders' meeting on 30th March 2012. The RACC members gave their perspective and advice on strategies to engage local stakeholders in Massif de la Hotte and their experience working in the KBA and with key donors in the area (such as IDB) for many years. The RACC members also gave their advice on the scope of the follow up Call for Proposals which was issued on 15 May 2012. Jamaica-based RACC members gave specific advice on a strategy for mobilising potential applicants in the country to help contribute to CEPF's targets. The RACC contributed to strategic discussions on CEPF's portfolio in the region including assisting with in-country donor and government coordination. For example, the RIT worked closely with the RACC members based in the Dominican Republic to ensure that CEPF strategies were aligned to national GEF priorities including the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources' agenda for the national protected area system.

- 1.3.** The RIT identified 14 external technical reviewers in addition to the 17 RACC members who also perform technical reviews of LOIs. These technical reviewers were contacted for their expertise in specific areas that were addressed in applications such as invasive species eradication and management, networking on biodiversity conservation issues in the Caribbean region, protected area management and financing in the Dominican Republic and sustainable financing for protected areas in Jamaica.

The RIT, together with the RACC members and the other voluntary independent technical experts, reviewed 241 LOIs that were received from seven calls for proposals that were issued over the CEPF Caribbean islands investment period. Once an LOI was approved, the RIT and its team of independent technical reviewers then worked closely with the CEPF

Secretariat to review full proposals that were prepared by the applicants. Scorecards for each LOI were completed by each reviewer to document comments and recommendations.

- 1.4. The CEPF Secretariat conducted 6-monthly monitoring visits to the RIT to evaluate the RIT's performance, budget and compliance against the objectives in the ecosystem profile and logical framework (under Strategic Direction #4). The CEPF Secretariat and CEPF Donors (including representatives from the World Bank and the EU) visited the region on 14 occasions to evaluate the RIT, grantees and the implementation of the portfolio at large. In each instance, the RIT helped to plan and participate in the monitoring visits, which also included visits to in-country donor and government partners as well as grantee offices and project field sites where community members and project beneficiaries also participated.

In addition, the RIT was evaluated by a firm, Baastel, that conducted an independent evaluation on behalf of CEPF Donor, l'Agence Française de Développement in November 2013. In early 2016, the RIT was also part of an evaluation conducted by the Global Island Partnership (GLISPA) that conducted another independent evaluation of CEPF's investments in island regions.

The RIT reviewed the RACC's performance against the Terms of Reference and is confident that the RACC played a very strategic role in the portfolio, providing advice on country and regional level conservation initiatives and relevant trends as well as conducting technical reviews of LOIs and proposals.

As communication is challenging in the region, meeting face-to-face when possible was extremely beneficial to the team.

## **Component 2 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

### **Component 2:**

Broad constituency of civil society organisations working across institutional and political boundaries participating in CEPF implementation in the Caribbean islands.

### **Planned Products/ Deliverables:**

- 2.1. Participation Strategy guides implementation of CEPF investment strategy in the Caribbean islands.
- 2.2. Stakeholder database developed within six months of the start of the project and maintained for the duration of the project as a publicly accessible register of civil society organisations for the region.
- 2.3. Report on stakeholder participation in CEPF implementation submitted to CEPF Secretariat annually as part of the RIT report on performance.

## **9. Describe the results from Component 2 and each product/deliverable**

### **Actual Products/Deliverables under Component 2:**

- 2.1.** During the April 2012 Supervision Mission it was agreed that the participation strategy product be removed from the RIT's performance tracker. Stakeholder participation continued to be a hallmark of the RIT's way of working, as evidenced by the extensive consultation process and varied methodologies used by CANARI for the Mid-Term Evaluation of the CEPF Caribbean Islands Programme.
- 2.2.** CEPF Caribbean stakeholder database (**Attachment 3**) was developed within six months of the start of the project and was maintained for the duration of the project. The database has contact information for 507 key stakeholders including applicants, grantees, other civil society partners, CEPF donors, other key donors and technical partners, government agencies and technical reviewers. In addition to being used by the RIT for its communication purposes, the grantee listing on the database was used by grantees and the CEPF Secretariat to support dissemination of their own information. The database was not made publicly available due to the fact that it holds detailed contact information for persons. However, CANARI can be contacted for information.

This database was extremely useful in facilitating the quick dissemination of communication products. The RIT also used the database to easily group stakeholders in categories (Grantees, applicants, CEPF Donors, other key donors, government partners, RACC members, mentors, etc.) which allowed for targeted communications to be sent as needed.

- 2.3.** CANARI reported on stakeholder participation in CEPF implementation in the Caribbean region as part of regular 6-monthly RIT performance reports.

### **Component 3 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

#### **Component 3:**

Effective communication to promote CEPF as a dynamic funding mechanism and for the dissemination of information and results of the project.

#### **Planned Products/ Deliverables:**

- 3.1.** Communication Strategy developed and used to guide the sharing of information, promotion of announcements and dissemination of lessons learned to key target audiences active in biodiversity conservation in the Caribbean islands
- 3.2.** CEPF launched within four months of the start of the project and calls for LOIs issued, with deadlines for submission set annually.
- 3.3.** Stakeholders updated on progress of CEPF investment strategy within six months and for the duration of the project via targeted media (e.g. CEPF Caribbean webpage, quarterly CEPF Caribbean e-newsletter, CEPF Caribbean social networking tools, existing conservation e-groups).

- 3.4. At least 20 exchange visits – physical and virtual (including using participatory video) - within and between countries facilitated or promoted for grantees to visit CEPF projects of particular interest to them by the end of the project.
- 3.5. All four languages (English, French, Spanish and Creole) represented in at least ten culturally-appropriate products developed and disseminated in collaboration with grantees by the end of the project documenting results and lessons learned during CEPF projects (including lessons from successful conservation activities that can be adapted and/or incorporated into existing and new projects) - to include written materials (electronic and hard copy) and audiovisual (to include PowerPoint presentations, videos, performance pieces, art, drama and music).
- 3.6. Policy brief (4 pages) on the role of the RIT as an effective regional mechanism to support grant-making to civil society in the Caribbean. Policy brief translated into French and Spanish, graphically designed and printed.
- 3.7. 4-page document that highlights the key results achieved by CEPF in the Caribbean and outlines priorities for biodiversity conservation moving forward. Document translated into French and Spanish, graphically designed and printed.
- 3.8. Case studies on best practices from CEPF grants in the Caribbean drafted and included in two key regional reports: CARICOM Biodiversity Outlook report and the UNEP State of Biodiversity in Latin America and the Caribbean report.
- 3.9. Communication products widely disseminated to CEPF Caribbean stakeholders, including through face-to-face meetings with the CARICOM Secretariat, OECS Commission and the European Union to support efforts to negotiate formal support for another phase of CEPF in the Caribbean, catalyse policy change and develop follow up work.

## **10. Describe the results from Component 3 and each product/deliverable**

### **Actual Products/ Deliverables under Component 3**

- 3.1. Communication Strategy was developed (**Attachment 4**) and used to guide the sharing of information, promotion of announcements and dissemination of lessons learned to key target audiences active in biodiversity conservation in the Caribbean islands.
- 3.2. The RIT launched the CEPF in the Dominican Republic, Jamaica and Haiti between January and February, 2011. The first call for proposals was issued on 1 February, 2011 for Jamaica and Haiti and the second call for proposals was issued on 1 April, 2011 for the Dominican Republic. The calls were communicated via the launch activities in the Dominican Republic, Jamaica and Haiti, through the CANARI and CEPF websites, CANARI's email lists and relevant Caribbean listserves<sup>1</sup>. The RIT also held several meetings with potential partners and grantees during the launch and otherwise to communicate the calls for LOIs. See

---

<sup>1</sup> Listservs used included the CEPF Caribbean grantees yahoo listserv, GLISPA, BirdsCaribbean, CRFM, FAO, IUCN, SIDS, CCA Members Group, Caribbean Biodiversity Group, CAMPAM and ParksCaribbean.

**Attachment 5** for an outline of the launch activities in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica in table format.

The RIT issued a total of seven calls for proposals, each of which were translated into French and Spanish and disseminated widely via the CANARI and CEPF websites, listservs, CANARI's Facebook page and via direct email to all key stakeholders listed in the CEPF Caribbean stakeholder database. For the sixth and seventh calls for proposals, the RIT also issued pre-call announcements in English, French and Spanish via the same dissemination avenues as listed above.

The CEPF Caribbean webpage on CANARI's website also included a section on [applying for funding](#) which promoted the calls for proposals and housed resources and information for applicants.

- 3.3.** The RIT updated stakeholders on the progress of CEPF's investment strategy on a regular basis through the use of targeted media as well as face-to-face meetings, using the Communication Strategy and the CEPF Caribbean stakeholder database for guidance.

The RIT posted CEPF-related news on [CANARI's Facebook page](#) with 113 posts over the entire project period being about CEPF projects and initiatives in the region. These posts were shared between one and twenty times by grantees and other key partners.

[Fourteen issues of the CEPF Caribbean e-newsletter, \*Capacité\*](#), were published and disseminated via direct email, listservs, CANARI's website and Facebook page to more than 500 stakeholders. The newsletter was picked up and shared by other stakeholders in the region, including the newsletter of the Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (RAC-SPAW) and the IUCN WPCA Vice-Chair for the Caribbean region who regularly forwarded it to the CAMPAM and ParksCaribbean listservs as well. The Small Island Developing States (SIDS) Policy and Practice project included a feature on *Capacité* in their monthly email update and this was sent to their mailing list. IUCN also included a link to *Capacité* in the March issue of their PILARES Newsletter, available at [http://www.iucn.org/knowledge/news/newsletters/boletin\\_mensual\\_pilares.cfm?sType=email\\_version](http://www.iucn.org/knowledge/news/newsletters/boletin_mensual_pilares.cfm?sType=email_version).

From Issue #7 of the *Capacité* newsletter, the RIT decided to do thematic features focusing on issues that were relevant to CEPF's strategy and implementation in the region including climate change, innovation, partnerships for conservation, how biodiversity conservation benefits communities, combating invasive species, ecosystem services, communication and networking. The RIT also included a "Hot Tips and Topics for Good Grant Management" column, which focused on key project management issues such as the CEPF procurement policy and the conflict of interest policy. This feature was shared with grant directors of the other hotspots and has been used by the Eastern Afromontane RIT in the "grantee resources" section of their web site at <http://www.birdlife.org/africa/resources>.

The RIT developed a [CEPF Caribbean webpage](#) that highlighted the RIT's project and also served as a portal for information directed towards applicants, grantees, donors and other key stakeholders. For example, the RIT kept an updated summary listing of all projects in

the region in [English](#), [French](#) and [Spanish](#) which was regularly updated on CANARI's website to keep stakeholders informed of new grants contracted.

The RIT engaged with biodiversity conservation and protected area management actors within government institutions and donors based in-country on a regular basis. The RIT placed a lot of importance on engaging governments as much as possible to not only share information on CEPF projects and plans in-country and in the region, but to get feedback on whether proposed actions by some grantees and applicants were indeed a priority for the government. For example, the RIT held several meetings with the Environment Ministry in the Dominican Republic to ensure projects and proposals were meeting priority needs, to track the progress of management plans and approvals within the Ministry and to ensure that communication between the portfolio and the government remained streamlined. The RIT also met regularly with in-country donors in the Dominican Republic including the World Bank, the Japanese Embassy, the French Embassy, AFD and the GEF Focal Point based in the Ministry of the Environment. The donor representatives in Santo Domingo expressed thanks that the RIT actively reached out to them to share information on CEPF throughout the life of the portfolio.

Similarly, the RIT Haitian Country Coordinator kept in touch with the Director of the National Agency for Protected Areas in Haiti to get information on newly integrated protected areas and to share information about CEPF. The RIT Country Coordinator for Jamaica communicated regularly with Jamaican government partners and CEPF has been recognised in Jamaica as a support mechanism for biodiversity conservation. This is evident in the fact that CEPF is one of five supporting initiatives explicitly mentioned in the draft Protected Area System Master Plan for Jamaica.

The RIT was in contact with the GEF Focal Points in CEPF-eligible countries via email, phone and face-to-face meetings where possible. The main focus of engagement was initially to support the CEPF Secretariat in securing the required GEF Focal Point endorsement letters for CEPF. In addition to the RIT's regular meetings with the GEF Focal Points of the three CEPF priority countries of the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica, the RIT also opportunistically met with the GEF Focal Points of Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines while there for other CANARI meetings and workshops. The RIT kept in touch with the GEF Focal Points and National Biodiversity Focal Points throughout the CEPF eligible countries to keep them updated on CEPF progress as well as proposals received for work in their specific countries.

In-country and visiting donors also joined site visits to CEPF projects which were facilitated by the RIT in collaboration with the CEPF Secretariat. This was a very useful way to not only keep the donor community updated on key progress, but to showcase the work and achievements of the grantees and local communities.

CANARI also promoted CEPF in the Caribbean and provided updates to stakeholders via face-to-face outreach to agencies developing or managing regional and sub-regional projects (e.g. GIZ Caribbean Aqua-Terrestrial Solutions-Programme [CATS], the United Nations Environment Programme Caribbean Environment Programme [UNEP-CEP] Integrating Water, Land and Ecosystems Management in Caribbean SIDS

[IWEco] project, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization [UN FAO] and the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre [CCCCC]) and to governments and key agencies at regional events (e.g. the Meeting of Senior Officials & Council of Ministers on Environmental Sustainability for the Organisation of Eastern Caribbean States [OECS]) and at global events such as the IUCN World Parks Congress and Samoa SIDS Conference on Sustainable Development in September 2014. This enabled CANARI to influence or play a role in initiatives that will build on results achieved by CEPF to enhance impact and sustainability.

The CEPF Caribbean mid-term evaluation process in 2013 provided a platform for engaging stakeholders in multiple ways and through the use of varied methodologies, including national focus group discussions, a regional meeting, structured interviews, on-line surveys, and participatory methodologies applied in a workshop setting. Stakeholders engaged in the process included CEPF grantees, RACC members, donors, actual and potential institutional partners/collaborators from governmental, intergovernmental and other technical agencies, RIT staff, and CEPF Secretariat staff. Reports of the mid-term evaluation were uploaded to CANARI's website [here](#) and also sent directly via email to participants and key stakeholders.

CANARI also engaged stakeholders through its many complementary programmes and projects throughout the region. CANARI's role as Chair of the IUCN Regional Committee for the Caribbean was extremely relevant, particularly as this network is largely made up of civil society members who were CEPF grantees (in Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Jamaica and Saint Lucia). This was an avenue for CANARI to facilitate regional networking and to promote information sharing and collaboration on biodiversity conservation.

An example of RIT stakeholder outreach and communication at the local level occurred in Massif de la Hotte in Haiti where there are several actors investing and working in biodiversity conservation initiatives and so coordination is critical. The RIT worked with the CEPF Secretariat (with support from Organisation pour la Réhabilitation de l'Environnement [ORE]) to facilitate a stakeholders meeting to identify complementary projects and initiatives being implemented to help avoid duplication of efforts and increase collaboration in the KBA. This meeting was held in La Borde on 30 March 2012 and was also an opportunity to reflect on actions that would lead to tangible conservation results with local stakeholders. Park Macaya, within the Massif de la Hotte KBA, emerged as the focus of the discussions. Following this meeting, CANARI issued a call for proposals on 15 May 2012 soliciting projects for biodiversity conservation initiatives in Massif de la Hotte, taking into account the recommendations made during the meeting. The full report of the stakeholders meeting including conclusions and recommendations can be found in French on CANARI's website [here](#).

CANARI also utilised the regional pool of mentors that was developed to support the RIT's role and implementation of the CEPF Caribbean programme (see Deliverable 5.2 below for details) to help share information on CEPF throughout the region, particularly with civil society and local communities.

**3.4.** The RIT identified opportunities for exchange visits at both the country and regional level over the course of the project, some of which were facilitated by the RIT directly and others which were promoted for grantees and facilitated by other partners.

Some examples of exchanges include the following:

- The RIT drew on complementary funding from the MacArthur Foundation to facilitate a one-day national action learning group meeting in Jamaica on 4 April 2014 in follow up to a grantee workshop on social communications. The group continued electronic discussions towards implementing a national biodiversity communication campaign.
- CEPF grantees in the Dominican Republic had the opportunity to showcase their work in protected area management and biodiversity conservation as part of a two-day event jointly hosted by CEPF and the AFD Dominican Republic office on 8-9 December, 2014. More than 50 key stakeholders from civil society, government, donor agencies and local communities came together in Santo Domingo on 8 December, 2014 to share experiences and evaluate best practices and lessons learnt from biodiversity conservation projects being implemented by civil society with the aim of identifying challenges and opportunities for present and future action. CEPF grantees who presented their work included CAD, SOH, PRONATURA, INTEC, Grupo Jaragua and KIUNZI. They focused on sharing how they are using innovative methods and approaches to improve management effectiveness of protected areas in the country, supporting and enhancing ecosystem services from protected areas, taking bi-national action for biodiversity conservation on Hispaniola, and promoting effective communication. Participants also had an opportunity to see one CEPF grantee's work (PRONATURA) in the field on 9 December, 2014 during a visit to La Humeadora National Park, where PRONATURA demonstrated how they have been ensuring participatory management of a critical protected area in the country along with local community and government partners.
- The [Mid-Term Evaluation workshop](#) on 10-12 July, 2013 and associated, activities, notably the field visit to the Caribbean Coastal Area Management (CCAM) Foundation's CEPF project area in the Portland Ridge KBA on 13 July, 2013 afforded an opportunity for sharing of experiences and exchange of information. This was supported with complementary funding from the MacArthur Foundation.
- In Haiti, the RIT Country Coordinator encouraged four grantees (OPDFM, the Philadelphia Zoo, AVSF and IIF) to meet and discuss their projects, resulting in greater coordination of efforts. The Country Coordinator participated in a meeting in Philadelphia on 26 September, 2012 hosted by the Philadelphia Zoo between key players from the Philadelphia Zoo, the Pennsylvania State University, the Government of Haiti, and local Haitian organisations including Société Audubon Haiti and Quisqueya University to devise a long term collaborative plan to conserve Haiti's vanishing amphibian diversity. The main purpose of the meeting was to create a Strategic Plan for the Conservation of Critically Endangered frogs of Haiti. It was critical that CEPF, through the RIT, was represented and participated in this meeting as it helped to inform future CEPF investments as well as coordination among grantees working in the priority KBAs in the country. The RIT Country Coordinator for Haiti facilitated dialogue between CEPF grantees within Haiti and the Dominican Republic as well as between grantees and the local and central governments.

**3.5.** The RIT developed and disseminated the following products, some in collaboration with grantees and the CEPF Secretariat, to document results and lessons learned during CEPF projects:

- [Fourteen issues of Capacité](#), the CEPF Caribbean quarterly e-newsletter published in English, French and Spanish. Grantees contributed articles to each issue of the newsletter to provide updates on project progress and to share results and lessons learned that could be adapted and/ or incorporated into existing and new projects.
- Five case studies on CEPF Caribbean projects in English (see Product/ Deliverable 3.8 below for details).
- CANARI Policy Brief #22: Effective support for Caribbean civil society for biodiversity conservation and rural development: Results and recommendations from the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund 2010 – 2016. This policy brief was published in [English](#), [French](#) and [Spanish](#).
- CANARI Policy Brief #23: Effective grant-making to Caribbean civil society: Lessons and innovation from CANARI's experience as an intermediary organisation. This policy brief was published in [English](#), [French](#) and [Spanish](#).
- 50 project posters were created in English, French and Spanish ([Attachment 6](#)) and displayed at the cocktail events in each of the three countries where the final assessment was held.
- [The Final Report on the CEPF Caribbean Logframe](#) published in English, which documents the key achievements of the portfolio from 2010 to 2016 against the original investment targets.
- The RIT contributed to the [CEPF Annual Portfolio Overview for the Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot: October 2010 – December 2011](#) which was authored by the CEPF Secretariat.
- The RIT contributed to the [CEPF Annual Portfolio Overview for the Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot: July 2013 – September 2014](#) which was authored by the CEPF Secretariat.
- CEPF's Civil Society Tracking Tool (CSTT) was already available in English, French and Spanish and was translated into Haitian Kreyol by a CEPF Caribbean grantee, the International Iguana Foundation ([Attachment 7](#)).
- Listing of all the CEPF Caribbean small and large projects including summary actions for each grant produced in [English](#), [French](#) and [Spanish](#).
- The RIT helped to disseminate several products from grantees over the portfolio period via direct email to stakeholders and via CANARI's Facebook page, including for example:
  - [Estudio de biodiversidad en el Monumento Manuel Domingo Fuerte](#), a biodiversity study published by CEPF grantees in the Dominican Republic, IDDI and SOH
  - [Experiencias en la Gestión de los Servicios Ecosistémicos en Centroamérica y el Caribe](#), published by CEPF grantees and key partners in the Dominican Republic.
  - Panos Caribbean's online database, the [Panos Information Portal](#)
  - Promotion of a webinar hosted by CEPF Grantee, CABI, on the control of invasive species on Cabritos Island
  - Caribbean Airlines magazine (Caribbean Beat) [article](#) on CEPF grantee Environmental Awareness Group and their work in Antigua and Barbuda
  - [Article](#) from one of the Panos Caribbean journalist fellows, Novelette Brooks, highlighting the value of the Cockpit Country in Jamaica

- CEPF grantee Bahamas National Trust's public service announcement to raise awareness of their efforts to declare five new protected areas on the island of San Salvador, including the 2 priority KBAs in their project
- CEPF grantee the Zoological Society of Philadelphia's video on their efforts to investigate the status of amphibians on the island of Hispaniola
- The Conservation Strategy Fund's study "[Economic comparison of alternatives to building a port on Goat Islands](#)"
- The "[Development Alert!](#)" website developed by CEPF grantees, the World Resources Institute (WRI) and Jamaica Environment Trust (JET)
- Report written by WRI and JET "[Environmental Information, Participation and Justice](#)"

The RIT incorporated recommendations made to improve processes of implementing CEPF in region as much as possible. The RIT and the CEPF Secretariat made a lot of effort to ensure that lessons learned were acted upon, especially in the process of issuing calls for proposals, providing feedback to grantees and in the part 2 proposal development process.

- 3.6.** CANARI Policy Brief #23: Effective grant-making to Caribbean civil society: Lessons and innovation from CANARI's experience as an intermediary organisation was developed, translated into French and Spanish, graphically designed and printed.
- 3.7.** CANARI Policy Brief #22: Effective support for Caribbean civil society for biodiversity conservation and rural development: Results and recommendations from the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund 2010 – 2016 was developed in [English](#), translated into [French](#) and [Spanish](#), graphically designed and printed.
- 3.8.** One case study ([Attachment 8](#)) was included in the UNEP State of Biodiversity in Latin America and the Caribbean Report. The case study focused on CEPF grantee, Consorcio Ambiental Dominicano's (CAD's), large grant project in the Dominican Republic. The case study can be seen on page 40 in the full report here: [http://www.unep-wcmc.org/system/comfy/cms/files/files/000/000/734/original/Biodiversity\\_Review\\_LAC.pdf](http://www.unep-wcmc.org/system/comfy/cms/files/files/000/000/734/original/Biodiversity_Review_LAC.pdf)

In addition, UNEP included recommendations that the RIT made on the final draft of the report which included further highlighting the important role that civil society is playing to help contribute towards achievement of the Aichi Targets.

The RIT also submitted four case studies on CEPF Caribbean projects to CARICOM to include in the CARICOM Biodiversity Outlook report which is due to be finalised and published by CARICOM at the end of 2016. These case studies focused on the following:

- 1) Caribbean civil society collaborate to protect offshore islands from invasive species ([Attachment 9](#))
- 2) Participatory protected area policy, planning and management in The Bahamas and Jamaica ([Attachment 10](#))
- 3) The creation of Haiti's first municipal protected area ([Attachment 11](#))
- 4) Role of a regional coordinating mechanism to increase effectiveness of civil society's impact on biodiversity conservation ([Attachment 12](#))

- 3.9.** CANARI presented key results and recommendations from the CEPF Caribbean islands investment in a face-to-face meeting with the OECS Commission on 28 June, 2016 (see [Attachment 13](#) for the slide presentation).

CANARI partnered with the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (UN FAO) to convene a donor roundtable in Barbados on 22 July, 2016 to explore a strategic approach for a coordinated regional programme for biodiversity conservation, building resilience to climate change and disaster risk reduction, sustainable livelihoods and development, and civil society strengthening in the Caribbean. Eight persons representing the donor community and the Barbados government participated in the meeting where results of the first phase of CEPF's investment in the Caribbean were shared, along with best practices for grant-making to Caribbean civil society. The report of the meeting is found at [Attachment 14](#).

A dissemination strategy was developed ([Attachment 15](#)) to help guide the strategic dissemination of the two key communication products, CANARI Policy Brief #22 and CANARI Policy Brief #23 as noted above.

These products were widely disseminated via direct email to 507 CEPF Caribbean stakeholders, uploaded to CANARI's website, and shared via listservs and CANARI's Facebook page. Printed copies of the two policy briefs were also sent to the CEPF Secretariat and all of the GEF Operational Focal Points in the eleven countries that were eligible for CEPF support in the region. Printed copies were also mailed to key target audiences.

Even though it occurred just outside of the grant period, it is worth noting that CANARI also shared the two policy briefs with key stakeholders at two face-to-face meetings – the Caribbean Challenge Initiative/ Caribbean Biodiversity Fund meeting held in Saint Lucia on 19-23 September, 2016, and the IWECO inception meeting held in Jamaica on 20-22 September, 2016.

#### **Component 4 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

##### **Component 4:**

Strategic leadership provided to develop a coherent portfolio of grants that effectively responds to each strategic direction and the investment priorities identified in the ecosystem profile, takes advantage of opportunities for drawing and building on existing work of the RIT and others in the region, facilitates coordination for increased impact, and complements and leverages investments by other donors.

##### **Planned Products/ Deliverables:**

- 4.1.** Face-to-face or videoconference meetings with CEPF Secretariat to discuss portfolio development held at inception and annually thereafter for the duration of the project.
- 4.2.** Database on work being conducted under other grant programmes relevant to conservation priorities identified in the ecosystem profile developed within three months of the project and maintained for the duration of the project.

- 4.3. Gaps in addressing the conservation priorities identified in the ecosystem profile identified and appropriate civil society organisations encouraged to submit applications to address these gaps within 12 months of the start of the project and at least annually thereafter for the duration of the project.
- 4.4. Communication and collaboration among civil society applicants and grantees promoted where coordination of projects would result in greater overall impacts within three months of approving projects and ongoing as needed.
- 4.5. Information sharing meetings (face-to-face opportunistically or via videoconference) with other donors investing in ecosystem conservation in the Caribbean islands held regularly to plan strategic coordination using existing donor networks (such as the Latin American and the Caribbean Network of Environmental Funds) and ongoing CANARI outreach to donors with RIT input into donor strategies and workplans as invited.
- 4.6. At least US\$2 million in co-financing for individual CEPF projects leveraged by the end of the project.
- 4.7. Commitments of sustained funding for priority conservation actions by civil society beyond the end of the CEPF investment period secured by the end of the project.
- 4.8. Joint event of the CEPF Caribbean, AFD and the French Embassy in the Dominican Republic held in Santo Domingo to promote the work of CEPF in the region and engage current and potential donors.
- 4.9. Small donor event in Jamaica to promote the work of CEPF and engage current and potential donors in the country.

## **11. Describe the results from Component 4 and each product/deliverable**

### **Actual Products/ Deliverables under Component 4**

- 4.1. Apart from the 6-monthly face-to-face meetings that the RIT had with the CEPF Secretariat and additional visits accompanied by CEPF Donors to the region, the RIT Manager and CEPF Grant Director for the region were in touch frequently via email, Skype and phone to discuss portfolio development.
- 4.2. The Donor Landscape Map (**Attachment 16**) was developed within the first few months of the project.
- 4.3. The RIT and CEPF Secretariat worked together to issue calls for proposals that would invite submission of project that were strategically aligned to the ecosystem profile priorities. The RIT had regular discussions with the CEPF Secretariat, especially after each call for proposals had been processed, in order to assess the overall portfolio status and the extent to which each investment priority was being addressed. For example, the first two calls for proposals specifically targeted CSOs in the highest priority countries for CEPF's investment in the Caribbean (Haiti, Dominican Republic and Jamaica).

The RIT and CEPF Secretariat facilitated a stakeholders meeting on 30 March, 2012 in the Massif de la Hotte KBA in Haiti to discuss CEPF's strategy for the area. Although this was one of the highest priority KBAs for CEPF in the region, up to early 2012 proposals had not been successfully submitted to address the conservation priorities in the area. A report of the stakeholders meeting can be seen [here](#). Following the meeting, the RIT issued the fourth call for proposals ([English](#), [French](#)) to invite strategic proposals that would lead to tangible conservation results with local stakeholders.

In addition, gaps in addressing the conservation priorities were identified as part of the mid-term review process that took place in 2013 (see Component 9 for details). The priorities of the [sixth call for proposals](#) (also available in [French](#) and [Spanish](#)) in the Caribbean islands hotspot were then determined by these identified gaps. Information about this call was widely disseminated to stakeholders including through a pre-call announcement that alerted potential applicants to the call. The RIT also engaged in active outreach to potential applicants during the pre-call period.

In 2015, the RIT supported grantees in the Dominican Republic in the process of planning a climate change adaptation workshop that helped CSOs identify and prioritise climate change adaptation actions specific to their areas of work. This resulted in the development of a plan of action focused on addressing capacity gaps in accessing climate finance in the context of biodiversity conservation in the country.

**4.4. Sharing of information, networking and brokering relationships amongst applicants and grantees was facilitated by the RIT wherever possible to promote coordination and collaboration. Efforts included the following:**

- Facilitating face-to-face and virtual meetings amongst applicants during the proposal development process: When reviewing small and large grant LOIs and full proposals, the RIT looked in particular for possible synergies and areas for alignment amongst the applications to see whether collaboration was possible and appropriate. The RIT facilitated meetings (both face-to-face and virtual) between applicants once their LOIs had been approved during the proposal development process. For example, the Caribbean Coastal Area Management Foundation (C-CAM) and the Caribbean Wildlife Alliance (CWA), two grantees that developed large and small grant proposals at the same time, were put in touch by the RIT to ensure that their proposed activities in the Portland Bight Protected Area in Jamaica were coordinated. This resulted in the two projects being well aligned and mutually supportive. CWA's small grant project strategically fed results into the development of the management plans that were drafted under C-CAM's large grant project. Similarly, grantees IDDI, CAD and SOH were introduced by the RIT and coordinated the implementation of their large and small grant projects which focused in the Bahoruco Oriental KBA in the Dominican Republic. In addition, the RIT collaborated with the CEPF Secretariat to facilitate a meeting in Santo Domingo for grantees and partners on 28 March, 2012 to share information and coordinate action where appropriate. Six grantees and applicants who had their proposals in pipeline (CAD, INTEC, SOH, IDDI, FLQE and Grupo Jaragua) presented their projects and the meeting was also used as an opportunity to go over key points on CEPF project implementation.

- Facilitating grantee and partner networking at the CEPF Caribbean mid-term evaluation meetings: The 10-12 July, 2013 regional workshop held in Kingston, Jamaica with grantees and key partners as part of the mid-term evaluation process was an important opportunity for knowledge sharing and networking among grantees. The meeting was attended by 38 participants representing grantees, donors, key partners, and representatives of the RACC. The three national focus group meetings held in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica as part of the mid-term evaluation process also provided opportunities for grantees to come together to share information on their projects with each other, but also with other partners and stakeholders in-country. Participants shared information and gave feedback on how they felt the CEPF programme was working in their country and gave specific recommendations to the RIT and the CEPF Secretariat for moving forward. Participants also noted the benefits of coming together face-to-face from time to time to share information and exchange ideas, especially in Haiti, where this was challenging due to the local travel expenses and distances.
- Facilitating in-country grantee to grantee exchanges: A meeting was held for the members of Rezo Ekolo (a Haitian environmental network) on 28 March 2012 in Port-au-Prince primarily to get an update on how the network was progressing. CEPF grantees - International Iguana Foundation and REPIE - as well as CEPF subgrantee on the Birdlife International project, Societe Audubon Haiti, were present at this meeting along with seven other Rezo Ekolo member organisations.

The RIT also facilitated grantee to grantee meetings in the Dominican Republic in November 2012 and December 2014 for all the grantees based in the country to provide a platform for sharing information and promoting coordination and collaboration.

- Brokering relationships amongst applicants and grantees working in the same KBA: In Haiti, the RIT facilitated discussions among grantees, many of whom had not worked together before (including the Philadelphia Zoo, AVSF, OPDFM, Societe Audubon Haiti and the International Iguana Foundation), as well as with other key partners in government and the donor community. These grantees and partners coordinated efforts in two high priority KBAs in Haiti - Massif de la Hotte and Massif de la Selle. In KBAs in the Dominican Republic (including Loma Quita Espuela, Loma Guaconejo and Loma Humeadora), the RIT supported efforts for grantees such as CAD, FLQE, SODIN, INTEC and PRONATURA to share information and best practices on ecosystem valuations and payment for ecosystem services.
- Arranging 'new grantee' induction sessions: The RIT planned and facilitated grantee induction sessions which were useful in not only giving new grantees an orientation of CEPF and their contract requirements, but in bringing grantees together face-to-face or virtually.
- Facilitating capacity building workshops for grantees: In September 2013, the RIT Country Coordinator in the Dominican Republic, with support from members of CEPF grantee, *Instituto Dominicano de Desarrollo Integral* (IDDI) (translated as the Dominican Institute for Comprehensive Development), co-facilitated a [workshop](#) designed to strengthen capacities of CSOs in sustainable financing. Representatives from 15 CSOs

working in biodiversity conservation shared experiences and lessons on the most effective ways to improve their organisation's visibility to attract funding, sustainable management of funds and diversification of funding sources. Ten out of the 15 CSOs in attendance were beneficiaries of CEPF small or large grants. This activity was supported by complementary funding from the MacArthur Foundation.

In April 2014, the RIT Country Coordinator in Jamaica, in collaboration with Panos Caribbean, a CEPF grantee, facilitated a [workshop](#) to apply the action learning methodology to promote continued sharing and learning in communication on biodiversity conservation while drawing on the experience and expertise of the group. The workshop also sought to provide an enabling environment for the realisation of goals crafted under Panos' CEPF-funded project: *Strengthening the Engagement of Caribbean Civil Society in Biodiversity Conservation through Local and Regional Networking and Effective Sharing of Learning and Best Practices*.

- Facilitating action learning group sessions: The RIT Country Coordinators in Jamaica and the Dominican Republic led processes to strengthen networking among CSOs through the establishment of national Action Learning Groups (ALGs) in their countries. This effort was supported under CANARI's complementary grant from the MacArthur Foundation and was an opportunity to bring people together to discuss biodiversity conservation issues at a country level in an action learning approach. The first of these groups was established in the [Dominican Republic in June 2012](#), and involved the participation of 25 representatives of 19 groups. [The first meeting of the national ALG in Jamaica](#) was held in February 2013, and was attended by 20 NGOs and CBOs.

These first two meetings introduced CSO representatives in attendance to the action learning process, and provided an opportunity for organisations working on similar issues to share experiences and lessons learnt. In the Dominican Republic, organisations identified specific ways in which they could assist each other depending on their strength in particular areas, such as financial monitoring or communication and advocacy. In Jamaica, participants identified key challenges and barriers to the effectiveness of CSOs with a biodiversity conservation mandate. In particular, it was noted that networking among CSOs and the need for opportunities to do so in a more systematic manner should be a priority.

**4.5. The RIT and CANARI at large coordinated and shared information with other donors investing in ecosystem conservation in the Caribbean islands through the following means:**

Inputting into development of other donor strategies and workplans

CANARI inputted into the development of the GEF regional project, "Integrating Water, Land and Ecosystems Management in Caribbean Small Island Developing States (IWeco)". This is a \$20M, four-year project that will be implemented in nine Caribbean islands: Antigua and Barbuda, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Grenada and Barbados. The project will contribute to the preservation of Caribbean ecosystems that are of global significance and the sustainability of livelihoods through the application of existing proven technologies and approaches that are appropriate for small island developing states through improved fresh and coastal water resources management, sustainable land management and forest management that also

seek to enhance resilience of socio-ecological systems to the impacts of climate change. The project is being managed by UNEP's Caribbean Environment Programme (UNEP-CEP) and CANARI is earmarked for a role in implementation that will focus on supporting participation of civil society and local communities in biodiversity conservation, climate change and sustainable forestry. A small grants component has also been included and the CEPF Caribbean investment was recognised as a complementary project.

The RIT held discussions with the IUCN BIOPAMA regional project for the Caribbean to identify avenues for collaboration. BIOPAMA expressed interest in supporting CEPF Caribbean initiatives on a case-by-case basis. CANARI collaborated with BIOPAMA in 2015 to [design and develop a training course for terrestrial protected area managers in the Caribbean](#) and CEPF grantees and government partners from Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Saint Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines participated in the course.

CANARI's work with the MacArthur Foundation provided a close link between some of their work in the region and CEPF's investment. The mentor programme which CANARI developed under its [complementary MacArthur Foundation project](#) directly supported CEPF's strategy and capacity building efforts in the region. The RIT also participated in a MacArthur Grantees meeting held in Port-au-Prince on 9-10 February, 2011 which further facilitated information sharing with the MacArthur Foundation and their grantees working in Haiti. The CEPF Caribbean launch activities in Haiti were able to successfully 'piggyback' on this meeting whereby the MacArthur grantees and staff of the Foundation were able to participate in the CEPF launch presentation and discussions held on 8 February, 2011 and throughout the week in Haiti.

#### Communicating virtually with donors working on ecosystem conservation in the Caribbean region

The RIT added the CEPF and other donors working in the Caribbean region to its CEPF Caribbean Stakeholder Database so that they received regular email updates on the portfolio's progress throughout the project period. This included issues of the CEPF Caribbean quarterly newsletter, press releases, special reports (such as the CEPF Caribbean mid-term evaluation reports), other communication products such as the CANARI policy briefs developed under this project, news of the grantees' work in their particular countries, as well as posts and updates from the CEPF website.

#### Engaging donors in the CEPF Caribbean mid-term evaluation process and the final evaluation

Donors and other partners with an interest in biodiversity conservation were engaged as part of the mid-term evaluation process via the regional workshop, which was attended by representatives of the Deutsche Gesellschaft für International Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), the Organization of American States (OAS) Secretariat, IUCN - Regional Office for Mesoamerica and the Caribbean, Caribbean Public Health Agency, and Caribbean Research and Management of Biodiversity (CARMABI Foundation).

#### Meeting face-to-face with donors based in CEPF eligible countries in the Caribbean

The RIT arranged several meetings with donors and key partners based in the CEPF eligible countries in the region throughout the portfolio period. These meetings have been

documented in detail in the RIT's 6-monthly performance reports to the CEPF Secretariat and include the RIT meeting with:

- l'Agence Française de Développement (AFD) offices in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and the Regional Coordinator for AFD in the Lesser Antilles, Suriname and Guyana
- European Union (EU)
- EU Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in Territories of European Overseas (BEST) Commission
- Global Environment Facility (GEF) – including the GEF Operational Focal Points and the GEF Small Grants Programme (GEF-SGP)
- World Bank
- Japanese Embassies in Jamaica and Barbados
- French Embassies in the Dominican Republic and Haiti
- Caribbean Development Bank (CDB)
- Inter-American Development Bank (IDB)
- Caribbean Community (CARICOM) Secretariat
- OECS Commission
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
- Die Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
- La Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo (AECID)
- The Nature Conservancy (TNC) Caribbean Challenge Initiative
- Department for International Development (DFID) Caribbean
- Centre for Resource Management and Environmental Studies (CERMES) of the University of the West Indies
- Canadian High Commission, Barbados
- Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership (JCCCP), UNDP Barbados and the OECS
- USAID

The Dominican Republic was the most opportunistic country for this level of donor engagement due to the presence of CEPF and other donor staff as well as expressed interest on their part. Efforts to do similar outreach in other countries (Jamaica for example), were not as fruitful due in some part to the lack of relevant in-country staff to engage.

#### Planning and facilitating project site visits for donors

The RIT encouraged grantees to invite donor representatives who expressed interest to their project activities where appropriate and also planned and facilitated site visits for donors upon request. This was an excellent way to demonstrate project achievements and to share information on opportunities and needs.

#### Developing and sharing the Donor Landscape Map (see Product 4.2 for more information)

The Donor Landscape Map was shared directly with the MacArthur Foundation and the Foundations of Success. Foundations of Success is a non-profit organisation facilitating a 10-year funding strategy among various donors in the Caribbean and remarked that the Donor Landscape Map that CANARI prepared under this project was extremely useful as a resource to feed into their strategic planning process. They also expressed interested in building on the work that was done in the mapping exercise to further map donors' work in the region to the level of specific grants (what was funded, where, etc.).

#### Inviting donors and other key partners to be on the Regional Advisory Committee for CEPF (RACC)

RACC members included the UNDP GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP) National Coordinator for the Dominican Republic, the UNDP GEF-SGP Sub-Regional Coordinator for the OECS, a Forestry Officer from the UN FAO, Director of the Regional Activity Centre for the Special Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) Protocol, and a Programme Specialist from UNDP Dominican Republic who had responsibility for the implementation of GEF projects in country.

#### Participating in relevant donor meetings and events at the national and regional level to share information and coordinate actions

RIT members participated in a number of donor meetings and events throughout the project period which were excellent opportunities to share information and results on the CEPF Caribbean programme. These meetings included for example, the following:

- A meeting of UNDP GEF SGP Country Coordinators where CANARI presented on the CEPF Caribbean programme, among other CANARI projects. Interest was particularly expressed in supporting use of Participatory 3D Modelling (P3DM) and communication tools.
- A meeting hosted by UNDP on their national GEF project “Reingeniería del Sistema de Areas Protegidas RD”, which was a good opportunity to share information on CEPF and to get an overview of the status of national protected areas and management needs.
- Meeting between the Joint Virtual Clusters and the CARICOM Committee of Ambassadors on Implementation of CARICOM’s Strategic Plan for the Caribbean Community
- “Manejo Sustentable Marino y Adaptación al Cambio Climático 2012” in the Dominican Republic hosted by USAID and TNC
- “Perspectiva legales sobre Area Protegidas y Cambio Climático UICN” hosted by UNDP in the Dominican Republic
- “Mecanismos de Financiamiento Sostenible para la Biodiversidad” hosted by Fondo Marena in the Dominican Republic

#### Inviting donors to participate in grantee to grantee exchanges

The GEF Operational Focal Point, AFD representatives, World Bank representatives and other key donors participated in grantee to grantee exchanges facilitated by the RIT in the Dominican Republic.

#### Facilitating a donor roundtable

The RIT planned and facilitated a donor roundtable in Barbados on 22 July, 2016 to explore a strategic approach for a coordinated regional programme for biodiversity conservation, building resilience to climate change and disaster risk reduction, sustainable livelihoods and development, and civil society strengthening in the Caribbean. See results under Product 3.9 for details.

- 4.6.** CANARI’s efforts to fundraise to support individual CEPF projects was done through two main approaches – firstly, through development of proposals to seek complementary or follow-up funding for CEPF-supported activities and secondly, through brokering

relationships between CEPF grantees and donors and facilitating spaces for grantees to have a direct platform to access interested donors in the region.

CANARI's proposal development efforts and results:

- CANARI received a [complementary grant from the MacArthur Foundation](#) for a total amount of \$475,000 of which \$375,000 was captured as co-financing for the CEPF Caribbean programme and used to support CANARI's role as the RIT. The grant supported a project to help strengthen the role of civil society in biodiversity conservation in the region. See Product 5.2 for more information on the mentor programme that was supported through this grant. Three relevant communication products were developed through funding support from this grant and shared with CEPF grantees and partners:
  - [CANARI Policy Brief #16 - "Are we there yet? Using participatory monitoring and evaluation to assess real results in the Caribbean"](#).
  - [CANARI Policy Brief #18 - "Data and information for effective protected area management in the Caribbean: tools and approaches"](#).
  - [CANARI Toolkit - "Facilitating participatory natural resource management: A toolkit for Caribbean managers"](#) (also available in French and Spanish).
- CANARI received two grants from the IUCN BIOPAMA for a total amount of \$31,000 to [design and deliver a training course for terrestrial protected area managers in the Caribbean region](#). CEPF grantees and government partners from Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, Saint Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines participated in the course.
- CANARI planned and facilitated a [protected areas study tour in Trinidad for Haitian government agencies and key partners](#) in June, 2015 which was supported by UNDP Haiti for a total amount of \$10,410. The study tour enhanced the awareness and understanding of senior Haitian government officials and their key partners responsible for protected areas in Haiti about different protected area management systems and arrangements and the benefits of co-management arrangements. A CEPF grantee working in the Massif de la Selle KBA participated in the study tour along with members of the National Protected Area Agency.
- In October 2012, CANARI facilitated a [regional training of trainers in participatory three-dimensional modelling \(P3DM\)](#) which was funded by the Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Co-operation ACP-EU (CTA) for \$82,250. This is a useful tool for protected area / land use management planning and there is wide interest in expanding training throughout the region.
- CANARI received a grant from the Caribbean Public Health Agency (CARPHA) and GIZ for \$49,190 to implement a Participatory Three-Dimensional Modelling (P3DM) exercise for the Soufriere-Scotts head watershed and coastal and marine protected area in Dominica for the project "[Adaptation of Rural Economies and Natural Resources to Climate Change](#)".
- In June, 2016, CANARI submitted a proposal to the EU to implement a €1.9M, four-year project titled, "Civil society and small and micro enterprise innovation for marine and coastal conservation in the Caribbean" to be implemented in ten countries: Antigua and Barbuda, The Bahamas, Dominica, Grenada, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, and Trinidad and Tobago. The project aims to build on the results and address recommendations

of the first phase of the CEPF Caribbean programme (as well as other regional initiatives) and CANARI as the lead implementer will partner with three CEPF grantees in Antigua and Barbuda, Haiti and Jamaica as well as the Caribbean Network of Fisherfolk Organisations (CNFO) to implement actions. CANARI was informed that it was successful in this application in October 2016 and implementation is expected to start in early 2017.

- CANARI submitted other proposals relevant to and in support of the CEPF Caribbean programme (some in collaboration with CEPF grantees) but these were unsuccessful:
  - Expression of Interest to the Caribbean Community Climate Change Centre (CCCCC) to be the Implementation Consultant for the Coastal Protection for Climate Change Adaptation in the Small Island States in the Caribbean Project.
  - Proposal to Norad in collaboration with Panos Caribbean, "Putting people closer to the centre of forest governance in Haiti". The proposed long-term impact was enhanced forest governance in Massif de la Selle Biosphere Reserve, Haiti. The aim was for national and local CSOs to have strengthened capacity to participate in governance for climate, environment and development actions.
  - A joint proposal to USAID for MPA strengthening in Haiti (Three Bays), Dominican Republic (Monte Cristi), Jamaica (Negril) and Antigua (North East Management Area). This proposal was submitted by the University of Rhode Island, CERMES, CANARI, FoProBim, the Environmental Awareness Group, and AgroFrontera.
  - Proposal to the Darwin Initiative Round 21 to strengthen participatory planning and management of protected areas in Haiti. This proposed project set out to support and partner with two CEPF grantees in Haiti working in Massif de la Selle and Caracol Bay.

The RIT's efforts in brokering relationships between grantees and donors included, for example:

- See Products 3.4, 3.9, 4.5, 4.8, 4.9 and 9.7 for information on donor related events and efforts to broker relationships between grantees and potential donors that the RIT arranged in collaboration with the CEPF Secretariat.
- The RIT supported the dialogue between the Spanish Cooperation (AECID), the Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources in the Dominican Republic and CSOs including IDDI, SOH, CAD and IDEAC about management planning and follow up funding for the Bahoruco Oriental KBA. These talks resulted in AECID co-funding infrastructure in the KBA.
- The RIT supported the planning and facilitation of three cocktail events held in Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Jamaica during the CEPF Caribbean final assessment in November 2015 which were very effective in engaging donors, government and the media. The French Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, the Head of AFD in the Dominican Republic, the Japanese Embassy in Jamaica and Haiti, the World Bank Country Manager for Jamaica, Head of Operations for the EU Delegation in Haiti, and several other key donor representatives were all in attendance. Donors in each country gave remarks at the cocktail event and had an opportunity to speak one-on-one with grantees in a casual setting. This was well received and helped to start

conversations between donors and grantees on a one-on-one basis, for example in Jamaica where three grantees had follow up meetings with the Japanese Embassy. The RIT Country Coordinator in Jamaica attended these follow-up meetings to support the grantees.

- 4.7.** Opportunities and needs for sustained funding were communicated to donors, government and private sector entities by the RIT to support priority conservation actions beyond the end of CEPF's first phase of funding through various avenues including: face-to-face meetings with key partners and donors in-country and at regional events that took place throughout the RIT project period; ensuring the participation of key partners and donors in both the mid-term and final evaluations where opportunities and needs for sustained funding were specifically discussed; and through developing and disseminating key communication products (such as CANARI Policy Briefs #22 and #23) which present the results achieved by the portfolio and priorities and recommendations for follow up support.

The RIT believes that its efforts in this regard contributed to CEPF announcing in July, 2016 that it would be supporting a second phase of funding for the Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot during 2017 to 2022.

- 4.8.** A one-day meeting was held with AFD-Dominican Republic in Santo Domingo on 8 December, 2014 to promote CEPF's results in the region, primarily the results achieved in the Dominican Republic, to current and potential donors. Over 50 stakeholders participated in this successful event. A field visit to La Humeadora National Park in the Dominican Republic was facilitated for AFD, the French Embassy and other donors and government partners in the country on 9 December, 2014. This was a key event that engaged and directly involved stakeholders including CEPF grantees, donors, government partners, local community members and project beneficiaries for the purpose of sharing information and experiences on CEPF's investments in the country. The event also had the added benefit of donor outreach and promotion of CEPF as an important investment for biodiversity conservation and sustainable development. Grantees based in the Dominican Republic enjoyed the opportunity of presenting their work first hand to a CEPF donor (AFD) and to their civil society partners. The field visit to La Humeadora was also a wonderful opportunity for stakeholders to visit a project site and see the results of a CEPF grantee's (PRONATURA's) project.

- 4.9.** The Jamaica Country Coordinator met with donors based in country (including the Japanese Embassy, World Bank, Canadian International Development Agency and GIZ) to assess their interest in having an event of some kind with CEPF grantees, as well as to understand if there are any opportunities for collaboration and/ or funding. The RIT and CEPF Secretariat eventually agreed that any such donor event should be strategic and linked to the final assessment activities that took place in Jamaica in November, 2015.

#### **Component 5 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

##### **Component 5:**

Targeted support provided to civil society organisations with design, management, monitoring, and reporting on conservation actions and incorporating lessons learnt from successful

conservation activities into developing and implementing existing and new projects on a needs basis through advisory, training and mentoring programmes

**Planned Products/ Deliverables:**

- 5.1.** Advisory system to assist CEPF applicants and awardees established within four months of the start of the project and RIT providing hands-on assistance with project design, management, monitoring, and reporting to requests from civil society organisations as needed.
- 5.2.** If additional funding is secured, regional pool of trainers/mentors from each of the 11 countries selected as CEPF priorities holding national training workshops and providing support to civil society organisations in their countries with design, management, monitoring, and reporting on CEPF grants.

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

**Actual Products/ Deliverables under Component 5**

- 5.1.** The RIT provided hands-on assistance to small and large grant applicants and grantees throughout the investment period including through the following efforts:

Support provided by the RIT to applicants:

- During the CEPF Caribbean launch activities in January - February 2011, the RIT facilitated 2 workshops (in the Dominican Republic and Jamaica) for CSOs to explain the CEPF application process, the LOI form, and to provide applicants with tips on proposal design and help applicants to identify how their ideas could fit under CEPF's strategy. These workshops especially targeted those organisations whose work focused in the CEPF-identified priority KBAs.
- The RIT developed internal guidelines on the process for providing advice to applicants. When a request for information or advice on a draft LOI was made, the RIT (including the relevant Country Coordinators) immediately responded. The RIT advised applicants on the CEPF application process and reiterated CEPF's investment strategy for the Caribbean. The RIT advised applicants to read the Ecosystem Profile, to look closely at CEPF's and CANARI's websites for additional information and to pay close attention to how their proposal could meet CEPF's conservation outcomes.
- Development of a document "Tips for Preparing a CEPF Letter of Inquiry" in [English](#), [French](#) and [Spanish](#) which was uploaded to CANARI's website and links included in all Call for Proposal documents.
- Provision of support to large grant applicants during the design of their projects during the Part 2 proposal development process on how best to address the comments and recommendations of the proposal reviewers, and in how to understand and complete the application forms and contract documentation. Recommendations were made in the national focus group sessions and regional mid-term evaluation workshop on how to make the process of Part 2 proposal development smoother. These recommendations are documented in the reports of the focus group sessions ([Report of the Dominican Republic national focus group](#))

[meeting, Report of the Jamaica national focus group meeting, Report of the Haiti national focus group meeting](#)) and the [Report of the regional workshop](#).

- Conducting pre-project site visits in cases where it was beneficial for the applicant to meet with the RIT face-to-face to get support with their application.
- Refinement of small grant proposals for contracting (once the LOI had been approved).

Support provided by the RIT to grantees:

- Provision of technical and administrative advice on implementation of activities, including ensuring that grantees understood and followed CEPF policies and procedures (such as the procurement and conflict of interest policies).
- Participation in grantee activities as and when appropriate, for example, the three RIT Country Coordinators participated in one-day workshops held by Conservation International CSP in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica where Conservation Agreements were introduced. It was important that the RIT was involved so that it could have supported follow-up efforts where grantees expressed an interest in exploring this model.
- Review of draft project documents from grantees to provide comments and recommendations where appropriate (for example with terms of reference for consultancies, consultancy contracts, financial administration and technical plans such as draft management plans for protected areas) to ensure documents were in line with CEPF policies and procedures.
- Meetings with government partners in support of grantee activities. For example, in the Dominican Republic, the RIT Country Coordinator had several phone calls and face-to-face meetings with staff in the Environment Ministry to support in-country grantees in ensuring strong linkages with the government's needs and agenda and also to encourage movement within the Ministry as far as possible with the approval and/ or endorsement of management plans and actions for protected areas.
- Review of draft performance and financial reports. A lot of time was spent supporting grantees with the submission of budget and performance reports in CEPF's online reporting system, GEM. Assisting grantees with filling in sections of the reports correctly and supporting some grantees with their Detailed Transaction Reports was a key area of work.
- Capacity building of grantees, for example in advance of the Mid-Term Evaluation regional workshop in Jamaica, the RIT hosted a [training session to build the capacity of grantees in financial management and reporting](#) on 9 July, 2013. Representatives of 15 grantee organisations participated in the workshop, which was supported with complementary funding from the MacArthur Foundation.
- See Product 5.2 for information on the support provided to grantees by the regional pool of mentors that the RIT set up.
- Support with seeking and processing project amendments, where necessary.
- Guidance to grantees in the project close-out process.
- Brokering national and regional-level communication and introductions to donors to garner support for complementary and follow up activities. The RIT also accompanied grantees to meetings with donors when the opportunity arose.

5.2. CANARI secured funding from the MacArthur Foundation for a \$475,000 project titled [“Consolidating the role of civil society in biodiversity conservation in the Caribbean islands”](#).

This project was designed to support the CEPF investment by: strengthening the ability of CANARI to perform the RIT role and strategically link this with its other work; and helping to build the capacity of CSOs to design relevant projects, successfully apply for CEPF and other grants, effectively and efficiently implement projects, and share lessons learnt.

CANARI established a pool of mentors based across the 11 countries eligible for CEPF support, recognising that CSOs would need additional hands-on support to develop applications and manage grants under the CEPF Caribbean islands programme. In particular, this was seen to be important in the eight countries where the RIT did not have a staff person based: Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Bahamas, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia, St. Kitts and Nevis and St. Vincent and the Grenadines.

Mentors selected were persons who CANARI had previously interacted with from a mix of government agencies, regional agencies, CSOs, and academic institutes. They are based in the Caribbean islands and have competencies (skills, knowledge, and experience) in:

- natural resource management and building sustainable natural resource-based livelihoods;
- project identification and development, proposal writing, project management (including monitoring and evaluation) and communication;
- providing capacity building through training, coaching and mentoring to CSOs.

Twenty mentors representing the 11 CEPF countries plus Trinidad and Tobago attended an [orientation workshop](#) held in October 2011 in St. Vincent. The CEPF Grant Director for the Caribbean also attended the workshop. The workshop was very participatory in nature and confirmed the willingness of the mentors to help build the capacity of civil society to play a more effective role in biodiversity conservation in their countries. Participants were able to define what mentoring means to them and explored the different capacities that are needed to be an effective mentor. In particular, mentors built and strengthened their capacity in participatory problem analysis and identification, project planning and proposal writing and participatory facilitation. These were seen to be essential competencies in supporting CSOs to effectively access the CEPF programme.

Following this, a [second mentors workshop](#) was facilitated in July 2012 for 15 mentors from 10 countries. Participants built on the process of action learning for effective mentoring that they were introduced to in the first mentor workshop and had an opportunity to use the approach to solve specific problems and challenges they had been encountering in their roles as mentors. In particular, mentors built and strengthened their capacity in doing community needs assessments, understanding the different stages of NGO development, conducting monitoring and evaluation, and using participatory video as a tool for evaluation. The field visit during the mentor workshop was particularly valuable as a learning experience and validated the need for mentors to increase their capacity in facilitation and the need to be neutral and independent in one’s approach to mentoring. Mentors also evaluated the application of their training since the initial workshop through discussion and the use of participatory video (PV). This latter activity contributed to the testing of PV as a participatory monitoring and evaluation tool and a [participatory video](#) was developed.

The contribution of mentors to building capacity of CSOs was promoted in three issues of the quarterly e-newsletter produced by CANARI about the CEPF Caribbean Islands programme:

- Capacité Issue #1 (June 2012) [Help from a regional pool of mentors is here! p.10-11](#)
- Capacité Issue #2 (September 2012) [Chatting with Fitz - The views of a mentor. p.13](#)
- Capacité Issue #10 (September 2014) [Building the capacity of Caribbean civil society through mentoring. p.12](#)

In 2012 and 2013, a total of 60 participants representing 40 groups (CSOs, community-based organisations [CBOs], government agencies and a few university students) attended national training workshops held by mentors in Antigua and Barbuda, Barbados, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines. CANARI provided technical and logistical support for the workshops, which were designed to build the capacity of CSOs to develop projects on biodiversity conservation in protected areas in the Caribbean islands. These national workshops allowed mentors to use the mentoring skills acquired, focusing especially on proposal development and project planning. Sessions of the workshops focused on the CEPF LOI form in particular as well as the CEPF priority KBAs in-country. Mentors were briefed before the workshops on the scope of the fifth call for proposals (that was issued on 2 July, 2012) in order for them to be able to help guide organisations as to the specific scope and priorities that CEPF was currently trying to address in their countries in particular. Workshops resulted in:

- Analysed priority needs for biodiversity conservation in the country
- Built understanding of CEPF and other funding opportunities for supporting CSO's work in biodiversity conservation
- Enhanced capacity of CSOs to be able to develop projects and proposals to seek support for their work from CEPF and other donors
- Greater sharing of experiences and collaboration among CSOs, including potential collaboration or coordination of projects in biodiversity conservation

See the report of the national training workshops [here](#).

Mentors also assisted grantees with monitoring and evaluating projects. For example, in the Dominican Republic, mentor Santiago Rivas participated in two site visits with the RIT Country Coordinator to help facilitate discussions and to also build his own capacity to help other groups, as he became more familiar with certain CEPF project requirements.

### **Component 6 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

#### **Component 6:**

Internal and external reviews of grant applications conducted under Sub-Grant Mechanism.

#### **Planned Products/ Deliverables:**

**6.1.** Initial RIT review of LOIs and proposals under Sub-Grant Mechanism conducted within 1 week of submission of each.

**6.2.** Technical and financial review of all LOIs and proposals under Sub-Grant Mechanism conducted by the RIT and at least two experts from the technical review team within three weeks of submission of each.

- 6.3. Feedback on LOIs provided to project applicants for small grants under Sub-Grant Mechanism within four weeks of each submission.
- 6.4. Successful small grant projects (up to \$20,000) under Sub-Grant Mechanism announced under Sub-Grant Mechanism, contracting completed and documentation submitted to the CEPF Secretariat within ten weeks of submission of LOIs.
- 6.5. Projects under Sub-Grant Mechanism screened to identify any environmental and social effects of the project and define any safeguard requirements necessary in accordance with CEPF policies.

### **13. Describe the results from Component 6 and each product/deliverable**

#### **Actual Products/ Deliverables under Component 6**

- 6.1. The RIT conducted an initial review of LOIs and proposals submitted under the Sub-Grant Mechanism (i.e. the small grants) within one week of submission of each, for the seven calls for proposals that were issued. RIT members completed scorecards for each LOI that was reviewed to provide systematic feedback to the CEPF Secretariat. Information in each scorecard included the RIT's recommendations on if and how a proposal could be improved and identification of linkages to other proposals and grants where applicable.
- 6.2. The RIT conducted a technical and financial review of all LOIs and proposals under Sub-Grant Mechanism, with at least two RACC members and/ or independent technical experts reviewing each LOI that met the basic eligibility criteria, within three weeks of submission of each.
- 6.3. The RIT provided feedback on LOIs to project applicants for small grants under Sub-Grant Mechanism within four weeks of each submission.
- 6.4. 29 successful small grant projects (up to \$20,000) under the Sub-Grant Mechanism were announced, contracting completed and documentation uploaded to CEPF's online Grant Management system (GEM) within ten weeks of submission of LOIs. All documentation for each of the 29 small grants can be found and accessed by the CEPF Secretariat in GEM.
- 6.5. All 29 projects under Sub-Grant Mechanism were screened to identify any environmental and social effects of the project in accordance with CEPF policies. No small grants contracted by the RIT triggered any safeguards.

#### **Component 7 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

##### **Component 7:**

Internal and external reviews of grant applications conducted on applications for larger grants (> \$20,000).

##### **Planned Products/ Deliverables:**

- 7.1. Initial RIT review of LOIs and proposals conducted within 1 week of receipt.

- 7.2. Technical and financial review of all LOIs and full proposals conducted by RIT and at least two experts (RACC members and other experts as needed) within three weeks of submission of each.
- 7.3. Risk assessment conducted, justification and summary prepared and final recommendations on issuing grants submitted to CEPF Secretariat one week after final response to applicant and final proposal adjustments.

#### **14. Describe the results from Component 7 and each product/deliverable**

##### **Actual Products/ Deliverables under Component 7**

- 7.1. In advance of the LOI review period for each call for proposals, the CEPF Secretariat and the RIT worked together to devise a timetable for the review process. The RIT conducted its initial review of all LOIs submitted for large grants according to this agreed upon timetable for each call for proposals. This initial review served the purpose of firstly selecting all LOIs that met the basic eligibility criteria and then secondly, to coordinate which RACC members and other independent technical reviewers were best suited to review the eligible LOI submissions.
- 7.2. Following from deliverable 7.1 above, the RIT conducted full technical and financial reviews of each LOI submission for a large grant by completing a scorecard based on CEPF's criteria for funding and taking into consideration the specific requirements and strategic priorities of the call for proposals. Each eligible LOI was reviewed by at least two RACC members and/or other technical experts who also completed scorecards. All the scorecards were submitted to the CEPF Secretariat and also uploaded to CEPF's online grant management system (GEM).
- 7.3. Conference calls were held between the RIT, the CEPF Caribbean Grant Director and other senior CEPF management staff members to make decisions on all LOIs submitted and to discuss the RIT's recommendations (which included the recommendations that came from the RACC and other technical reviewers) for which large grant LOIs should have moved onto the part 2 proposal development phase.

Programmatic risk assessments and justifications were completed for proposals that were contracted. It was then agreed upon in the April 2012 monitoring visit by the CEPF Secretariat that project summaries for all large grant proposals would be completed by the Secretariat.

#### **Component 8 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

##### **Component 8:**

CEPF investments monitored and evaluated at grant and portfolio levels.

##### **Planned Products/ Deliverables:**

- 8.1. Performance and compliance monitoring of grants conducted in accordance with the CEPF Performance Monitoring Manual (including monitoring of environmental and social safeguards and mitigation actions in accordance with CEPF policies).

- 8.2.** Regular project site visits conducted by CANARI and/or members of the RACC as agreed with the CEPF Grant Director, to project sites over the course of the project and additional project site visits made opportunistically when CANARI is in the country to monitor implementation, and trip reports submitted to the CEPF Secretariat.
- 8.3.** Assessments of the investment portfolio conducted in accordance with the CEPF Performance Monitoring Manual.
- 8.4.** Data collected from large and small grant final reports for CEPF's global monitoring efforts, including from METTs and Civil Society Tracking Tools (CSTTs) and inputted into CEPF's Monitoring Indicators database.

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

**Actual Products/ Deliverables under Component 8**

- 8.1.** The RIT monitored all grants in the portfolio in accordance with the CEPF Performance Monitoring Manual. The RIT's primary responsibilities as outlined in this manual include:
- Partnering with the CEPF Grant Director to facilitate strong performance in achievement of the ecosystem profile;
  - Leading on performance and compliance monitoring of all grants;
  - Managing compliance for data collection of the GEF Tracking Tools (also known as the 'METTs');
  - Preparing the Portfolio Monitoring Plan;
  - Preparing the Annual Performance Report on the Logframe;
  - Supporting the CEPF Grant Director in organizing participatory assessments at the mid-point and end of grant-making.

The RIT completed the following to fulfil the above responsibilities:

Partnering with the CEPF Grant Director to facilitate strong performance in achievement of the ecosystem profile

The RIT worked very closely with the CEPF Grant Director to regularly monitor performance at the portfolio level. This included tracking the portfolio-level budget to ensure that investments being made were strategic and reflected the priorities as set out in the Ecosystem Profile. For example, the 17 highest priority KBAs as identified in the Ecosystem Profile were located in three countries (the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica) and so it was important for the RIT and CEPF Secretariat to track proposal approvals and project budgets to ensure that overall investments in the region were proportional to this prioritisation. It was also important to track the portfolio's investments on a regular basis in order to identify emerging gaps and to make informed decisions about what future calls for proposals should focus on to help fill these gaps.

Support to applicants in the proposal design process

The RIT worked closely with applicants whose LOIs had been approved to design projects that had clear indicators and targets that could be easily measured and assessed. This support also included the RIT visiting and speaking with project partners (such as the government) to ensure proposed project activities were well aligned and coordinated locally and nationally. For example, the Haitian Country Coordinator provided support to small and

large grant applicants CODE, OGPARG, REPIE, Fondation Macaya, Société Audubon Haiti and FONDTAH in July 2012, which included reviewing draft proposals and meeting with the South Department Director of the Ministry of Environment while visiting the applicants in the Massif de la Hotte KBA to ensure multiple proposals were well coordinated. Similarly, the RIT Country Coordinator for Jamaica visited a part 2 proposal applicant on 29 December, 2012 in the Catadupa KBA in order to see the area, better understand what the applicant was proposing and also help to explain CEPF's suggestions and recommendations for the proposal in moving forward.

#### Conducting orientation sessions for new small and large grantees

Once a proposal had been approved and grantees had received the draft contracts for their projects, the RIT would arrange an orientation session to go through CEPF's policies and procedures, reporting requirements and other key information that would help support smooth project implementation. This was also an opportunity for the new grantees to ask questions and get clarity where needed.

#### Supporting grantees with project implementation to ensure compliance with CEPF policies

The RIT worked closely with grantees to provide advice on the implementation of activities to not only ensure that progress was being made, but that CEPF policies and procedures were followed. For example, the RIT reviewed draft consultant contracts and documentation that was needed to adhere to the CEPF procurement policy.

#### Participation in grantee project activities

RIT members participated in grantee activities such as project workshops and training sessions, both as a means to support the grantee partners and to keep track of project progress and provide advice to the grantee when helpful.

#### Supporting grantees in report preparation

The RIT supported grantees via phone and Skype calls, emails and face-to-face meetings in the preparation of their programmatic and financial reports where needed.

#### Reviewing submitted grantee programmatic and financial reports

The RIT reviewed the 6-monthly grantee performance reports (required for large grants) and regular performance reports from small grantees as well as Final Project Completion Reports required from all grantees. Feedback was provided to the CEPF Secretariat on if all the grant reporting requirements had been met (including submission of key documents, METTs and CSTTs) and if the report was completed comprehensively. The RIT also supported grantees in updating drafts of their reports in cases where further clarity and information was required.

#### Collection of CEPF monitoring tools

The RIT collected baseline, mid-term and final monitoring tools including the GEF Tracking Tools (METTs) and the Civil Society Tracking Tools (CSTTs) from grantees. The completed tools were saved in GEM and shared with the CEPF Secretariat.

#### Monitoring of the small grants mechanism

The RIT maintained its small grants database. This included uploading all data to the RIT Small Grants Mechanism GEM entry, where the information is accessible by the CEPF

Secretariat. The RIT found GEM to be a useful online database for a central recordkeeping point for the small grant awards and so all relevant documents including original LOI submissions, programmatic and financial risk assessments, reviewer scorecards, contracts, programmatic and financial reports and key communications were uploaded for each small grant. The RIT submitted its [Final Project Completion Report for the small grants mechanism](#) on 30 November, 2015.

Preparing the Annual Performance Report on the Logframe

See Product/ Deliverable 8.3 below for details.

Planning and facilitating the CEPF Caribbean mid-term evaluation process

See Component 9 for details.

Supporting the planning and facilitation of the CEPF Caribbean final assessment process

See Component 10 for details.

**8.2.** The RIT conducted a total of 86 site visits to small and large grants throughout the portfolio period. Site visit reports were completed for each visit, a draft shared with the grantee for verification and then submitted to the CEPF Secretariat and uploaded to GEM. These 86 site visits do not include the additional visits that the RIT did in collaboration with the CEPF Secretariat on its regular six-monthly monitoring visits to the region where the RIT and CEPF Secretariat team would visit grantees and project sites in-country.

**8.3.** The RIT updated the Report on the CEPF Caribbean Islands Logframe on an annual basis and the [Final Report on the CEPF Caribbean islands Logframe](#) was completed and approved by the CEPF Secretariat on 30 June, 2016. It was uploaded to the CEPF and CANARI websites and has been used by both CEPF and CANARI to communicate key results of the portfolio. The RIT also contributed to the Annual Portfolio Overview reports that were authored by the CEPF Caribbean Grant Director ([Annual Portfolio Overview Report 2010- 2011](#); [Annual Portfolio Overview Report 2013 – 2014](#)).

**8.4.** The RIT collected data from all the large and small grant final reports, including all the METTs and CSTTs that were submitted by grantees and inputted the data into CEPF's Monitoring Indicator's database. This included collecting data on new or revised policies and laws, new partnerships and networks, long-term financing mechanisms and data on beneficiaries from each grant.

**Component 9 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

**Component 9:**

Management and facilitation of the mid-term evaluation of implementation of the CEPF strategy in the Caribbean islands hotspot

**Planned Products/ Deliverables:**

**9.1.** Desk review conducted of key reports (including existing 6-monthly Performance Reports submitted by large grantees and the RIT; reports submitted by small grantees; Annual Portfolio Overview reports and other key material on the portfolio).

- 9.2. Online survey developed and administered to gather information from CEPF applicants, grantees, RACC members, GEF Focal points, key government partners, key donors and other key technical partners conducting biodiversity conservation initiatives in the Caribbean.
- 9.3. Semi-structured interviews conducted with RACC members and mentors to elicit additional information on key achievements, lessons learned and recommendations for the way forward.
- 9.4. Semi-structured interviews conducted with selected CEPF grantees (including those based abroad who will not be able to participate in the focus group meetings or the regional meeting) to elicit additional information on key achievements, lessons learned and recommendations for the way forward.
- 9.5. Three national focus group sessions facilitated –in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica – to bring together CEPF applicants, grantees, RACC members, mentors, GEF Focal Points, key government agencies, and other donors, to facilitate sharing and analysis at the project and national level on results and lessons learned.
- 9.6. Draft report for discussion and analysis prepared, based on the findings of the interviews and focus group meetings.
- 9.7. One 3-day regional evaluation workshop facilitated for key stakeholders to validate results and lessons identified and collated in the draft report.
- 9.8. Draft report of the regional evaluation workshop including key findings on results, lessons and recommendations written and submitted to the CEPF Secretariat to use in the preparation of the CEPF Secretariat- authored report on the mid-term evaluation.
- 9.9. Dissemination of all reports (electronically) to participants in the mid-term evaluation process and key stakeholders identified in the CEPF Caribbean Communication Plan drafted by the RIT. This will include dissemination of the final mid-term assessment report authored by the CEPF Secretariat.

## **16. Describe the results from Component 9 and each product/deliverable**

### **Actual Products/ Deliverables under Component 9**

- 9.1. A desk review was conducted by the RIT, drawing from the following reports submitted by the RIT and CEPF Secretariat reports:
  - The Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot Ecosystem Profile
  - 20 small grant project proposals
  - Small grantee interim progress reports
  - Small grantee Final Project Completion Reports
  - 35 large grant project proposals
  - Large grantee performance reports (submitted on a 6-monthly basis)
  - Large grantee Final Project Completion Reports
  - Annual Portfolio Overview Report October 2010 - December 2011
  - Annual Report on the Logframe October 2010 - December 2011

- Annual Report on the Logframe January 2012 - December 2012
- CEPF-RIT Supervision Mission Report - June 2011
- CEPF-RIT Supervision Mission Report - October 2011
- CEPF-RIT Supervision Mission Report - April 2012
- CEPF-RIT Supervision Mission Report - November 2012 (Draft report)
- Project Site Visit Reports (prepared by the RIT as part of monitoring the portfolio)

The [desk review report](#) was uploaded to CANARI's website and disseminated to stakeholders.

- 9.2.** A written online survey was developed and administered by the RIT between August and September 2013 using Survey Monkey. The survey was provided in English, French and Spanish. Invitations to participate in the survey were sent directly to key stakeholders of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme including all CEPF applicants and grantees, members of the RACC, donors, government partners and other organisations working on biodiversity conservation and sustainable development in the region. Apart from direct email invitation, the RIT posted the opportunity to participate in the survey via the following Caribbean listservs: GLISPA Discuss, BirdsCaribbean and the IUCN Caribbean Members. There were 32 respondents to the survey. A [summary report of findings from the online survey](#) was uploaded to CANARI's website and disseminated to stakeholders.
- 9.3.** The RIT conducted telephone/Skype semi-structured interviews in September 2013 with five RACC members to elicit additional information on key achievements, lessons and recommendations for the way forward.
- 9.4.** The RIT conducted telephone/Skype semi-structured interviews in September 2013 with 11 selected grantees (including those based outside of the region who were not be able to participate in the focus group meetings or the regional workshop) to elicit additional information on key achievements, lessons and recommendations for the way forward. The report of the interviews is considered confidential and therefore was not posted on CANARI's web site.
- 9.5.** Three national focus group sessions were facilitated, the reports of which can be accessed from CANARI's website:
- [Report of the Haiti national focus group session](#) held on 11 June 2013
  - [Report of the Jamaica national focus group session](#) held on 12 June 2013
  - [Report of the Dominican Republic national focus group session](#) held on 14 June 2013
- 9.6.** Draft report for discussion and analysis prepared. The analysis of focus group meetings informed discussions during the three-day regional evaluation workshop described below.
- 9.7.** The [three-day regional workshop](#) was held in Kingston, Jamaica from 10 – 12 July 2013. This was facilitated by six members of the RIT and attended by the three members of the CEPF Secretariat. There were 38 participants representing grantees, donors, key partners, and representatives of the RACC. This workshop had additional objectives focused on facilitating networking for knowledge sharing and enhanced coordination and collaboration among

CEPF grantees and with their partners and potential donors as well as building awareness and commitment of CEPF grantees, synergies and coordination.

9.8. A draft report of the regional workshop and reports of all components of the Mid-Term Evaluation process, including key findings on results, lessons and recommendations, were prepared and submitted to the CEPF Secretariat. A summary report of the mid-term evaluation was also completed in [English](#), [French](#) and [Spanish](#).

9.9. Reports were electronically disseminated to CEPF grantees, GEF Focal Points, RACC members, mentors, donors, and key partners. The following reports of the Mid-Term Evaluation process are available on CANARI's web site:

- [Concept note](#)
- [Mid-term evaluation framework](#)
- [Report of the Dominican Republic national focus group meeting](#)
- [Report of the Jamaica national focus group meeting](#)
- [Report of the Haiti national focus group meeting](#)
- [Report of the mid-term evaluation desk review](#)
- [Summary report of the findings from the online survey](#)
- [Report of the regional workshop](#)
- Summary report of the mid-term evaluation in [English](#), [French](#) and [Spanish](#)

#### **Component 10 (as stated in the approved proposal)**

##### **Component 10:**

Support the Final Assessment of the CEPF Caribbean programme

##### **Planned Products/ Deliverables:**

10.1. Call for proposals issued in English, French and Spanish to contract a grantee(s) to lead on the stakeholder consultations in the DR, Haiti and Jamaica.

10.2. Support provided to amend Rainforest Alliance's current grant with CEPF to include their support in data compilation for the final assessment.

10.3. Invitation list and contacts for in-country appointments provided to the assessment grantee(s) for the stakeholder consultations and in-country meetings with key government and donor partners.

10.4. Input provided to the CEPF Secretariat on the agenda for the stakeholder consultations.

10.5. Input provided to the CEPF Secretariat for the development of a questionnaire (Survey Monkey) on key results and cross-cutting themes.

10.6. Technical review of the pre-workshop document for the stakeholder consultations (document drafted by the CEPF Secretariat).

10.7. Participation in and co-facilitation of the stakeholder consultations in the DR, Haiti and Jamaica.

## **10.8. Final RIT team meeting held**

## **17. Describe the results from Component 10 and each product/deliverable**

### **Actual Products/ Deliverables under Component 10**

**10.1.** The seventh Call for Proposals was issued on 18 March, 2015 with a deadline date of 22 April, 2015. The purpose of the call was to contract an organisation(s) to support the CEPF Secretariat in planning and facilitating the final assessment of the CEPF Caribbean Islands Programme.

The call was translated into French and Spanish and disseminated via CANARI and CEPF's websites, listservs, CANARI's Facebook page and via direct email to all key stakeholders listed in CANARI's stakeholder database. The RIT also issued a pre-call announcement in English, French and Spanish on 6 March, 2015 via the same dissemination avenues as listed above for the main Call.

A total number of eight applications were received (six large grant LOIs and two small grant LOIs). The RIT and CEPF Secretariat reviewed and discussed all applications, completed scorecards and provided responses to all applicants during this period.

The RIT and the CEPF Secretariat agreed upon and finally selected two assessment grantees (KIUNZI and CARIBSAVE) to help plan and facilitate the final assessment activities in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Jamaica.

**10.2.** Support was provided to the Rainforest Alliance to amend their grant with CEPF to include their support in data compilation for the final assessment. Discrete deliverables were identified for them to work on including:

- developing and distributing a questionnaire on key results and cross-cutting themes
- Drafting summaries of the results of each grant in the portfolio
- compiling data on each grant to feed into CEPF's regional and global monitoring systems (e.g. number of communities benefited, etc.)
- Developing case studies of 10 selected projects to be featured on CEPF's website and other fora.

**10.3.** Invitation list and contacts for in-country appointments provided to CARIBSAVE and KIUNZI for the stakeholder consultations and in-country meetings with key government and donor partners.

**10.4.** The RIT manager and three Country Coordinators provided input to the CEPF Secretariat for the agendas for the final consultations in Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Jamaica. Each agenda was slightly different in scope and objectives and activities were adjusted accordingly.

**10.5.** The RIT manager provided comments on the draft questionnaire on key results and cross-cutting themes on 13 October, 2015.

**10.6.** The RIT provided extensive support with planning the final assessment activities in Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Jamaica. Support included:

- participation in several Skype and phone calls to plan the agenda, prepare the facilitation plan, and provide support to CARIBSAVE and KIUNZI in their outreach to stakeholders invited to the assessment activities;
- creation of 50 project posters in English, French and Spanish (**Attachment 6**), which were displayed at the cocktail events in each of the three countries where the final assessment was held;
- preparation of certificates of appreciation which were awarded to 48 grantees, sub-grantees and some key community beneficiaries who participated in the final assessment workshops, presented by CEPF donors and partners at the cocktail events in Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Jamaica;
- support by the Country Coordinators to grantees with preparing their project presentations for the consultations.

**10.7.** The RIT Manager participated in all three stakeholder consultations held in Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Jamaica. The three RIT Country Coordinators co-facilitated the consultations in their countries and the Haitian Country Coordinator also participated in the Dominican Republic-based consultation and site visit.

The RIT also provided support in reviewing press releases and articles that were drafted by Panos Caribbean to promote the results of the final assessment in Haiti and Jamaica.

**10.8.** An RIT team meeting was held in Santo Domingo on 14 November, 2015 with the RIT Manager and the three Country Coordinators (The Jamaica Country Coordinator Skyped into the meeting from Jamaica). The focus of the meeting was to analyse key results and lessons learnt from the RIT experience and to pose recommendations for CANARI moving forward. Recommendations included suggestions that CANARI leverage its five-year role as the RIT and the partnerships it developed with civil society, government and donors across the region. With opportunities to engage more in the Dominican Republic and Haiti, for example under the Green Climate Fund, it was recommended that CANARI follow up with local civil society partners who have expressed interest in working with CANARI on this. In addition, CANARI needs to communicate the capacity it has built as an institution that can coordinate regional level programmes and support civil society's efforts in biodiversity conservation and other related areas. Promoting the model of the RIT is something that is attractive to other donors and CANARI can seek opportunities, such as the European Development Fund (EDF), to expand on this. One of the final communication products under the RIT project (CANARI Policy Brief #23) spoke to the latter recommendation.

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

The RIT completed all project components. The printing of the two CANARI Policy Briefs (see Deliverables 3.6 and 3.7) occurred just outside the RIT project period (in August 2016) but did not affect the overall impact of the project as CANARI still disseminated the documents as planned. As the printing of these communication products occurred outside the project period, CANARI covered the costs which was counted as a co-financing contribution towards the project (see section on Additional Funding below for further information).

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

- [CEPF Caribbean webpage](#) hosted on CANARI’s website
- [Fourteen issues of Capacité](#), the CEPF Caribbean quarterly e-newsletter published in English, French and Spanish
- CANARI Policy Brief 22: “Effective support for Caribbean civil society for biodiversity conservation and rural development: Results and recommendations from the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund 2010 – 2016” available in [English](#), [French](#) and [Spanish](#)
- CANARI Policy Brief 23: “Effective grant-making for Caribbean civil society: Lessons and innovation from CANARI’s experience as an intermediary organisation” available in [English](#), [French](#) and [Spanish](#)
- Tips for Preparing a CEPF Letter of Inquiry in [English](#), [French](#) and [Spanish](#)

**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).

**20. Did your organization complete the CEPF Civil Society Tracking Tool (CSTT) at the beginning and end of your project? Yes/No**

No

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

n/a

**Hectares Under Improved Management**

<b>Project Results</b>	<b>Hectares*</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>22. Did your project strengthen the management of an existing protected area?</b>	n/a	<i>List the name of each protected area</i>
<b>23. Did your project create a new protected area or expand an existing protected area?</b>	n/a	<i>List the name of each protected area, the date of proclamation, and the type of proclamation (e.g., legal declaration, community agreement, stewardship agreement)</i>
<b>24. 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)</b>	n/a	<i>List the name of each key biodiversity area</i>
<b>25. Did your project improve the management of a production landscape for biodiversity conservation</b>	n/a	<i>List the name or describe the location of the production landscape</i>

26. 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

27. 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**

n/a

<i>Did your project provide training or education for . . .</i>	Male	Female	Total	Brief Description
28. Adults for community leadership or resource management positions				
29. Adults for livelihoods or increased income				
30. School-aged children				
31. Other				

32. List the name and approximate population size of any “community” that benefited from the project.

*Community name, surrounding district, surrounding province, country*      *Population size*

n/a

### 33. Socioeconomic Benefits to Target Communities

n/a

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.

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

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

n/a

## Lessons Learned

### **34. 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**

The RIT documented lessons learned about effective grant-making to Caribbean civil society in Policy Brief #23: “Effective grant-making to Caribbean civil society: Lessons and innovation from CANARI’s experience as an intermediary organisation” available in in [English](#), [French](#) and [Spanish](#).

In addition, the RIT documented lessons learned in each 6-monthly project performance report that was submitted to the CEPF Secretariat. These lessons have been summarised below.

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

#### IMPORTANT BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS

Working within the Caribbean region is costly and so in order for the RIT to perform its role effectively, certain budget considerations need to be in place, including in the following areas:

- Communication and outreach: Funds for communications are needed to cover a range of needs including visibility and branding at the very outset of the project. It would have been useful for example, to budget funds for each of the Country Coordinators to have cameras to document site visits and other grantee activities and to importantly capture images that the RIT could use in its larger communication efforts.

It is critical to budget time and resources towards the end of a project to compile data and develop communication products to share results, lessons learned and best practices. The amendment to the RIT project completed in March, 2016 allowed the RIT additional time and resources to prepare important communication products and invest time in doing additional and targeted outreach to key donors. This will go a long way to not only share knowledge, but leverage further resources for civil society's work in biodiversity conservation in the region, including the second phase of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme.

- Time for the RIT to provide technical support to grantees: i.e. not only support with proposal development and monitoring progress of grant implementation, but also time to support the review of consultant contracts, key communication products, draft strategy and action plans, etc.
- Travel: Travel within the Caribbean is costly and must be budgeted for sufficiently. The RIT did not include a travel budget for the 6-monthly monitoring visits that it was required to participate in with the CEPF Secretariat. As these visits (called ‘supervision missions’ by the CEPF Secretariat) occurred every six months and included the need for RIT to spend significant time planning the visits, including handling the logistics of project site visits and meetings with in-country partners, this time needs to be specifically budgeted for. In-country and regional travel to participate in these visits was also not originally budgeted.
- Translation: All key documents within the portfolio should be translated into the languages of the region– in the Caribbean’s case, this included English, French, Spanish and Haitian Kreyol –

and this must be budgeted for accordingly. Having Spanish and French translators who are experienced in translating technical biodiversity conservation and grant management related documents is important to ensure that documents are correctly translated.

#### REGULAR RIT TEAM MEETINGS

With such a large team situated across four different countries in the region (Dominican Republic, Haiti, Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago), it is important to hold regular team meetings to share information at both the country and portfolio levels. This is especially important to facilitate knowledge sharing and effective planning and coordination of the portfolio budget and activities. The RIT held regular meetings virtually and face-to-face wherever possible (by piggybacking on other events).

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

#### CALLS FOR PROPOSALS

- Having one deadline date for receiving both small and large grant LOIs was clearer for applicants, as opposed to having two separate dates for submission.
- At least six weeks should be given to applicants to respond to a call for proposals allowing for sufficient time for applicants to consult with relevant stakeholders, obtain government endorsement where relevant and to prepare a solid LOI.
- Issuing a simple pre-call announcement before the main call is issued helped to mobilise applicants and also added a little more time to the call for proposals process in terms of the amount of time applicants had to prepare their proposals.

#### CLEAR AND PRACTICAL APPLICATION FORMS

The RIT strongly believes that the LOI form should be reformatted to allow for a more practical approach to proposal design, a more logical review of the LOI itself and a more efficient application process on a whole. The RIT often had to request that applicants revise their LOI and provide additional information including a timeline of activities, more details on the budget, etc. In most cases, the RIT had to ask applicants to devise a logical framework that would allow for the RIT's efficient monitoring and evaluating of project results once the project had been signed. If the LOI form incorporated all the necessary components of a project document template and if the components were in a more logical layout, the process of proposal design would be a lot smoother and less time would have to be spent liaising with applicants on multiple proposal drafts.

#### NEED FOR TARGETED OUTREACH TO APPLICANTS

Communication within and across the region is extremely challenging as most countries do not have the bandwidth required to support complex conference calls and/ or Skype. Different islands have different ICT capabilities and capacities and there is still a significant portion of the region where internet access is limited and internet use is irregular. This had implications for how the RIT conducted outreach and communication activities, especially to potential grantees. It was not sufficient for the RIT to use web-based methods only. For example, during the first call for proposals which focused on Haiti and Jamaica, the RIT Country Coordinator for Jamaica printed hardcopies of the call for proposals document and other relevant information and posted these to the Parishes in Jamaica where the priority KBAs are located. This form of targeted outreach to community groups and areas which are somewhat isolated, helps to increase transparency and reach key players in the KBAs.

### CLEAR REPORTING TEMPLATES

The RIT spent a lot of time supporting grantees to submit financial and performance reports. If the CEPF reporting templates included some instructions on what is expected in each reporting section, this would help to facilitate more accurate and thorough reports. In addition, more guidance is needed for grantees who have to submit Detailed Transaction Reports along with their quarterly financial reports. The RIT found that these were often not submitted correctly, did not contain all the information needed and there were often discrepancies with the figures in the Detailed Transaction Reports and the related budget lines in the online financial report in Grant Writer.

### VALUE OF THE REGIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR CEPF (RACC)

The Regional Advisory Committee for CEPF in the Caribbean (RACC) proved to be a great source of strategic advice in the region for the RIT. RACC members not only fulfilled their role in reviewing LOIs and part 2 proposals, but they proved to be effective in promoting CEPF in the Caribbean and helping the RIT to coordinate efforts at the donor and governmental level.

### REVIEW OF LETTERS OF INQUIRY (LOIs)

Facilitating conference calls amongst the review team (comprising members of the RIT, CEPF Secretariat, RACC and other technical independent reviewers) to discuss particular LOIs was very useful. Proposals received for a particular country, KBA and/ or thematic area were discussed collectively to facilitate a broad strategic discussion on the proposals and how each was aligned to meeting CEPF's targets.

### DEVELOPMENT OF FULL PROPOSALS

Guidance given to large grant applicants to develop their LOIs into full proposals must be extremely clear in order to avoid a process that was at times cumbersome and overwhelming for applicants. Giving applicants new advice on several different occasions resulted in multiple drafts and reworking of proposals which took valuable time from the applicant, the RIT and the CEPF Secretariat. Applicants should be provided with a very clear outline of what is expected from the proposal and this should be communicated to the applicant from the very beginning.

### GRANTEE ORIENTATION MEETINGS

The RIT facilitated brief orientation meetings for new grantees to go through CEPF's terms and conditions, especially in relation to procurement, financial management and CEPF's conflict of interest policy. Bringing new grantees together for these orientation meetings was an opportunity to support networking and to allow the RIT to share some lessons learned and best practices in project implementation.

### MONITORING AND EVALUATION

- The Civil Society Tracking Tool (CSTT) templates in all languages should be standardised in terms of the scoring options to ensure that the sub-totals in each section are the same. There is a lot of room for error when using the Word version of the CSTT, so it is recommended that all the different language CSTT templates be put into Excel spreadsheets where the sub-totals are automatically added up.
- It would be useful for grantees to be given an orientation session on the use of the monitoring tools (CSTTs, METTs) and on the collection of other monitoring data such as beneficiaries. This should include a little 'how to' and best practices for filling out the tools as well as reminders to record numbers of beneficiaries when doing workshops and training events – which should be disaggregated into male and female beneficiaries.

- The RIT should double check the data submitted in the CSTTs and METTs as well as the grantee Final Project Completion Reports to at the very least check for accuracy of scoring. Many grantees made simple calculation errors for the sub-totals of scores or forgot to add up the sub-total at the end. Some grantees also checked more than one option in the multiple-choice answers to the CSTT which was confusing and interfered with the final scoring.
- The Report on the Logframe is an extensive, detailed-oriented task that requires a lot of time to compile. Instead of trying to update the report on an annual basis and then finally at the end of the portfolio, the RIT could instead update the report as and when a grantee's Final Project Completion Report has been approved. So, updating the Logframe Report could be added to the 'checklist' that the RIT needs to confirm at each grantee's project closure. This would ensure that data is inputted on a more regular basis instead of the RIT trying to compile results from a mass of projects at any one time during implementation. It would also ensure that the RIT can verify results as needed with the grantee before their project has officially closed.
- The RACC cannot play a compliance role when it comes to fulfilling the RIT's mandate to monitor projects, but they can play an important and strategic role in providing the RIT with advice and information on a grantee's performance and overall country context as it relates to the projects.
- The design and budgets of grantee's projects did not take into account the considerable time the organisations needed to dedicate to all of CEPF's monitoring and evaluation activities. As a result, the grantees never had such resources properly or adequately budgeted. For example, for some projects in the Dominican Republic, the monitoring and evaluation demands of the 2013 calendar year were particularly heavy, as the year included visits from a CEPF donor, an independent evaluation by the AFD, the CEPF Caribbean mid-term evaluation regional meeting and national focus group session, as well as regular site visits conducted by the RIT and CEPF Secretariat. Grantees expect that their projects will be monitored, however, it is important to make budgetary allocations for staff time for regular CEPF site visits and to try to stagger the various monitoring activities as much as possible. Where donor visits and external evaluations cannot be planned for and budgeted in advance, it is particularly important to be considerate of grantees' staff time and resources.

#### PARTICIPATORY MONITORING AND EVALUATION

Site visits were one platform for the RIT to listen to the 'voices in the field'. The RIT encouraged a participatory evaluation approach that helped build the capacity of the grantee and other key stakeholders to design and conduct evaluations of their own activities. Conducting site visits is not only important for the collection of information, for example, to see if planned activities have been done or not, but it also facilitates collective analysis and builds consensus on what results have really been achieved, and how these results have been producing or can produce true impacts. In this sense, the RIT acted as critical mentor, coach and facilitator. Monitoring in a participatory way takes time, energy and commitment from all involved, not to mention coordination with and support of many players, project staff and other stakeholders. The benefits gained through participatory monitoring include capturing local knowledge, verification of information from key players (validation) as well as building and consolidating knowledge, skills and relationships among the project staff, community residents and other stakeholders. Reporting on site visits also consumes more time than planned, as the draft site visit report is also shared with the grantee's project coordinator and management in order to get agreement about the conclusions. In this respect, participatory monitoring and evaluation can contribute to improved organisational capacity, empowering the grantee and project staff to act and create change together with their community organisations and local government institutions.

### SMALL GRANTS MANAGEMENT

The RIT [Final Project Completion Report for the Small Grants Mechanism](#) describes several lessons learnt on the management of a small grants programme.

### FOSTERING REGIONAL COLLABORATION AND INTEGRATING REGIONAL PARTNERS

Even though travel in the Caribbean region is expensive, there is definite value in bringing people together to share ideas, results and lessons learnt from their work. Bringing CEPF grantees from Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Saint Lucia and St. Vincent and the Grenadines to the Jamaica-based final assessment consultation was very important in terms of giving a space for these important grantees to share their work and also in terms of networking with other CSOs. Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Jamaica are no doubt the priority countries in the region for CEPF's investments but it was important to recognise the regional element in the programme and for efforts to be made to integrate the countries and grantees as much as possible and to highlight the regional-level results and impacts.

### DONOR OUTREACH, COMMUNICATION and FUNDRAISING

It is important to engage donors at a very early stage in a project or programme, even if there are no results to show at the time. Keeping in regular communication and fostering relationships with donors and other key partners is important to demonstrate transparency and a commitment to sharing information and lessons learnt. Fundraising is also a process that in most cases comes after regular communication and outreach has been taking place and when there are results to demonstrate. The RIT Country Coordinator in the Dominican Republic performed very strongly in this area, fostering relationships with local partners and donor representatives in country including the French Embassy and AFD that became advocates for CEPF's investments in the country and region.

### GRIEVANCE MECHANISMS

It is important to carefully document any and all grievances thoroughly and be sure to follow the case through to closure. Inform the CEPF Secretariat of all grievances immediately and follow procedures accordingly.

### DONOR OUTREACH

The joint CEPF and AFD-Dominican Republic event that was held during 8-9 December, 2014 was a great opportunity for donors to learn more directly about the work CEPF is supporting in the Dominican Republic, about the grantee organisations, and also about the country context and importance of investing in biodiversity conservation for a variety of reasons including the socio-economic benefits that can be derived from a people-centered, holistic approach to conservation. This approach was demonstrated through the links made to strengthening the local organisations, sustainable livelihoods and links to policy development.

### GRANTEE EXCHANGES

The field visit to La Humeadora National Park that was held as part of the two-day AFD-Dominican Republic event in December 2014 was an excellent opportunity for grantees and other key stakeholders to learn first-hand what CEPF is supporting and the kinds of activities being carried out by a grantee. In-country exchanges can be facilitated at a relatively low cost, however, grantee and RIT time to plan and facilitate the exchange needs to be taken into account – and this is where the real cost lies. It is important to budget for planning and facilitation of exchanges both in-country and across countries in the region.

## SAFEGUARDS

It is important for the RIT to be sufficiently trained in the World Bank's Safeguards which CEPF adheres to, in order to more effectively monitor policy compliance and advise grantees correctly. In turn, it is important for grantees to be fully aware of the safeguards as well.

## COMMUNICATION

Capacité, the CEPF Caribbean quarterly e-newsletter, proved to be an invaluable communication product. Inviting grantees to submit articles and photos worked very well and gave the newsletter an interesting and engaging feel, with stories coming directly from the field. Stakeholders commented on the fact that the newsletter provided another opportunity for transparency and information sharing on the amount of funds that were awarded to projects in the region as the RIT included an updated list of new grants approved during each quarter.

## PROCESSING OF AMENDMENTS & GOOD PROJECT MANAGEMENT

It is important to express to grantees the need to request no-cost extensions to their grants as early as possible. Several grantees requested amendments at a very late stage (i.e. weeks or days before their grant was due to end). Apart from the difficulty with having these amendments processed due to the internal systems of the CEPF Secretariat, which require several reviews, it is not good practice in terms of project management on the grantee's side. Even though unexpected events occur, including bad weather and other events such as country elections that may cause delays, grantees should be urged to plan in a way that provides a 'safety-net' to mitigate against project risks and delays.

## FINAL ASSESSMENT

It was unrealistic to assume that the RIT could have a minimal role to play in the planning and implementation of the final assessment of the CEPF Caribbean programme. The RIT has such a critical role in the implementation of CEPF's investments in any region and so resources should be available and plans should include time for an RIT to be heavily involved in both the planning and implementation phases of any assessment/ evaluation. Even though an amendment was done to provide additional resources to the RIT for these efforts, in hindsight, the budget was not enough to cover the level of work that was eventually put in, especially by the Country Coordinators.

## VALUE OF CELEBRATING GRANTEEES

The RIT and CEPF Secretariat created certificates for each grantee to receive at the final assessment meetings which took place in November, 2015. Sub-grantees and a few local beneficiaries who participated in the final assessment consultations also received certificates. This worked extremely well and grantees really appreciated the gesture. In addition, inviting local representatives of CEPF's donors and key partners in-country to give out the certificates was also a great way to involve and put a spotlight on CEPF's key supporters. Importantly, making sure that no one grantee was singled out, but rather all grantees received the same certificate, was important in ensuring a fair celebration of everyone's efforts.

## HIGH LEVEL COCKTAIL EVENTS

The three cocktail events held in Haiti, the Dominican Republic and Jamaica during the final assessment were very effective in engaging donors, government and the media. Committing to a two-hour cocktail event is easier for high-level stakeholders as opposed to joining a whole-day consultation. The French Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, the Head of AFD in the Dominican Republic, the Japanese Embassy in Jamaica and Haiti, the World Bank Country Manager for Jamaica, Head of Operations for the EU Delegation in Haiti, and several other key donor representatives were all in attendance. It was also a

good idea to invite the donors and government partners to say a few remarks and to give out certificates to the grantees. This was well received and also helped to start conversations between some donors and grantees on a one-on-one basis, for example in Jamaica where at least three grantees had follow up meetings with the Japanese Embassy.

#### RIT to RIT COMMUNICATION

The RIT Exchange that was held in Washington, D.C. in September 2013 was extremely useful in brokering relationships between RIT members of different hotspots. The exchange strengthened ties between RITs and was an excellent opportunity to share best practices and learning in order to improve CEPF practice and procedures as well as operational matters within the RITs. Following the exchange, the Caribbean RIT shared information and templates including on processes such as LOI reviews and the mid-term evaluation, with other RITs.

#### GRANTEE-TO-GRANTEE CAPACITY BUILDING

The RIT tried to facilitate greater networking among grantees especially at the country level in cases where organisations had complementary skill sets. For instance, one organisation may have been strong in financial management and another in advocacy and communications. There is a lot of room for grantees to work together in tangible ways to build each other's capacity and this proved ever more important in light of the limited time that the RIT had to work with grantees on a one-on-one basis. Grantee-to-grantee support is also a good way to build networks and leverage project results.

### **37. Describe any other lessons learned relevant to the conservation community**

#### IMPORTANCE OF FUNDING IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANNING EFFORTS

CEPF was committed to funding implementation, even in part, of any planning efforts they supported. For example, CEPF will not fund the development of a management plan if there is no guarantee that actions in the plan can be supported (whether from CEPF support or elsewhere).

#### Sustainability / Replication

### **38. Summarize the success or challenges in ensuring the project will be sustained or replicated**

Overall, the capacity of CSOs in the Caribbean has been built, CANARI as a regional institute has been strengthened and is better positioned, and policies, plans and programmes have been positively impacted in terms of participatory approaches and development and involvement of civil society. All this bodes very well for sustainability of CEPF's investments in the region.

Creation of formal and informal networks among CEPF grantees is an important impact of CEPF which will contribute to sustainability. For example, at the regional level CANARI and nine other NGOs (several of whom are CEPF grantees) from across the Caribbean signed an MOU and committed to a partnership called Nature Caribé, which aims to collaborate for the conservation and sustainable use of the natural resources of the Insular Caribbean in the following areas of work: biodiversity conservation, sustainable livelihoods, and environmental governance. Nature Caribé is a network that was supported by two CEPF small grants.

Influencing other programmes for biodiversity conservation in the Caribbean is another area where CEPF will ensure sustainability and replication. For example, at the regional level, CANARI was the Chair of the IUCN Caribbean Regional Committee from its inception in November 2010 to September 2016. In

this role, CANARI continually supported IUCN members in the Caribbean to have a strong voice in IUCN's work, including development of IUCN's policies and the 2017-2020 Programme. Several CEPF grantees are IUCN members. Other examples will be where CANARI is positioned to influence regional projects (e.g. IWEco) and programmes (e.g. Caribbean Challenge) to build on the results achieved by CEPF and promote the use of best practices (including the RIT model) and direct strategic support to civil society.

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

n/a

**Safeguards**

**40. 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**

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

CANARI sincerely thanks the CEPF Secretariat for the opportunity to be the RIT for the Caribbean islands portfolio.

## Additional Funding

### 42. 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

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount	Notes
MacArthur Foundation	A	\$350,000	This project was designed to support the CEPF investment by: strengthening the ability of CANARI to perform the RIT role and strategically link this with its other work; and helping to build the capacity of CSOs to design relevant projects, successfully apply for CEPF and other grants, effectively and efficiently implement projects, and share lessons learnt. See <a href="#">here</a> for project details.
CANARI	A	\$4,453	Printing Policy Briefs #2 and #23
EU	B	\$1,648,778	CANARI's success as the RIT was instrumental in the organisation securing funds for this project. See <a href="#">here</a> for project information.
BHP Billiton Trinidad and Tobago	B	\$500,000	CANARI's success as the RIT was instrumental in the organisation securing funds for this project. See <a href="#">here</a> for project information.
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Haiti	B	\$10,410	CANARI's success as the RIT was instrumental in the organisation securing funds for this project. See <a href="#">here</a> for project information.
IUCN BIOPAMA	B	\$31,000	CANARI's success as the RIT was instrumental in the organisation securing funds for this project. See <a href="#">here</a> for project information.

\* 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 investment 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](http://www.cepf.net), and publicized in our newsletter and other communications.

Please include your full contact details below:

- 43. Name:** Anna Cadiz-Hadeed  
**44. Organization:** Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI)  
**45. Mailing address:** Fernandes Industrial Centre, Eastern Main Rd, Laventille, Trinidad, W.I.  
**46. Telephone number:** 868-626-6062  
**47. E-mail address:** [anna@canari.org](mailto:anna@canari.org); [info@canari.org](mailto:info@canari.org)