

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

Summary report of findings from the online survey

September 2013

1. Introduction

The Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Caribbean Islands Biodiversity Hotspot Programme mid-term evaluation was conducted by the Regional Implementation Team (the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute [CANARI]) in collaboration with the CEPF Secretariat over the period May – September 2013. This included an online survey using Survey Monkey. The survey is attached as Appendix 1. It was designed based on the [conceptual framework](#) for the mid-term evaluation. 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 Regional Advisory Committee for CEPF, 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.

This report analyses findings from the survey in terms of:

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

The survey also captured what stakeholders perceived as the most significant change as a result of the programme, and other recommendations, ideas and comments.

2. Findings

a. *Relevance*

Overwhelmingly, stakeholders reported that the CEPF Caribbean islands programme was very relevant in addressing the needs, expectations and capacities of Caribbean stakeholders. Out of a total of 56 responses, 25% of respondents felt that the programme was extremely relevant, 32% felt it was very relevant and 38% felt that it was relevant. Only 3% felt it was only a little relevant and 2% felt it was not relevant.

b. *Results*

For each of the result areas identified in the [CEPF Caribbean islands programme Logframe](#), stakeholders reported on the extent to which they felt that results are being achieved based on current progress at the mid-term of the programme. In all result areas except for CEPF Strategic Direction 5 (emergency support to Haitian civil society to mitigate the impacts of the 2010 earthquake), respondents felt that excellent or good progress was being made towards achievement of results, especially with improved protection and management of the 45 priority key biodiversity areas.

The assessment for each result area is as follows:

- i. **Improved protection and management of 45 priority key biodiversity areas:** Out of a total of 32 respondents, overwhelmingly, most respondents (91%) felt that the programme was making good progress or progress with results (22% and 61% of respondents respectively).

- ii. ***Integrated biodiversity conservation into landscape and development planning and implementation in six conservation corridors:*** Out of a total of 30 respondents, most (70%) felt that good progress or progress was being achieved (17% and 50% of respondents respectively). Only 3% of respondents felt that excellent progress was being made, while 13% of respondents felt that no progress was being made.
- iii. ***Supported Caribbean civil society to achieve biodiversity conservation by building local and regional institutional capacity and by fostering stakeholder collaboration:*** Out of a total of 33 respondents, most (57%) felt that excellent or good progress was being made (15% and 42% of respondents respectively) and 18% of respondents felt that progress was being made. Only 21% of respondents felt that a little progress was being made.
- iv. ***Provided strategic leadership and effective coordination of the CEPF investment in the Caribbean Islands Hotspot by CANARI in its role as the Regional Implementation Team (RIT):*** Out of a total of 32 respondents, most (59%) felt that excellent or good progress was being made towards achievement of results (15% and 44% of respondents respectively). Almost all of the rest (28% of respondents) felt that progress was being made.
- v. ***Provided emergency support to Haitian civil society to mitigate the impacts of the 2010 earthquake:*** Only 18 respondents commented on this result area. The results were mixed but generally most (83%) felt that good progress or progress or a little progress was made (38%, 17% and 38% of respondents respectively).

Respondents commented that many of the areas listed will take a long time to deliver results on and it was still early in terms of implementation, particularly for Jamaica. One respondent felt that although leadership and coordination of the programme have been excellent, even more focus could perhaps have been placed on capacity building to deliver concrete results on the ground, which is so weak in the region.

c. ***Efficiency and effectiveness***

Stakeholders reported the extent to which they felt the processes used in the programme have been effective. In general, stakeholders felt that the processes used were effective. However, ranking for each process was slightly different. Some processes had significant numbers of respondents ranking them as extremely or very effective, for example setting and communicating strategic priorities (i and ii), issuing calls for proposals (iv), technical review and selection of proposals (v), supporting the application process (vi), and monitoring projects (vii).

Some processes were ranked overall as weaker, with a significant number of respondents indicating that they felt the processes were not effective, for example catalysing additional support (xii), facilitating relationship building between governments and civil society (xiv), building capacity of civil society for sustainability (xv), influencing policy (xvii) and internal learning and performance in the RIT and the Secretariat (xviii).

The assessment for each result area is detailed below. Overwhelmingly, respondents felt that the result areas had been effectively achieved. Some respondents felt that the processes were not effective in a few result areas, namely: catalysing additional support; catalysing and facilitated networking amongst grantees; facilitating relationship building between CSOs and government, other key partners; building capacity of civil society organisations for sustainability; influencing policy; and being implemented with internal learning and improved performance within the CEPF RIT and Secretariat.

- i. ***Set strategic priorities for conservation funding through the Caribbean Ecosystem profiling process:*** Out of a total of 29 respondents, almost all (97%) felt that the process was effective with 10% of respondents saying it was extremely effective, 34% of respondents saying it was very effective and 52% saying it was effective.
- ii. ***Communicated strategic priorities:*** Out of a total of 30 respondents, almost all (97%) felt that the process was effective with 13% of respondents saying it was extremely effective, 33% of respondents saying it was very effective and 50% saying it was effective.
- iii. ***Communicated about CEPF and the work being achieved:*** Out of a total of 30 respondents, almost all (93%) felt that the process was effective with 20% of respondents saying it was extremely effective, 20% of respondents saying it was very effective and 53% saying it was effective.

- iv. **Issued calls for proposals:** Out of a total of 30 respondents, almost all (97%) felt that the process was effective with 20% of respondents saying it was extremely effective, 47% of respondents saying it was very effective and 30% saying it was effective.
- v. **Conducted technical review and selection of proposals:** Out of a total of 28 respondents, almost all (93%) felt that the process was effective with 21% of respondents saying it was extremely effective, 39% of respondents saying it was very effective and 32% saying it was effective.
- vi. **Supported the application process:** Out of a total of 28 respondents, almost all (96%) felt that the process was effective with 36% of respondents saying it was extremely effective, 25% of respondents saying it was very effective and 36% saying it was effective.
- vii. **Monitored projects:** Out of a total of 26 respondents, almost all (92%) felt that the process was effective with 15% of respondents saying it was extremely effective, 42% of respondents saying it was very effective and 35% saying it was effective.
- viii. **Supported project implementation (including financial management):** Out of a total of 26 respondents, almost all (92%) felt that the process was effective with 8% of respondents saying it was extremely effective, 85% of respondents saying it was very effective and 8% saying it was effective.
- ix. **Supported project evaluation and reporting:** Out of a total of 26 respondents, almost all (92%) felt that the process was effective with 17% of respondents saying it was extremely effective, 17% of respondents saying it was very effective and 48% saying it was effective.
- x. **Evaluated strategic impact:** Out of a total of 23 respondents, most (83%) felt that the process was effective with 17% of respondents saying it was extremely effective, 17% of respondents saying it was very effective and 48% saying it was effective.
- xi. **Managed portfolio investment (tracking spending, ensuring there is a good spread of funding across countries and priority areas):** Out of a total of only 19 respondents, most (94%) felt that the process was very effective or effective (32% and 63% of respondents respectively).
- xii. **Catalysed additional support:** Out of a total of only 20 respondents, most (79%) felt that the process was very effective or effective (15% and 60% of respondents respectively) and 21% of respondents felt it was not effective.
- xiii. **Catalysed and facilitated networking amongst grantees:** Out of a total of 29 respondents, most (79%) felt that the process was effective with 10% of respondents saying it was extremely effective, 28% of respondents saying it was very effective and 41% saying it was effective. A significant number (20% of respondents) felt it was not effective.
- xiv. **Facilitated relationship building between CSOs and government, other key partners:** Out of a total of 24 respondents, most (83%) felt that the process was effective with 38% of respondents saying it was very effective and 46% saying it was effective. A significant number (17% of respondents) felt it was not effective.
- xv. **Built capacity of civil society organisations for sustainability:** Out of a total of 27 respondents, most (89%) felt that the process was effective with 48% of respondents saying it was very effective and 26% saying it was effective. Many (26% of respondents) felt it was not effective.
- xvi. **Provided strategic leadership on how civil society can play a role in biodiversity conservation:** Out of a total of 28 respondents, most (86%) felt that the process was effective with 11% of respondents saying it was extremely effective, 32% of respondents saying it was very effective, and 43% saying it was effective.
- xvii. **Influenced policy:** Out of a total of 21 respondents, more than half (62%) felt that the process was effective with 19% of respondents saying it was very effective and 43% saying it was effective. A significant number (38% of respondents) felt it was not effective.
- xviii. **Been implemented with internal learning and improved performance within the CEPF RIT and Secretariat:** Out of a total of 22 respondents, most (86%) felt that the process was effective with

10% of respondents saying it was extremely effective, 36% of respondents saying it was very effective and 41% saying it was effective. Some (17% of respondents) felt it was not effective.

One respondent commented that he/she did not have enough information to judge, or that it was premature to make such an assessment, especially for building capacity of civil society organisations for sustainability (xv), providing strategic leadership on civil society's role (xvi) and influencing policy (xvii). Another respondent noted that the CEPF focus on supporting civil society creates a pull away from the important role that government agencies have, or should have. A third comment was that administration of the process appeared to be excellent, but "the extent to which this has built capacity or influenced policy in the region is a mute point".

d. **Sustainability**

Stakeholders assessed recommendations to help ensure that the results of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme are likely to remain sustained beyond the end of the project in September, 2015. Respondents fairly equally supported all of the recommendations suggested. These are presented in the order of the number of supporting responses (indicated in brackets) as:

- Promoting follow-up funding for initiatives (27)
- Building technical capacity of civil society organisations (25)
- Building organisational capacity of civil society organisations (24)
- Communication of the results to change policy (23)
- Networking among civil society organisations (22)
- Networking between civil society and private sector (22)
- Communication of the results to build awareness (21)
- Networking between civil society and government partners (20)

Additional recommendations suggested were mostly on assisting civil society to develop sustainable financing mechanisms. One suggestion was to establish a permanent financing and technical assistance facility to support civil society work in conservation. This facility should be managed by a Caribbean entity. It should not be a trust fund, but a financing window capitalised by partners that wish to support long-term processes in the region. Another recommendation was to assist civil society to learn more about fund raising from non-traditional sources (for example, private sector businesses, online fund raising such as crowdfunding).

Another recommendation was made to extend the programme deadline to allow more or better assimilation of key concepts and delivery of results, beyond what can be achieved in three to four years of project implementation.

e. **Most Significant Change**

The survey asked, *"What do you think has been the most significant change in terms of engaging civil society in the conservation of globally threatened biodiversity in the Caribbean due to the CEPF Caribbean islands programme since it started in October 2010? Please write your story of what you think is the most significant change in the box below."*

Respondents identified a range of most significant changes that they felt the CEPF Caribbean islands programme was achieving, many of which were closely related to the focus of the result areas specified in the [programme Logframe](#) as follows:

- Increased capacity and positive action by civil society**, particularly noting enhanced technical capacity, knowledge and awareness and "appreciation of local biodiversity and how they can better manage it". There is increased responsibility of civil society and "interest in accessing funding and commitment to take up responsibility to lead change." One respondent felt the most significant change was that "the knowledge and dedication within civil society is put to work in a positive and effective sense."
- Achieving positive results for biodiversity conservation, highlighted by two stories:**
 - "Getting local groups ... to work to reverse biodiversity loss in a meaningful way."
 - "... now has skilled and dedicated field personnel working to restore, manage and monitor their critically important offshore islands. This has already led to clear improvements for biodiversity, including the removal of goats and sheep from one severely overgrazed and eroded island ... in 2012".

- iii. ***Supporting local groups***, especially at the grassroots or community level, by promoting ownership and engaging them in projects and providing some funds to local organisations, including supporting a municipal initiative.
- iv. ***Facilitating partnerships and networking*** for organisations (including CBOs and NGOs) to work together for biodiversity conservation.
- v. ***Supporting advocacy***, in particular having sustained funding to focus on specific areas and attempt to influence longer term policy was seen to be the most significant change.
- vi. ***Improving understanding and acceptance of the role of protected areas.***
- vii. ***Providing strategic leadership*** on the ways in which civil society can play a role in the conservation of biodiversity.
- viii. ***Supporting CANARI***, by elevating its administrative capacity and regional profile, and enabling it to extend this programme of work, which it was already doing, into new areas.
- ix. ***Supporting a rigorous regional Caribbean-owned approach*** with “several positive aspects. A financing mechanism managed by an organisation from the Caribbean and that knows and respects the Caribbean (as opposed to the various ‘sustainable financing’ schemes in the region). Rigour in the systems and procedures, and the quality of technical assistance, with people based in the islands and thus being available for quality support. A regional approach, with work in 3 languages, and with effective communication.”
- x. ***Promoting a focus on global biodiversity priorities***, rather than local ones, via “an enforced change of focus”.

One respondent commented that, “You have gained some publicity but not achieved much.”

Two stories that were submitted highlighting several themes are presented in the boxes below.

Most Significant Change Story 1: I was pleasantly surprised the amount of work that has been achieved with civil society via the CEPF programme. Clearly civil society can achieve conservation goals with clear direction and plan to follow. The Caribbean Ecosystems Profiling Process provides a clear north for civil society to work towards. The programme allows for all groups to be involved independent of size or capacity. The programme enriches the relationship between civil society groups and provides and support network to ensure conservation goals for the Caribbean are achieved.

Most Significant Change Story 2: Following the training of our Caribbean Birding Trail guides in June 2013 (see articles here: <http://www.caribbeanbirdingtrail.org/new-bird-enthusiasts-unleashed-on-grenada/> and here: <http://www.caribbeanbirdingtrail.org/building-the-caribbean-birding-trail-model-of-service/> and here: <http://www.caribbeanbirdingtrail.org/inaugural-guide-training-program-in-grenada/>), the 24 participants (mostly guides that work for tour companies in Grenada) have formed a group called "GrenBirders". Previously they viewed themselves as competitors, but now they are partners working together. They meet to go birding every week to advance their bird guiding skills and they are working together to address critical conservation issues on their island, like disposal of trash and waste. They have a much greater appreciation for the KBAs, birds, and the Grenada Dove as a flagship for conservation, and they are entering their bird observations in eBird Caribbean, advancing our knowledge of what birds are using the sites year-round. They have also had success leading new bird tours (see postscript below) and are working with hotels to raise awareness and help promote their businesses. Our guides make the connection. That is where the training is so crucial. Conservation was threaded through our entire training in Grenada. And we talked at length with them about what they can tell their visitors about contributing to conservation. Having an informed and engaged community/ citizenry is VITAL to helping ensure that valuable parks and protected areas are NOT sold to developers (a daily threat in the Caribbean) and are instead supported and appreciated as they should be, by visitors and local alike. The success of this pilot training has confirmed our past experiences on the importance of outreach, education and community engagement to achieve lasting conservation. The CBT helps communities see that the protected area and birds/ nature can support sustainable livelihoods as well as conserve the country's natural heritage for future generations to enjoy, and provide an alternative to habitat destruction for ill-conceived and unsustainable developments (as is being proposed right now for the Portland Bight Protected Area – see below) . p.s. One of our newly trained guides in Grenada gave a tour for a small family group that had never birded before. They spent the morning with him learning how to use binoculars and then went to find some of the island's specialties. They saw THREE Grenada Doves at the Mt. Hartmann KBA!! They were so excited. Their only complaint was that the tour was too short! They had no idea that birdwatching could be so fun. p.p.s. Proposed development in Portland Bight Protected Area: We/ SCSCB have been discussing this latest development threat and what we can do to help. The discussion in the local media has been extensive and wide ranging. Here is one link about protecting the site: http://www.jamaicaobserver.com/news/Officials-insist-Goat-Islands-must-be-protected_14977497. A local source says the government MAY have already signed off on it! Some comments below from Ted Eubanks (our CBT consultant) and our Media Working Group: Once again protected status is being jettisoned when an area is eyed for a new development scheme. This is reminiscent of the Mount Hartman fiasco. There is a simple rule in conservation. Bad things fill voids. Protected areas without public support and involvement (i.e., economic) are seen as voids by the development community. This is particularly true in the Caribbean where post-colonial nations are desperate for any type of investment and are willing to sacrifice national patrimony for whatever the post-colonial powers dish out. Our plodding conservation efforts cannot keep pace with development pressures. We are outstripped and outmanned. What we can do, however, is engage the public in a dialogue about birds and nature as a critical part of a commonly shared patrimony. This is precisely what we are trying to do with the CBT, and we have no time to waste in moving forward with this effort.

f. **Additional recommendations, ideas and comments**

Additional recommendations, ideas and comments for action by the CEPF Caribbean islands programme were submitted around several themes:

- i. **Improve administrative processes:** Respondents suggested that “less onerous procedures” were needed and the programme was “too bureaucratic, too slow, projects (are) not adequately funded, (and the) administrative burden (is) too high.” They felt that “CEPF needs to be a tad more sensitive to the fact that NGOs have other projects to manage such that they do not have, for example, three whole days to commit to a mid-term review — however much they would want to be able to block that time, given their recognition of the tremendous value of biodiversity and their commitment to playing their part in its conservation.” Doing fewer reviews of the proposals was suggested. Comments were also made on the reporting process and format. One comment is presented in the Box below.

Recommendation on improving administrative processes: The reporting burden is exceptionally high considering the relatively small grant sizes, and I really cannot imagine how a small NGO can manage this. Annual, or at least half-yearly, financial reporting would greatly ease the work load at both ends. For our... project ..., one month is scarcely enough time to reconcile all the costs for the previous quarter. I know several West Indian organisations who won't apply to CEPF because they have heard it is too hard! More importantly, I would also recommend moving away from online applications and reporting, because it makes whatever we write extremely difficult to share, discuss and improve with our own colleagues, our project partners or indeed others who might be interested (including other CEPF grantees working on similar issues). Yes we can produce a pdf print out, but it's hardly in a readable format, especially the important log frame. This approach also relies on having a good internet connection, which is not always the case. Therefore myself, and at least several other grantees to my knowledge, write everything on Word docs first before uploading, paragraph by paragraph, which adds to the time and hassle. So, I would be all in favour of applications and reports by email.

- ii. **Do more to facilitate and support networking for communication, coordination, and mutual learning, especially between different CEPF projects:** Recommendations were made for CEPF to do more to facilitate networking for sharing of information, coordination and collaboration. Respondents felt that this was important especially for CSOs working on the same areas and with the same partners and stakeholders. It was suggested that “the RIT could help by ensuring grantees and applicants do talk to one another, ideally before new grants are approved.” It was suggested that CEPF should “facilitate networking between different CEPF projects in each country and throughout the region, facilitating contact between the different projects more actively” including “more networking and organising of networks among grantees and other supporting partners in the various islands.” It was suggested that more attention should be paid to building mutual assistance networks among the small islands of the Caribbean. Specifically related to this, it was suggested that “the project summaries posted online are very short and say very little. In the interests of improving networking, it would be great if fuller proposals and/or reports were made available to share, perhaps through the CEPF website. (Perhaps the newsletter is designed to go some way to achieve this, but only a few projects are covered each time).” In addition, respondents recommended that CEPF should “bring partners together to learn from each other” and “support a review across the countries of progress in policy and law on protected areas and biodiversity conservation.” Improving support from grants issued specifically to aid with communication was also suggested.
- iii. **Support financial sustainability of civil society:** Respondents recommend that CEPF should “help to generate and seek funding for the search for financial sustainability” via training in fundraising and proposal writing.
- iv. **Broaden the scope of funding:** Various recommendations were made on the focus of the CEPF funding as follows:
- Currently there is too rigid a geographic focus and the omission of marine areas is serious.
 - Change the funding priority from capacity building to conservation action.
 - Focus on institutional capacity of NGOs more than technical capacity. This should be guided by priorities identified in “NGO health checks.”

- Expand the focus on outreach, education and community engagement is urgently needed. One respondent felt that “Much more work is needed to develop pride and a conservation ethic in local people so that KBAs, IBAs and other important ecosystems/ habitats are recognised and appreciated for their values for local people – patrimony, recreation, sustainable livelihoods through tourism related businesses, invaluable ecosystem services and more. Politicians and decision makers also need to be engaged of course, but they come and go, with elections, thus, building awareness and appreciation of local communities is key to long-term conservation success. I would really like to see CEPF consider this aspect more strongly in their continued work in the Caribbean.”
- v. ***Evaluate conservation results of the projects in terms of their national significance and the uniqueness of their biodiversity, rather than measuring success in terms of land area:*** A comment from one respondent is presented in the Box below.

Conservation in small islands makes a big difference: The support from CEPF is certainly achieving conservation results on the ground, especially I think where it has provide support through existing projects and partnerships that were already in place, had co-funding and were able to respond swiftly and efficiently. I appreciate the fact that CEPF does allow some adjustments in timetables and budgets because conservation is by its very nature dealing with difficult problems in a rapidly changing environment, and there needs to be some flexibility to allow us to respond to new threats and new opportunities. So thank you for that. But I sense the CEPF team may sometimes fail to appreciate the importance of what is being achieved by grantees against some considerable odds. Some of the land areas we are working on are small, and therefore cannot rival the CEPF programmes in the Amazon or SE Asia in terms of size and sheer number of species. But that's like comparing apples with oranges. The Caribbean region has suffered higher rates of extinction because of its high endemism, with many species having very restricted ranges and weak resilience to invasive species and other anthropogenic impacts. Furthermore, in island ecosystems that naturally have a low number of species, the ecological and even cultural role of each native species becomes disproportionately important and irreplaceable. In a small country, national agencies are bound to have very few staff and never enough funding from national sources. Therefore I see no shame in us focusing on small areas, because that's an appropriate scale, and even a small island makes a big difference. I recommend CEPF try to view the projects in terms of their national significance and the uniqueness of their biodiversity, rather than measuring success in terms of land area.

- vi. ***Facilitate evaluation and learning on what works best in financing and supporting initiatives by and with CSOs in the Caribbean:*** Respondents suggested “A strong evaluation of project performance, deliverables and evaluation of results in the short and long term.” They also recommended that “an analysis (should be conducted), towards the end of the current Caribbean project, of what works best in financing and supporting initiatives by and with CSOs in the region. We have too many initiatives in the region that appear more interested in the self-promotion of those who promote them, or in organising high-level meetings in posh hotels and private islands that produce nice statements and no action. CEPF, while not perfect, can provide useful lessons.”
- vii. ***Extend the time period for the CEPF Caribbean islands programme to achieve results:*** Respondents suggested that longer-term engagement is needed to achieve significant results and that civil society is willing and able with minimum financial support to work towards conservation goals.

Broader recommendations made for ***project design and management by CSOs*** were that:

- Local people should be involved in designing the projects as well as implementing them.
- Civil society should be non partisan so as to encourage maximum participation and ownership by communities.
- “If an organisation does not have the capacity to manage large funds, organisations should form a network to manage large funds and for the implementation of activities.”

3. Conclusion

The online survey was useful in eliciting detailed feedback from English, French and Spanish-speaking stakeholders. The results were:

1. Overwhelmingly, respondents felt that ***the CEPF Caribbean islands programme was very relevant*** in addressing the needs, expectations and capacities of Caribbean stakeholders.

2. In all result areas except for CEPF Strategic Direction 5 (emergency support to Haitian civil society to mitigate the impacts of the 2010 earthquake), respondents felt that ***excellent or good progress was being made towards achievement of results***, especially with improved protection and management of 45 priority key biodiversity areas.
3. In general, respondents felt that ***the processes used by the CEPF Caribbean Islands Programme were effective, and in some cases very effective***. However, attention should be paid to improving processes where some stakeholders felt that processes were not effective, namely: catalysing additional support; catalysing and facilitated networking amongst grantees; facilitating relationship building between CSOs and government, other key partners; building capacity of civil society organisations for sustainability; influencing policy; and being implemented with internal learning and improved performance within the CEPF RIT and Secretariat.
4. Respondents endorsed recommendations to help ensure that the results of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme are likely to remain sustained beyond the end of the project in September, 2015. There was most ***support for recommendations on providing funding for follow-up initiatives and supporting civil society with sustainable financing***. Additional recommendations focused on building civil society capacity, supporting networking and partnerships, enhancing communication, and extending the life of the programme to allow time for achievement of results.
5. Respondents identified a range of most significant changes that the CEPF Caribbean Islands Programme was achieving, many of which were closely related to the focus of the result areas specified in the programme Logframe, namely that ***the programme was: increasing capacity and positive action by civil society, achieving positive results for biodiversity conservation, supporting local groups to engage in conservation, facilitating partnerships and networking, supporting advocacy, improving understanding and acceptance of the role of protected areas, promoting a focus on global biodiversity priorities, and providing strategic leadership on the ways in which civil society can play a role in the conservation of biodiversity***. However, additional significant changes identified were based on ***supporting CANARI to deliver work in this area, which it has already been doing, and supporting a rigorous regional Caribbean-owned approach***.
6. Respondents also identified a number of ***critical recommendations for improvement*** of the CEPF Caribbean islands programme, namely: improving administrative processes, supporting networking, communication and coordination; supporting financial sustainability of civil society; broadening the scope of funding; evaluating conservation results of the projects in terms of their national significance and the uniqueness of their biodiversity, rather than measuring success in terms of land area; facilitating evaluation and learning on what works best in financing and supporting initiatives by and with CSOs in the Caribbean; and extending the time period of the programme to enable delivery of results.

Appendix 1

Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Caribbean islands Biodiversity Hotspot Programme Mid-term Evaluation

QUESTIONS FOR SURVEY

Introduction

This survey is being conducted as part of the mid-term evaluation of the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF) Caribbean Islands Programme. This evaluation is being conducted by the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI), which is the Regional Implementation Team for the CEPF Caribbean Islands Programme. The evaluation framework and all reports produced, including the report from this survey, will be available on CANARI's CEPF [webpage](#) as soon as they are completed. A final report will be posted in October 2013 in English, French and Spanish. Thank you for your input!

Relevance

1. Please rate to what extent you think the CEPF Caribbean Islands Programme addresses the needs, expectations and capacities of Caribbean stakeholders?
 - a. Extremely relevant
 - b. Very relevant
 - c. Relevant
 - d. Only a little relevant
 - e. Not relevant

Results

2. For each of the areas identified below taken from the CEPF Caribbean Islands Logframe, please rate to what extent you feel that results are being achieved based on current progress at the mid-term of the programme. The CEPF Caribbean Islands Programme has:
 - a. Improved protection and management of 45 priority Key Biodiversity Areas
 - b. Integrated biodiversity conservation into landscape and development planning and implementation in six conservation corridors
 - c. Supported Caribbean civil society to achieve biodiversity conservation by building local and regional institutional capacity and by fostering stakeholder collaboration
 - d. Provided strategic leadership and effectively coordinated of the CEPF investment in the Caribbean Islands Hotspot by CANARI in its role as the Regional Implementation Team (RIT)
 - e. Provided emergency support Haitian civil society to mitigate the impacts of the 2010 earthquake
 - a. Excellent progress with results
 - b. Good progress with results
 - c. Progress with results
 - d. Only a little progress with results
 - e. No progress with results
 - f. No comment / not applicable
3. Do you have any comments on the above?

Effectiveness

4. For each of the areas identified below, please rate to what extent you feel the processes used have been effective. The CEPF Caribbean Islands Programme has:
 - a. Set strategic priorities for conservation funding through the Caribbean Ecosystem profiling process (See resulting document in [English](#), [French](#) and [Spanish](#).)
 - b. Communicated strategic priorities
 - c. Communicated about CEPF and the work being achieved
 - d. Issued calls for proposals
 - e. Conducted technical review and selection of proposals
 - f. Supported the application process
 - g. Monitored projects
 - h. Supported project implementation (including financial management)

- i. Supported project evaluation and reporting
 - j. Evaluated strategic impact
 - k. Managed portfolio investment (tracking spending, ensuring there is a good spread of funding across countries and priority areas)
 - l. Catalysed additional support
 - m. Catalysed and facilitated networking amongst grantees
 - n. Facilitated relationship building between CSOs and government, other key partners
 - o. Built capacity of civil society organisations for sustainability
 - p. Provided strategic leadership on how civil society can play a role in biodiversity conservation
 - q. Influenced policy
 - r. Been implemented with internal learning and improved performance within the CEPF RIT and Secretariat
-
- a. Extremely effective
 - b. Very effective
 - c. Effective
 - d. Only a little effective
 - e. Not effective
 - f. No comment / not applicable

5. Do you have any comments on the effectiveness of the processes described above?

Sustainability

6. What do you recommend is needed to help ensure that the results of the CEPF Caribbean Islands Programme are likely to remain sustained beyond the end of the project in September, 2015?

Please choose all that apply.

- a. Communication of the results to change policy
- b. Communication of the results to build awareness
- c. Building organisational capacity of civil society organisations
- d. Building technical capacity of civil society organisations
- e. Networking among civil society organisations
- f. Networking between civil society and government partners
- g. Networking between civil society and private sector
- h. Promoting follow-up funding for initiatives
- i. Other (please specify)

Most Significant Change stories

7. *What do you think has been the most significant change in terms of engaging civil society in the conservation of globally threatened biodiversity in the Caribbean due to the CEPF Caribbean islands programme since it started in October 2010?* Please write your story of what you think is the most significant change in the box below.

Other comments

8. What other recommendations, ideas and/or comments do you have for the CEPF Caribbean Islands Programme?

End survey

Thank you for your valuable input!

If you would like to discuss your comments, ideas and recommendations with someone from CANARI please contact Anna Cadiz, the Manager of the CEPF RIT at CANARI at anna@canari.org or +1-868-626-6062.