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# Executive Summary

## Summary Table

|  |
| --- |
| Project Title: “Advancing landscape approaches in Ecuador’s National Protected Area System to improve conservation of globally endangered wildlife l” |
| UNDAF Outcome(s): Institutions and local stakeholders promote a safe and healthy environment and environmental sustainability, that considers biodiversity conservation, natural resources and environmental management. |
| UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome: Sustainable and Equitable Environmental Planning. |
| Expected CP Outcome(s): Institutional reform and increase the capacity from the authorities and from other respective entities to assign priorities and incorporate into the national program for social development, aspects related to conservation, access and the sustainable use of biological biodiversity and the arrangement of the environment |
| Expected CPAP Output (s): Prioritization of conservation and the equitable and sustainable management of biodiversity in the development agenda |
| Executing Entity/Implementing Partner: Ministry of Environment of Ecuador |
| Implementing Entity/Responsible Partner: Wildlife Conservation Society - Ecuador. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Programme Period: 2013-2018  Key Result Area (Strategic Plan): Sustainable and Equitable Environmental Planning  Atlas Award ID: 00065940  Project ID: 00086648  PIMS # 4831  Project Duration: 5 years  Start date: September 2013  End Date September 2018  Actual end date: March 2019  Management Arrangements: NEX  PAC Meeting Date: June 07, 2013 | Total Resources Required: US$24,215,472  Total allocated resources:   * GEF US$4,450,472 * UNDP US$89,000   Other (partner managed resources):   * Government US$18,065,000 * Ecofondo US$1,000,000 * WCS US$250,000 * In addition to the resources within this project an estimated US$361,000 will be channeled through other on going UNDP projects to support activities related to this project (see UNDP cofinancing letter) |

## Project description

1. The project “Advancing landscape approaches in Ecuador’s National Protected Area System to improve conservation of globally endangered wildlife” (onwards: Landscapes - Wildlife Project) is an innovative approximation of the country on the subject of Wildlife conservation. It is the first time in Latin America that a GEF project is developed focused principally on the management of wildlife, and it is the first time that a landscape vision is applied to the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP, for its acronym in Spanish). The objective of this project is to accomplish that Ecuador’s PA system applies landscape approaches to increase its effectiveness for conservation of globally important wildlife. This will sustain and allow for the connectivity of the habitats in large enough areas, as well as sustaining different types of habitats for the distribution of key fauna.
2. To achieve the objective two levels were worked on, within two tightly integrated and interdependent components so that the coordinated action necessary to adopt this change was directed from within the inside of the appropriate instances and institutions and a set of outputs which are related to each other and that collectively achieve this challenge is delivered. Each of the two components has a desired outcome and a series of outputs:
   * Component 1 - Outcome 1: PAs contribute effectively to the conservation of threatened wildlife.
     + Output 1.1: Adaptive management framework to guide the cost-effective implementation of wildlife conservation.
     + Output 1.2: Emplacement of specific wildlife conservation actions in PAs.
     + Output 1.3: Community-based management schemes reduce pressures from subsistence hunting in 3 PAs.
   * Component 2 - Outcome 2: Management of non-PA areas in 5 target landscapes contributes effectively to the conservation of threatened wildlife.
     + Output 2.1: Enforcement-system strengthened for reducing illegal hunting.
     + Output 2.2: Land-use planning norms in place to protect habitats key for wildlife dispersal.
     + Output 2.3: Functional connectivity in landscapes important for wildlife dispersion.
3. The project has generated global environmental benefits because it pursues the conservation of globally important wildlife, though a landscape vision applied to management of national system of protected areas. In this manner, the project helps to increase the coverage of the threatened ecosystems and threatened species, which is an indicator for the strategic objective GEF[[1]](#footnote-1) BD1 “To increase the sustainability of the systems of protected areas”. The project has also contributed in the attainment of outcomes of the Country Program of the UNDP[[2]](#footnote-2), particularly “The institutional reform and the improvement of the ability of the authorities to prioritize and incorporate subjects on the matter of conservation, access and sustainable use of the biodiversity and the environmental planning within the National Development Plan.”

## Summary of Evaluation outcomes

1. This being the first GEF project focusing at wildlife in the region, it is an innovative project in its design and of great relevance for a country as mega diverse as Ecuador, with a large amount of species of fauna of global importance and a high level of threats. It was appropriate to insert wildlife management in the development of a landscape vision for the environmental management, given that this helped project management to gain relevance and collaboration with other entities within the Ministry of Environment (MAE) and other national and local governmental agencies. In general, the project design is considered satisfactory, with feasible activities and outputs and an adequate series of indicators. The evaluator commends the contribution in cash, from public funding on behalf of MAE to the project. To administer these funds and due to administrative reasons, an additional component was added (component 3, for the sustainable management of wildlife in captivity) and later on, yet another component was added to administer the GEF project “Amphibians and their genetic resources”. These administrative arrangements complicated the management of the project because the new components had a variable level of alignment with both of the two components of the Landscapes - Wildlife Project. The project has been well managed, with a team of capable staff, an adequate collaboration among executing and implementing agencies, an efficient financial administration, and a Steering Committee that supported with timely decision-making. The project has had a notable adaptive management ability based on effectively monitoring changes in the context.
2. The evaluator considers that the project has been effective, with a satisfactory generation of quality outputs. The project contributed to the positive management of wildlife in many locations achieving an effective collaboration of local communities and local governments. Though it demonstrated in several areas that the landscape management for the conservation of wildlife is possible, the objective of internalizing this vision in the management of the National Protected Areas System has not been achieved in full. This is because the project generated its different outputs and outcomes in many locations, but these elements were not necessarily linked. Also, the landscape vision is a concept which requires the commitment from several different units in the Ministry and other agencies and in the current context, it is difficult for these to live up to their initial expectations.
3. The project has generated important data about the state of wildlife in the country and this is being used for the monitoring of environmental management effectiveness. To know the impacts in terms of trends in the abundance of wildlife (the prime indicator of project impact), a much higher period of time than the project implementation is needed. The project is on its way to generating a positive impact on the effectiveness of the management of the protected areas (including the conservation of wildlife) and it has also supported the declaration of new conservation areas. The evaluator considers the low institutional and financial sustainability as the greatest barrier for the sustainability of outcomes and the achievement of an impact in the future.

## Table of evaluation rating

1. The evaluator has rated the project according to the following evaluation criteria:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Evaluation Criteria* | *Rating by the Evaluator* |
| Monitoring and evaluation (design and implementation) | Highly Satisfactory[[3]](#footnote-3) |
| Government and management (incl. Performance of Execution and implementation agencies) | Satisfactory |
| General Outcomes (Objective achievement) | Moderately Satisfactory |
| Relevance | Relevant[[4]](#footnote-4) |
| Effectivity | Satisfactory |
| Efficiency | Satisfactory |
| Sustainability | Moderately improbable[[5]](#footnote-5) |

## Summary of conclusions, lessons and recommendations

1. Based on information collected during the evaluation and the evaluation findings, the evaluator concluded the following:
   * Conclusion 1. The project has been well designed regarding its general logic, involvement of stakeholders, and institutional management arrangements. It possesses a detailed, well defined and ambitious array of indicators at the level of outcomes and objectives. The identification of assumptions and risks was incomplete.
   * Conclusion 2. The geographic and subject range of the project is wide, for which it is considered ambitious. The strategic response was to divide the activities in different landscapes, which was effective, but which has also generated a disperse execution.
   * Conclusion 3. Although the co-financing with public funding and the component 3 was executed well, the administrative arrangement of adding two components to the project has caused confusion and unnecessarily pressures the efficiency and effectiveness of the project.
   * Conclusion 4. The project has been well managed: it has staff that well-performed in the technical and administrative aspects. The inter-institutional collaboration has been positive and some challenges which arose during the first years were overcome in the second half of the project. The support from the implementing agency has been timely, adequate, and highly appreciated by the executing agencies.
   * Conclusion 5. The project has a good financial performance: at achieved an adequate pact of disbursement according to planning. The in-cash co-financing, with fresh funding, provided by national and local governmental agencies is highly commended.
   * Conclusion 6. The project has had a high adaptive capacity in the technical management as well as in the financial management which contributed to its effectiveness.
   * Conclusion 7. The project has contributed to positively changing the reality of wildlife management in the country although it did not manage to internalize the landscape approach in the SNAP or GAD management.
   * Conclusion 8. The limited financial capacity and the low number of dedicated staff in the MAE are a barrier for the effective and continuous conservation of wildlife.
   * Conclusion 9. There is an adequate inclusion of general normative instruments regarding wildlife in the new Environmental Organic Code and specific instruments at MAE, SENPLADES, and community level.
   * Conclusion 10. The project is highly relevant to the global and national environmental debate, and is aligned with the national environmental priorities.
   * Conclusion 11. The project has been effective in terms of the generation of outputs and achievement of outcomes.
   * Conclusion 12. The generation of knowledge, planning instruments and conservation and development projects with communities living in or around protected areas, resulted in a significant contribution in the management effectiveness of these protected areas. This, among other things, contributed to a better conservation of wildlife in several locations in the five landscapes.
   * Conclusion 13. Despite the fact that there is a no inclusion of normative in the territorial ordering and development plans (PDOT) of the local governments, the collaboration with the development of ten concrete plans[[6]](#footnote-6) has generated a greater attention and commitment for landscape management for wildlife management.
   * Conclusion 14. The support towards the capacity of detection and sanction resulted in positive indicators of the control of wildlife traffick.
   * Conclusion 15. The sustainable production projects have increased the economic and social indicators of more than 250 families in five landscapes, which additionally, is related to less negative interactions among humans and wildlife.
   * Conclusion 16. The project has been executed with efficiency, resulting in a positive benefit/cost balance considering the environmental and social results of the project in general.
   * Conclusion 17. The country adopted the project execution and contributed with funds and important efforts, although its support to the continuity of the outcomes is uncertain in the near future.
   * Conclusion 18. The socio-political sustainability is likely because there is interest and willingness from the government as well as from civil society to support positive initiatives for the conservation of biodiversity in Ecuador.
   * Conclusion 19. The institutional and financial sustainability is unlikely because the government commitment has not yet been translated into a structure or solid budget for the conservation of landscapes and wildlife.
   * Conclusion 20. There is a wide and growing gap between the finance needs for the conservation of landscapes and wildlife, and the public funds allocated to this matter.
   * Conclusion 21. The project developed an exit strategy late during its implementation. Although it is not complete, it has advanced a lot. Due to the lack of financial and human capacity (number of staff) from MAE, the implementation of the exit strategy is uncertain.
   * Conclusion 22. The project has generated valuable data regarding the distribution and abundance of wildlife. Nonetheless, a much longer period than the project implementation period is needed to be able to establish trustworthy trends.
   * Conclusion 23. The project has contributed to the increase of the area of natural vegetation cover under different conservation schemes and has contributed to its conservation in protected areas and other important natural areas for local governments
2. During the present evaluation, a series of lessons were identified, among which the principal ones are the following:

* Indicators that directly measure the state of a conservation object (in this case, the abundance of fauna) generate valuable data on environmental management, but need a much longer monitoring time (10-20 years or more; much more than the typical execution period of a regular GEF project) in order to be able to show its impact.
* Parish-level GADs associate easier to a field-level project then “high”-level government agencies, because of their more closeness with people and field practices, their shorter communication lines and decision-making processes.
* All provincial and parish GADs who have had an effective coordination with the project, were integrated by highly committed individuals. The presence of this committed staff is equally as important as formal institutional agreements.
* The management of human-wildlife conflicts[[7]](#footnote-7) is more effective and provides more (economic and social) co-benefits when it seeks a change of human conduct (good production practices) linked to direct benefits, rather than controlling wildlife. The effective collaboration among environmental and agricultural authorities helps to generate these multiple environmental and social benefits.
* For the adoption of local practices which are positive for the management of wildlife it is important to secure and demonstrate the direct benefits for the communities at the same time or even before environmental benefits.
* Considering the gender dimension in the selection of diverse agricultural practices can create more social and environmental co-benefits.

1. Based on the findings and the conclusions of this evaluation, the evaluator developed a series of recommendations that can help to consolidate the results of the project and increase the probability of impact. The most important are:

* During the last months of the project (before March 2019), the Management Unit Team must complete the exit strategy with roles, budgets, or dates for each of the necessary actions.
* Once the exit strategy is agreed upon, the DNB-MAE must ensure the concrete agreements for the implementation of each of the proposed sustainability actions, based on the actual and measurable commitments from the different MAE units and other actors.
* Once the institutional structure is defined, the MAE must contract an update of the model for wildlife management and adjust it to the reality of that new structure.
* During 2019 the DNB and the UNDP must seek a way through which the new projects currently under development (with GEF funds, or others, such as REDD Early Movers, and the Regional Program for the conservation of the jaguar) include the consolidation of part of the positive results from Landscapes - Wildlife Project.
* In order to strengthen the institutional capacity at a long term, during 2019 the MAE must look for forms of live up to their expectation[[8]](#footnote-8) of including personnel trained by the project within their regional teams.
* In the final project phase, the Management Unit and WCS must continue to seek for agreements with universities and species specialist groups beyond the working group ton Condor or the Study Group of Primates, so that they take responsibility or support DNB in the monitoring of wildlife. A formalizing on behalf of MAE, of their role in the monitoring protocols will consolidate their collaboration.
* MAE should make use of the formulation of the new legislation and the new institutional structure to consider the ACUS becoming part of the SNAP and for larger national support for Ramsar sites.
* It is important that technical criteria, based on the wildlife policy, are included in the updating of the PDOT. For this, during 2019 CONGOPE could provide support to the implementation of these guidelines by SENPLADES. The can also assist the provincial GADs, and through them, the parish GADs in the update, at least in the GAD with whom the Landscapes - Wildlife Project collaborated with.
* During 2019, MAE must take on the responsibility of collaboration with the FIAS aiming at consolidation and financing the wildlife fund.
* In case future projects need to include additional components, for administrative reasons, MAE has to ensure that these are designed and implemented fully within the framework of the project: they need to be contributing to the project’s general objective, its execution should be under the full responsibility of the same Manager and should be supervised by the same Steering Committee. If this is not possible, the component should be managed as a separate, parallel project.
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# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Purpose of the final evaluation

1. This document presents the final evaluation of the project UNDP/GEF “Advancing landscape approaches in Ecuador’s National Protected Area System to improve conservation of globally endangered wildlife” (Onwards: Landscapes - Wildlife Project). In accordance with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP)’ guidelines[[9]](#footnote-9) for the evaluation of projects funded by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) and the Terms of Reference (ToR) for this task (Annex 1), the final evaluation was executed near project closure, with the objective of determining the achievement of its outcomes and of taking away lessons that could improve the sustainability of the benefits of this project and help the general progress of UNDP programing. The evaluation analyzed the implementation and performance of the project, identifying the potential impact and sustainability of the outcomes. This includes the contribution to the conservation of wildlife and the contribution towards the global and specific environmental goals of the country. The evaluation of the project performance was executed with the main stakeholders of the project: the Ministry of the Environment of Ecuador (MAE, for its acronym in Spanish), the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) and the Consortium of Autonomous Provincial Governments of Ecuador (CONGOPE, for its acronym in Spanish). Other agencies also participated in this evaluation, like the National Institute for Biodiversity (INABIO, for its acronym in Spanish), the Sustainable Environment Investment Fund (FIAS, for its acronym in Spanish) and the Autonomous Decentralized Governments (GAD, for its acronym in Spanish) of the provinces and parishes of the project intervention areas and the direct project beneficiaries (inhabitants of the areas in which the project is implemented).

## 1.2. Focus and Methodology

1. The focus of the evaluation is to offer an independent analysis, transparent and participative of the performance, the achievements, and the lessons learned during the Landscapes - Wildlife Project. The final evaluation of the project GEF/UNPD has the main objective of determining the general performance of the project: an achievement of the outcomes and a contribution to the objectives is identified. Additionally, the evaluation brings recommendations that help consolidate the project outcomes and increase the probability of impact. Finally, the evaluation has the role of extracting lessons from the project implementation that are beneficial for the country, the executing agency, and for the very GEF/UNDP to improve their programing in the future.
2. To secure a participative and consulted evaluation, the evaluator applied different tools (more details in the section of methodology, see ¶ -paragraph –17).
   * Participation: in the core of the work of the evaluation was a series of bilateral interviews of a group with the different project actors. These interviews did not follow a unidirectional pattern of question-answer, but rather were executed in such a way that the interviewees had the freedom to bring any data they wanted about the project and could provide recommendations that they considered important to be included in the evaluation.
   * Consultation: during the different phases of the evaluation, the evaluator held an open and regular communication with the reference group of the project evaluation, with UNDP and the project management unit to present different elements (plans of work, initial observations, draft reports, etc.), specifically to obtain feedback and recommendations for the upcoming steps of the evaluation.
   * Communication: it is expected for the evaluation to bring clear findings and conclusions and that the resulting report be written in a way that implementing and executing agencies can use it with the end to inform the different actors, donors, similar programs and the general public.
3. The evaluation strictly followed the guidelines included in the Terms of Reference for this consultancy, including the application of the evaluation criteria OECD-DAC[[10]](#footnote-10) (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability) and the guidelines for final evaluations funded by GEF, supported by the UNDP[[11]](#footnote-11). The compilation of data for this evaluation was done in December 2018 and the presented data in the present report have been updated until that month. Additionally, some developments on the institutional level during January 2019 have been considered.

### 1.2.1. Inception Phase

1. During the inception phase for the evaluation (November 19th-30th 2018), the evaluator revised the project design and progress documents, revised the actual context of the project and of the conclusions and recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE). Based on the project document, the evaluator reconstructed a theory of change (ToC) that implicitly underpins the project. This allows an understanding of the logic of each causal relationship and especially, identifying complementary assumptions. The evaluator had some meetings with part of the project coordination team, with the UNDP and with the Steering Committee. The priorities for the final evaluation were validated based on these meetings. Primarily, it was agreed that the evaluation would analyze and validate the progress of the indicators as they were reported in the Project Implementation Report (PIR) but that it will focus specifically on the success factors and the reasons for the eventual incomplete achievement of the outcomes. Among the specific subjects of attention; development and mainstreaming of a landscape approach stood out (both at the level of national authority, and its application in the territory), as well as the challenges of the monitoring of wild fauna, the inter-institutional coordination, the alternative models of conservation (sites of wetlands of global importance –Ramsar- and Conservation and Sustainable Use Areas – ACUS vs. *Socio Bosque* and Municipal Reserves), the focus of gender and the sustainability strategy and of project closure (closure, sustainability, and legacy management).
2. Based on the analyzed elements in the inception phase (ToR, design and project management documents, reconstructed ToC, revision of the MTE, interviews with the project actors and meeting with the reference group), the evaluator developed a series of evaluation questions. The criteria and main questions were taken from the ToR and the evaluator included a series of additional questions. In annex 6 the inception report is presented, including the reconstructed ToC, the evaluation framework, and a matrix of the evaluation questions, indicators and verification sources.

### 1.2.2. Evaluation Methodology

1. The evaluation methodology consisted in a combination of methods and tools that collected qualitative and quantitative data necessary to answer the evaluation questions in an objective manner, based on evidence. The detailed methodology is included in the inception report (Annex 6) and is summarized below:

* *Revision of Documents.* The evaluator made an ample revision of the document gamma of documents during several evaluation phases, with different objective. The complete list is included in annex 5. It consists of:
  + Basic project documents, like the project document (Prodoc) and the progress reports (PIR).
  + Project management documents. It consists of work plans (multiannual and annual), the detailed budget and financial details, audit reports, meeting minutes, tracking tool, etc.
  + Documents produced in the project as the output of activities, such as publications, reports, studies, plans and strategies, and by other projects/organizations, relevant to the project.
* *Indicator Analysis.* With base in the PIR and conversations with the Project Management Unit, the evaluator collected the actual values of the indicators and included them in a table. These values where validated during the other steps of the information gathering for this evaluation.
* *Stakeholder interviews.* The evaluator made a series of semi-structured interviews with a representative number of stakeholders. The majority of the interviews where bilateral (one on one), but in some cases, where there were more than two persons, the interviews were organized by focal group. A template was designed for the interviews with specific questions (Annex 7). This template was based on the evaluation questions but not exactly the same. The questions were open-ended and allowed the evaluator and interviewee to have a wider conversation and not be restricted to a specific subject. The template was adapted for each group of actors so that depending on the group it could go deeper into different subjects. The data from each interview was registered in writing and was also audio recorded (after having requested permission from the interviewees). The response to each interview question was related to the relevant evaluation question for its due processing in the elaboration of the findings. Twenty-five bilateral meetings and in total and six group meetings (two with the Reference group of the evaluation, and one with each of the following organizations: MAE, WCS, and GAD Malacatos) were held. During these meetings, 51 persons were interviewed (19 women, 32 men). This included 5 persons from UNDP, 7 from the Management Unit, 15 from MAE, 7 from other public entities, 8 Decentralized Autonomous Government members (incl. CONGOPE), 3 persons from WCS, and five producers. The complete list of interviewed persons can be found in Annex 3.
* *Field Observations*. Several indicators of progress and success of the project are validated through visits to the focal areas of the project, with direct observations and conversations with the local beneficiaries. With this goal, during the evaluation the Parishes of Angochagua, Cuyuja and Malacatos, and the *Tembladera* Wetland were visited. Members of the Project Management Unit accompanied the observation tours, but did not intervene in the conversations with the producers nor in the interviews with other local actors.
* *Processing and validation of data.*  Once the gathering of the data was completed, it was organized according to the criteria and evaluation questions. In the cases were the data about certain interviews demonstrated a trend of coincidence and complementarity, it was used directly to sustain findings. In the cases where it did not coincide it was validated through a process of confrontation (for example, with the Management Unit) or a triangulation was made (with additional informants).
* *Elaboration of findings, conclusions and recommendations*. Based on the data compiled during the gathering phase and its indicial processing, the evaluator identified preliminary findings. Each finding is a partial answer to the evaluation questions and is based strictly evidence based (data found during the gathering of information). These initial findings were presented to the reference group of the evaluation for debate. Based in the feedback received, the evaluator defined the final findings, and the conclusions of the evaluation, referring to the findings and including his supported professional opinion. The conclusions sustain the rating of evaluation criteria according to the presented scale in Annex D of the ToR. As final elements of the evaluation, and referring to findings and conclusions, the evaluator identified a series of lessons and recommendations. The lessons learned during the execution of the project are good (or not-so-good) practices in the design, implementation, governance or in the context of the project that are worth being considered in future similar projects. The recommendations are directed towards agencies of implementation and execution and refer to the immediate corrective actions, future activities or recommendable practices to increase sustainability of the project outcomes, the probability to achieve the impact or the replica to another geographical or temporary scale.

## 1.3. Structure of this report

1. The evaluator elaborated this report with all of the supported findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations in a clear and concise manner, following the presented index in Annex F of the ToR. At first, it presents a brief description of the project in the environmental and developmental context of the of the country (Chapter 2). Then, it presents the results of the evaluation related to the design (Chapter 3.1) and the implementation of the project (Chapter 3.2). The central part of the report is the presentation of the evaluation of the project results, according to the OECD-DAC criteria (Chapter 3.3). Throughout Chapter 3, the evaluation results are organized by theme/criterion. First, the findings are presented, then the argumentation for this finding is elaborated, and it ends with the conclusions for each theme/criterion. At the end of the report (Chapter 4) the lessons and recommendations are presented. All of the support data (ToR, preparation report, lists of referenced documents and interviewed persons, timetable) are presented as annexes. The initial draft of the report entered in a revision process by the reference group, execution and implementation agencies and the subsequent edition on behalf of the evaluator resulted in this final report (available both in Spanish and in English). Separately, the evaluation has delivered a document in which the evaluator explains how the comments on the draft version of the report were considered in the final version.

# 2. Project Description and Development context

## 2.1. Start and length of the Project

1. The initial development of the project was in 2011. On November 25th, 2011, the Ecuadorean Minister of the Environment signed the guarantee letter. The PPG was executed in 2012, and on August 19th 2013, the final project received the final approval from the GEF *Chief Executive officer*. From this date on, the MAE continued the established procedure to the effect that the National Secretary of Planning and Development –SENPLADES, approve the project, with which it was possible to assign the co-financing agreed upon by the government. Said procedure is regular and necessary for the account to be created for which the funds are to be transferred. Nevertheless, and as explained by the MTE, in this case, the process took seven months. As a result, even though the project start date was programmed for September 2013 with a length of five years (until September 1018), the real start date of the project was April 2014, this is, with a seven- month delay. Starting from the Midterm Evaluation of the project, an extension was requested and approved at no cost for four months for which the final effective date is March 2019 (¶84).
2. The total budget of the project was US$24’215,472USD, a value that included the assigned resources by GEF ($4’450,472USD), and the co-financing from UNDP (US$ 89,000), the Government of Ecuador ($18’065,000), WCS ($250,000) and EcoFondo (US$ 1’000.000). Additionally, an estimated US$ 361,000 would be channeled through other projects in the course of the UNDP to support activities related to the present project (See Co-Financing Letter UNDP).

## 2.2. Issues which the Project will respond to

1. Even though it has a relatively small size, Ecuador is considered as one of the seventeen mega diverse countries in the world[[12]](#footnote-12). Its four main geographical regions (the Galapagos Islands, Coastal plains, Highlands, and the Amazon basin) are subject to numerous climate systems, giving place to topographical zones, diverse climate and vegetation such as mangroves and the marshes of the tropical coast, the inter-Andean and exuberant valleys, and the Andean areas with the mountain forests and Páramo. As a result, these ecological and climate conditions, combined with bio-geographical factors, possesses an enormous richness of species at the second highest endemic level in the world.
2. Ecuador has significantly invested in establishing protected areas, which at present, represent close to 20% of land surface of the country. The National System of Protected Areas (SNAP) of Ecuador, incorporates four subsystems (i) State Subsystem of Protected Areas (SEAP, for its acronym in Spanish) [[13]](#footnote-13), (ii) areas conserved by GAD, (iii) Community conserved areas, and (iv) Private conserved areas. The categories of PA included in the SEAP have restrictions and the different uses allowed in the categories of protected areas are not clearly defined in the Ecuadorian legislation. The Unified Text of the Secondary Environmental Legislation (TULAS, for its acronym in Spanish) of 2003, contains general dispositions for the types of activities allowed in the protected areas, but makes no specific distinction between the different categories of PA as to its management and relationship with the objectives of wildlife conservation. The protected areas of SEAP are established in public lands and most of them are inhabited by a variety of local and indigenous communities. These communities generally are dedicated to subsistence farming and production activities in a small scale. The Constitution (2008) recognizes the rights of these populations to use the natural resources within their territories, and the National Biodiversity Strategy proposes actions that are coherent with the subsistence activities of the local communities.
3. In September 2008, the Ecuadorean Government created the *Socio Bosqu*e Program, implemented by MAE. The program offers incentives to the farmers and indigenous communities that commit themselves to protecting their native forests, páramo, and other types of vegetation. Areas at risk of deforestation and areas considered of high value for environmental services and of high poverty levels are given priority. Towards the end of 2018, Socio Bosque had a total of 2,681 active contracts with land owners, including around 175,000 persons, covering a total of 1.6 million hectares of native forest, páramo, and other types of vegetation[[14]](#footnote-14). Socio Bosque *de facto* complements SNAP. The program is centered in continuing to keep the forest cover and that also includes participatory zoning processes that define enabled zones for conservation, hunting, fishing, recollecting, residence, and harvesting.
4. The diversity of fauna in Ecuador is particularly rich but faces different pressures and threats. One of the threats is global climate change that can directly and indirectly affect wildlife in a yet unknown magnitude[[15]](#footnote-15). The main direct pressures are the loss or degradation of habitats by conversion to grasslands and harvesting illegal wild animal trafficking, unsustainable hunting and fishing and human-wildlife conflicts. These threats are linked to processes like oil drilling and mining, demographic growth, and migration, logging and the advance of the agricultural limit related to a better accessibility. Other than the threats related to fragmentation and habitat loss, there is a series of direct threats that wildlife faces in natural areas. Multiple factors are aggravated by demographic and economic reasons. These factors are principally unsustainable subsistence hunting, commercial hunting, wildlife trafficking, killing of wild animals by conflicts with humans, destruction and fragmentation of habitats due to the clearance for agriculture and cattle raising.
5. The main barrier for guaranteeing an efficient protection of many species and populations of native wildlife fauna, is the lack of adequate capacities; knowledge and systems that allow for PAs to function efficiently for the conservation of globally important wildlife. Despite the PAs bringing protection to habitats at a macro level, the lack of an integrating landscape vision, its location and its actual management regimes, form a barrier for an adequate and long-term conservation. Some species of the categories ‘critically endangered’, ‘endangered’, and ‘vulnerable’ in the Red List of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), are particularly demanding in terms of size, dispersion distances and the connectivity of habitats. This raises the probability them entering conflict with humans and makes them highly depending on the surrounding and adjacent landscapes to which these PAs are managed in.
6. To overcome the barriers and bring a long-term solution to the wildlife threats, a paradigm change is required from the actual PA management focusing on site-level management to adopting a wider landscape approach. This new type of management must be based in up-to-date data about the requirements of the wildlife under consideration. It must be complemented with habitat improvements and must include the population of the producing rural areas to value the connectivity of productive landscapes that surround and separate them.
7. A barrier to applying a landscape vision in the management of protected areas is the weak governance and deficient development plans in the surrounding landscapes of the protected areas. This must be resolved through the support of the management of local governments and integrating landscape and conservation of wildlife concepts in their territorial development plans along with the inter-institutional coordination at different scales.
8. Other barriers are related to the communities that surround the natural areas and that interact with wildlife: on one side, there is a little control to poaching and commercial hunting and there is limited inter-institutional management capacity for the handling of human-wildlife conflicts. Because of this, in order to become sustainable and efficient, a solution has to come alongside efforts to reduce hunting and illegal commerce of wild fauna; involving the active participation of local communities, in collaboration with the strengthened public institutions (on central and decentralized levels), and bring alternatives to guarantee economic and nutritional safety.
9. During the implementation of the project, the context suffered several changes, mainly related to institutional and economic aspects. The main change has been the economic recession since 2015, related to the low prices of oil. This has generated a decline of the fiscal budget caused, among others, a decrease in the MAE[[16]](#footnote-16) budget, and liquidity shortfalls in the Socio Bosque program which stopped incorporating new areas. At an institutional level, there has been a constant administrative change in all levels, both in authorities as well as in strategic orientations. Among others, since October 2018, MAE is in a process of restructuring; initially by the fusion with the National Secretary of Water (SENAGUA) which at present, will not be taking place (¶121). Parallel to this, the FIAS was formed as a new entity of fund management for environmental subjects. The present government decided to develop the Environmental Organic Code (COA, for its abbreviation in Spanish) as a new general Law for environmental subjects, replacing, among others, the TULAS. The change of local governments, also generated a deface of the project with the development of the plans of the local governments. Another change that generated new opportunities was the start of the Amazon Integral Program of Conservation of Forests and Sustainable production (PROAmazonía), executed by the MAE and the Ministry of Agriculture and Cattle-Raising (MAG), financed by the Green Climate Fund and GEF and implemented by the UNDP.

## 2.3. Immediate and development objectives

1. The Landscapes - Wildlife Project is an innovative approximation of the country to the theme of wildlife conservation. It is the first time in Latin America that a GEF project is developed focusing principally on the management of wildlife, and it is the first time that a landscape vision in the management of the Protected Areas systems is applied. The objective of this project was to accomplish for Ecuador’s PA system to apply landscape approaches to increase its effectiveness for conservation of globally important wildlife. This will allow for the connectivity of the habitats, in areas, big enough, as well as maintaining different types of habitat for the dispersion of key fauna.
2. The project is centered in the conservation of 19 animal wildlife species threatened at a global level (13 mammals, 4 birds, one reptile, and one fish). During its design, the project selected five intervention landscapes which include seven focal protected areas (The Wildlife Refuge *El Pambilar*, the Ecological Reserve *Cotacachi-Cayapas*, the Ecological Reserve *El Ángel*, the Ecological Reserve *Cofán-Bermejo*, the Ecological Reserve *Antisana*, the National *Llanganates* Park and the National *Podocarpus* Park), and two corridors (*Llanganates-Sangay* and Cuyabeno-Yasuní).

* Landscape 1 “Pambilar-Cotacachi Cayapas”: joins with, and includes the Wildlife Refuge El Pambilar and the low zone of the Cotacachi-Cayapas Ecological Reserve.
* Landscape 2 “Cotacachi Cayapas-El Ángel”: joins with and includes the El Pambilar Wildlife Refuge and the low zone of the Ecological Reserve Cotacachi-Cayapas.
* Landscape 3 “Cofán Bermejo-Llanganates”: Joins with and includes the Cofán-Bermejo Ecological Reserve, the National Park Cayambe-Coca, the Antisana Ecological Reserve, The National Park Cayambe-Coca, the National Park Llanganates, and the Llanganates-Sangay Corridor.
* Landscape 4 “Cuyabeno–Yasuní Corridor”: connects two of the biggest PA of the country in the Ecuadorean Amazon (The Cuyabeno Fauna Production Reserve and the Yasuní National Park).
* Landscape 5 “Podocarpus National Park”: with its connections towards the East and Southwest (National Park Yacuri and the Cerro Plateado Biological Reserve).

1. During the execution of the project and with attention to the accomplishment of one of its indicators, two protected area replicas were added (National Parks Cayambe-Coca and Sangay) and two replica provinces (El Oro and Azuay), with which the project did not work with directly, but that were benefited indirectly through the connectivity at a landscape level that it promoted.
2. The project generated global environmental benefits because it focused on the conservation of emblematic and threatened wildlife through a landscape vision in the management of the protected area systems. In this way, the project helped to increase the coverage of the threatened habitats and threatened species, which constitutes an indicator for the strategic GEF objective BD1 “improve the sustainability of the protected area systems”. The project also contributed to the attainment of the outcomes of UNDP Country Program, particularly the “Institutional reform and the improvement of the ability of the authorities to prioritize and incorporate themes on the matter of conservation, access and sustainable use of biodiversity and of environmental planning in the National Development Plan.

## 2.4 Main Stakeholders

1. The Ecuadorean environmental institutional setting is led by the Ministry of the Environment (MAE). The Natural Patrimony sub-secretary is directly related to the present project. This sub-secretary integrates the National Biodiversity Directorate that also includes the Protected Area Unit, the wildlife Unit, the Biodiversity Unit, and the Genetic Resources Unit and the National Forest Directorate. Because it is the technical focal point for GEF, it endorses GEF projects and generally works as executing agency.
2. Among other relevant national government agencies, the National Planning and Development Secretary (SENPLADES, for its acronym in Spanish) is responsible for the coordination of the National Decentralized System of Participative Planning, in which it promotes the integral development of the country, the deconcentrating and the decentralization, as well as the establishing of plans, institutional reform programs and projects, territorial, ordering of the territory, public investment and planning. This role is relevant for the project due to the landscape approach of the project. The Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Husbandry (MAG) is the leading sectorial institution that regulates, norms, facilitates, controls and evaluates the management of the agricultural and cattle production. It is relevant to the present project because so many of the threats that affect wildlife and its habitats are originated in the production areas which concern MAG.
3. The Decentralized Autonomous Governments (GAD), in their three levels have the task of determining the organization and use of land at a local level, as well as a determining element of the floor usage plans. The GAD at province, municipal and Parish levels are responsible for the generating of development plans and land use, environmental management, declaration of provincial and municipal protected areas, formulating local environmental norms and of the execution of sustainable project management of the natural resources.
4. Article 167 of TULAS includes the creation of Management Committees in all of the protected Areas with the objective of promoting the voluntary participation of public and private entities with interests or responsibilities related to the PAs (including, implicitly, the sustainable wildlife management within its limits).
5. The Environmental Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) have an important role in the environmental management in Ecuador. They support the National Government as much as the subnational and local communities, with studies, strengthening of capacities, technical support, social communication, environmental education and direct conservation programs (sustainable management, species protections). WCS is one of them, with specific experience in applied research and sustainable management of wildlife at a global level. WCS Ecuador, present in Ecuador since 2001, participates as the responsible agency for the execution of several activities in the Landscapes- Wildlife Project.
6. Several universities in Ecuador participate in different ways with environmental management and wildlife management, through research and professional development of future professionals. Especially the Faculties for Biological Sciences and the Museums of Natural Sciences are important sources of information on biodiversity. In the present project, several universities participated in specific activities, among them the Universidad San Francisco de Quito, the Universidad Técnica Particular de Loja and the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador.
7. The families who are organized in rural communities (whether or not belonging to indigenous groups) are considered the final beneficiaries of the project. The outcome indicator of the UNDP Country Program, explicitly recognizes the right of the social actors to a healthy environment, safe and environmental sustainability, and the project contributed with tools and the creation of abilities to do so. The rural communities directly benefited from the implementation of these sustainable production initiatives and from the alternative sources of protein that were developed in this project. Local producers are the main stakeholders in the actions of reducing the pressure on wildlife, the reduction of illegal bush meat commerce and of human-wildlife conflicts. With a participatory focus, the project activities which have direct interaction with communities were planned, agreed, executed and monitored with them. In the case of the indigenous communities that have their territories legally denominated as Territorial circumscriptions, have the same functions that those of local governments (GAD) in virtue of what was set in COOTAD.
8. The United Nations System in the Country counts on the permanent representation of several agencies. The United Nations for Development Program (UNDP) is one of them. UNDP has supported sustainable development and environmental management for several decades. One of its support-channels is the GEF project implementation. UNDP has been the implementing agency for a total of 56 GEF projects which include Ecuador; 22 of which were national projects (only implemented in Ecuador) the rest of them binational, regional, or global. Twelve GEF-UNDP projects in Ecuador were full-size and the rest of them of medium size. The UNDP has also been the implementing agency of the GEF Small Grants Program in Ecuador.

## 2.5. Expected Outcomes

1. To accomplish its main objective, the project worked at two levels within two integrated and interdependent components in a coordinated manner. This was necessary to adopt this foreseen paradigm change which could be directed form the inside of the appropriate institutional instances. A group of outputs related to each other would be generated to collectively accomplish this challenge. Each of these components has a planned outcome and a series of outputs.
   * Component 1 - Outcome 1: PAs contribute effectively to the conservation of threatened wildlife.
     + Output 1.1: Adaptive management framework to guide the cost-effective implementation of wildlife conservation.
     + Output 1.2: Emplacement of specific wildlife conservation actions in PAs.
     + Output 1.3: Community-based management schemes reduce pressures from subsistence hunting in 3 PAs.
   * Component 2 - Outcome 2: Management of non-PA areas in 5 target landscapes contributes effectively to the conservation of threatened wildlife.
     + Output 2.1: Enforcement-system strengthened for reducing illegal hunting.
     + Output 2.2: Land-use planning norms in place to protect habitats key for wildlife dispersal.
     + Output 2.3: Functional connectivity in landscapes important for wildlife dispersion.

## 2.6. Established baseline indicators

1. The Prodoc Results framework established a total of six indicators for the objective: one on the situation of the wildlife population, one on the state of the selected habitats, one for threat reduction, two for the favorable surroundings, and one for replication. The outcomes of both components have five indicators each. Each of the sixteen indicators has detailed data on its concept, its form of measurement and its baseline (Section II of Prodoc). The Prodoc did not include indicators at the level of outputs or activities.

# 3. Evaluation Findings

## 3.1. Project design and formulation

### 3.1.1. Analysis of project logic, strategies, outcomes and indicators.

*D1[[17]](#footnote-17). The design of the Project includes a coherent logic, with a clearly defined objective and a strategy that consists of different actions to treat issues related to the management of wildlife in an integral manner.*

*D2. Covering five landscapes, the project had a wide presence in the territory. Having chosen a strategy of different actions in each landscape, resulted in a certain level of dispersion.*

*D3. The project has detailed indicators at the level of outcomes and objectives. Some indicators were adapted to the reality of the context during the execution of the project. The main impact indicator (01) requires a lot of investment (of budget and time) for its measurement and it has not been measured enough yet.*

1. The MTE has concluded that the project was well designed, with a relevant objective for the country, a coherent hypothesis, adequately identified barriers and a logical framework with outcomes related to these barriers. During the inception phase of the present evaluation, the evaluator confirmed the good quality of the general design. The evaluator reconstructed the Theory of Change (ToC) that implicitly underpins the project[[18]](#footnote-18). This ToC was directly built with the elements from the results framework, implying that the planned outputs and outcomes were related in a logical and direct manner to the objective. The only change that the evaluator had suggested has to do with the formulation of the impact. Although the general objective (“The SNAP applies landscape focuses to increase its effectiveness for the conservation of wildlife”) is clear, it is not formulated as an impact in the sense of the UNDP-GEF[[19]](#footnote-19) guidelines, but represents several aspects that are represented by its indicators. For this reason, in the ToC this objective is presented as an umbrella that includes final outcomes and impact. The evaluator considered that the impact of the project is better represented by the first indicator of the objective (The maintenance or increase of the abundance of priority species of wildlife in the landscapes). Due to this, this indicator is presented as ‘impact’ in the ToC and the other indicators are presented as ‘final outcomes’. In addition, during the creation of the ToC the evaluator identified that an assumption was missing: the inclusion of conservation models implies the protection of the vegetation. Therefore, a second ‘impact’ was proposed that explains the conservation state of the natural vegetation included in conservation areas. At the same time, this impact also helps to improve the abundance of focal species. Thus, the ToC clearly represents the project logic with a final impact (abundance of priority species) that is generated in two ways (that can be considered as “impact pathways[[20]](#footnote-20)”) : (1) the management of a territory that results in a better conservation of the natural vegetation cover (within and outside protected areas) and through this, it contributes to improve the state of wildlife and (2) the different direct actions of wildlife management implemented in the territory (control of illegal trafficking, hunting sustainability, inclusion of fauna management aspects in local plans), contribute to improve the state of wildlife.
2. According to the interviewed persons regarding the formulation of the project, the focus of the management of wildlife through the promoting of a landscape vision, was an effort to align the project to the GEF strategic objectives at its time. Therefore, the desired impact to improve the state of conservation of wildlife was associated through the application of the focus of landscape management. Promoting a landscape vision ensures an integral approach that combines the management of protected areas, other natural areas and productive landscapes; it seeks connectivity between elements; combines natural ecosystem conservation activities with sustainable use of productive areas, and includes the opportunity to coordinate between several stakeholders and sectors. All this would result in good territorial management which, in combination with actions directly focused on fauna (management plans, trafficking control and commerce, conflict management), would result in an improvement of the state of conservation of wildlife in the entire landscape and additionally, would also generate other environmental and social benefits.
3. The project is applied in five landscapes, covering a large portion of the country. It is also focused on 19 focal species among birds, mammals, reptiles and, fish. The expected outcomes speak at a landscape level (the protected areas and the unprotected areas management in 5 landscapes efficiently contributes to the conservation of wildlife). Due to obvious time limitations, financial and human resources, it was accepted that all of the actions would not be able to be implemented in all of the landscapes nor cover the entire population of focal species. Additionally, due to strategic considerations, it was not necessary to consider all of the activities in all of the landscapes: not all of the threats to wildlife are manifested in the same way everywhere. As an answer, the decision to apply certain strategies in certain zones and focus on a few species in each landscape with basis on a strategic analysis of necessity and opportunity. In total, the project worked on more than 60 parishes and municipalities, in 11 provinces, directly with 7 protected areas and with 2 additional for certain actions. In all of these locations, activities such as censuses and monitoring, strengthening of capacities, management support in the legal and normative fields, wildlife trafficking control, productive project implementation, deals so that sustainable hunting or subsistence and alternative sources of protein projects and projects for the mitigation of human-wildlife conflicts were reached. Nevertheless, in none of these locations more than three of these activities took place and in most of them only one occurred. Additionally, certain activities (for example, in the sustainable production projects) they were implemented in a few locations in each landscape. This implementation strategy is justifiable from an effectiveness point of view (to focus actions where they would be the most relevant) and efficiency (use the resources in the best way), but the outcome was a geographically disperse project and the complete array of activities was never applied in none of the sites. Thus, the project has managed to attend an area and a population much greater than with a possible alternative strategy (i.e. apply all of the activities in a few sites), but with the risk of few persons understanding its entire logic by participating only in a few activities. For example, in the interviews with the 23 local actors, only five (all of the MAE[[21]](#footnote-21) functionaries,) were involved in more than two project activities.
4. Generally, the quality of all 16 project indicators is good. All of the have a clear explanation of their relevance, they are quantified, have a baseline, and a detailed explanation of the target levels (goal) and of its way of measuring. The MTE concluded that they are precise and relevant. Nevertheless, the evaluator additionally observed that the goals of some indicators (01, 1.3) are highly ambitious and hard to accomplish. It was also observed that some indicators should be adjusted (02, 03, 2.5) so that they better fit the present context. As an answer to the MTE, the project adjusted the formulation of a few indicators. As it is observed in some outcomes of this evaluation, most of them were accomplished, and due to this, have demonstrated that they were adequate and measurable. Nevertheless, the measuring of the main impact indicator (01, Maintenance or increase of the abundance of species in selected landscapes) was too expensive in terms of budget, time and human ability. This caused the project to extend 4 months, in order to be able to have a minimum level of measurement for the main species. Although some valuable data was accomplished from the state of abundance of the wildlife, this period is still short to have reliable data to evidence population trends for the species (¶128, 129). The need for long-term monitoring to demonstrate trends in the abundance of wildlife that is well known and has been able to be anticipated in the new project design. [[22]](#footnote-22)
5. The project design does not have indicators at the output level. Due to this, the quality and quantity of the planned outputs cannot be analyzed. For example, the output 1.1 (“management framework to guide the rentable implementation”) does not say in what it consists of, when it must be ready, and what subjects it must include. While it is true that there is a series of activities mentioned under the output, it is not possible, for example, to understand in detail what the data and decision support system mentioned in output 1.1.c “Data Management and Decision support system based in updated and trustworthy data and in traditional knowledge” consists of.

### 3.1.2 Assumptions and risks

*D4. The assumptions and risks included in the project design are adequate and logical but the list is not complete.*

*D5. The risk analysis is robust, detailed, and it has been used in part to identify activities and outputs.*

1. Five assumptions are considered in the results framework of Prodoc. These are related to the impact of climate change and of human activities, that do not exceed the margin of tolerance of the species and of the habitats, with the continuity of the local government conditions, and from the presence and sustained interest, collaboration and commitment of MAE, GAD and communities (see results framework, Prodoc). In the project design, these five assumptions were associated to the accomplishment of the objective (3) with the outcome (2). In reconstructing the ToC during the inception phase, the evaluator identified a series of additional assumptions (see table 1 of the inception report; Annex 6). Several of these assumptions are associated to the accomplishment of activities and outputs, such as the availability of trained human resources, the presence of incentives, and the obtaining of co-financing. Though they sound marginal, these are factors that have caused challenges in the implementation of the project. (¶87, 0, 90). At a level of accomplishment of direct outcomes, another type of assumption exists which was not identified in project design: the acceptance and application of plans and legislation, and the continuity of coordination among different institutions. Finally, the evaluator has identified two additional assumptions to the accomplishment of the impact, which are considered to be fundamental for the ToC of the project (¶44). The first assumption is that with a better conservation of the vegetation the state of the wildlife is effectively improved. The second assumption is that there are no other human or natural pressures that affect wildlife (in other words: an eventual impact can be attributed to the project that is not influenced by other factors).
2. The risk analysis matrix of the project (Prodoc, Section IV, Part II) presents again three of the six assumptions from the results framework; using other wording (continuity of the MAE commitment, collaboration and interest from communities, local governance). It also presents two new risks (high rotation of MAE personnel and delays due to having the administration through the HACT[[23]](#footnote-23) by WCS). This list of risks, though it may be redundant with the assumptions, is adequate. With the experience in the change of context during the implementation period of the project (¶29), an additional risk could have been included: the economic instability of the country which drastically reduced the availability of fiscal funds for the MAE and its programs (incl. Socio Bosque). This risk has affected the accomplishment of several outputs (¶87, 103), and though some were mitigated, it is still threatening the sustainability of the project (¶126). In the PIR, the project reported risks that have reached critical levels, either in the list of Prodocs or other risks. The risk that was not originally received (the budget reduction of MAE) was reported upon in PIR 2015 and 2016. In PIR 2017 the risk was reported on the impossibility of making three monitoring rounds.
3. The risk analysis included in the Prodoc is correct and complete, with its categorization, impact score and probability, presentation of mitigation measures or answer and the owner of the risk. In three risks, the mitigation measure that was proposed was directly included in the logic of the project. For example, as an answer to the risk of lack of will from the communities to change their habits and adopt alternatives, the project included the outcomes of promoting and strengthening the subsistence mediums that provide benefits for the wellbeing. Thus, for the risk of the governability conditions to be developed inadequately, the project strengthens the role of the GAD and incorporates elements of collaboration with SENPLADES through the guide for the inclusion of wildlife criteria in Territorial Ordering and Development Plans (PDOT, for its acronym in Spanish). On the other side, the response to the risk that the MAE keeps supporting with strategic sectors was “the project will be focused on showing the economic, social, environment and cultural benefits of the conservation of wildlife”. But this, in reality, did not happen: while the project did accomplish benefits at the local level, there are no studies or strategies to demonstrate the general benefits at a national level.

*3.1.3. Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design*

*D6. The project has included few lessons from other projects in its design. This was in part because of the novel approach of the project. During the implementation of the project the communication and collaboration with other projects in execution was effective, but the experience of the previous projects was scarcely included.*

1. This project is the first in the GEF portfolio in Latin America focused on wildlife. In the region, there have been other large initiatives, supported by other donors, regarding the conservation of wildlife in the context of territory, but focused on emblematic species and with a vision of corridors more than of complete landscapes[[24]](#footnote-24). Due to this singularity, there are not many previous projects available whose lessons and experiences could be included. The main strategy through which the project included previous experiences was through the collaboration with institutions and groups of specialists that have accumulated expertise with the management of fauna in the country, like WCS, USFQ, and the *Cóndor Andino* Working Group. During this evaluation, according to several interviewed key informants, the invitation on behalf of MAE to WCS to participate as responsible partner of the project was specific to this end: to ensure that an organization with more experience in the subject has an important role in the project. The evaluator considers that this was an effective strategy: while there are more organizations in the country with relevant expertise in the management of wildlife, who have been able to be included in some way to the project (i.e. *Aves y Conservación*, Conservation International, IUCN), WCS probably has the most relevant expertise. Moreover, the WCS personnel maintains a good professional and personal relationship with the rest of the institutions so that there is *de facto* communication.
2. The Prodoc[[25]](#footnote-25) mentions how the project would collaborate with four other GEF projects relevant to the Landscapes - Wildlife Project. More than focusing on incorporating lessons from these projects, this section explains how the activities were coordinated and how the communication was maintained during the execution. For example, actions in the Tembladera wetland (El Oro) were constructed based on a previous project[[26]](#footnote-26). In the field visits (Imbabura), the evaluator also observed that lessons with cattle management that were learned in the GEF/FAO project “Resisting Focuses to the climate of cattle production” were applied in the Landscapes - Wildlife Project. The collaboration with the National Support System of Protected Areas project (PASNAP) has been continued as it is executed by the MAE together with two other projects, supporting the National Directorate of Biodiversity (DNB, for its acronym in Spanish) in a coordinated manner. Subsequently, after its execution, the project established an effective contact with PROAmazonía; another UNDP project with financing form the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and GEF that will support and bring sustainability to the productive actions and conservation in the Amazon landscapes (¶103, 126). It also has the managerial coordination with the GEF/UNDP project “Conservation of the Biodiversity of Ecuadorean Amphibians and Sustainable use of its Genetic Resources” which started in 2016 and that is administratively connected to the Landscapes - Wildlife Project (¶65). The regional project GEF/UNDP “Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (LAC)” and the Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN[[27]](#footnote-27)) were important to support the policy framework that was inserted in the Landscapes - Wildlife Project. In general, the managers of the different projects executed by the MAE interviewees during these evaluations confirmed that a frequent communication has been kept (every week or every two weeks) among them and at the directive and ministerial level of MAE, which helped the exchange of experiences and lessons.
3. Apart from the already mentioned GEF projects, the Prodoc does not mention other ongoing initiatives, like for example, another GEF project executed during the same period (United Nations Program for the Environment, Consortium for the Sustainable development of the Andean Eco-Region – CONDESAN: multiplying environmental benefits and of carbon in the high Andean ecosystems) which has several aspects of coincidence with the Landscapes –Wildlife Project. Although it was not foreseen that the design, during the execution of the project, an effective collaboration with CONDESAN specifically was established for the management of ACUS. Another relevant example that was not mentioned is the program “Initiative for the conservation of the Andean Amazon”, financed by the Agency of the United States for International Development (USAID) that was in its final phase when the Landscapes - Wildlife Project was underway. This project supported, for ten years, a series of programs of sustainable use of agriculture and biodiversity (including wildlife) in two landscapes of the present project.
4. The evaluator observed that in the field the project did seek collaboration and alignment with other ongoing projects, such as the ones mentioned above from FAO and CONDESAN. Despite this, the project did not include other experiences from past experiences in the same zones. For example, in the zone of the project in Napo (Cuyuja) the Project of Adaptation to the Impact of the Accelerated Retreat of Glaciers in the Tropical Andes –PRAA[[28]](#footnote-28) took place, which included support for greenhouse family farming. In Imbabura, one of the communities who was included in the project, had been beneficiary to a series of projects for the management of its Andean ecosystems and its productive system. In both cases, although some local informants remember these projects, there has not been a systematic inclusion of these experiences, through an *ex-ante* identification, an identifying of good practices and lessons and/or the mobilization of the local memory.

### 3.1.4. Planned stakeholder participation

*D7. The project has identified a wide range of relevant stakeholders and their role in the project was identified after consultations during the design phase. This resulted in a representative participation of stakeholders in the implementation of the project.*

1. The Prodoc includes an adequate analysis of actors, that had too been identified by the MTE. During the development phase of the project (PPG), a representation of them was consulted and a detailed table of main actors was established, GAD municipal and provincial, and NGOs and the activity zones. A summary of the main actors and their role in the project is presented in Table 1. The evaluator considers the identification and association of actors in the design and execution to be complete and adequate.

*Table 1. Key institutional stakeholders[[29]](#footnote-29)*

| Stakeholder | Function (related to the project) | Role in the project implementation |
| --- | --- | --- |
| MAE | Leading institution of the environmental sector. Managing Protecting Areas, leading agency for management and the conservation of wildlife, Direction of the Socio Bosque Program, GEF focal point. | Project executing agency. Co-financing, technical support, national and provincial coordination (provincial leaderships). |
| MAG | It is the leading institution of agriculture. | Support and assessment of sustainable production projects. |
| SENPLADES | Coordinates the Decentralized Participative National Planning System; in charge of promoting the territorial ordering, like that of the planning and guiding of the public investment. | Coordinating and giving consultations in support of the project regarding territorial planning processes of use of land and of GADs. |
| GAD provincial and municipal. | Generating plans for land use and development for environmental management. | Support of Parishes, Declaration of sub-national protected areas, the formulation of environmental local norms (incl. support to PDOT). Co-financing. |
| GAD Parish | Development of PDOT, promoting local rural development. | Coordination of sustainable production projects with communities, co-financing, implementing of wildlife management in PDOT. |
| Local Management Committees | Cooperation in the conservation and management of the PAs and their buffer zones. | Strengthening and promoting dialogue, coordination and governance at a local level. |
| Indigenous communities and farmer organizations | Conservation, management and sustainable use of wildlife in its territories. | Channels for representation of local interests in the project decisions, implementing local actions. |
| Universities | Tasks of technical supports as that of generating technical and scientific data. | Information supplies to guide wildlife strategies. |
| NGOs | Research activities, training, planning and field practices for conservation and rural development. | Support in the collaboration and complementarity of the conservation of wildlife initiatives. In case of WCS, it is a responsible partner. |
| National Police (Environmental Protection Unit) | Control and enforcement of the environmental norms. | Orientation on the application of legislation related to wildlife. |

### 3.1.5. Replication approach

*D8. Replication was integrated in the logic of the project through specific activities and was measured through an indicator at the objective level. The replication by third parties was not planned, however, there are examples of evidence that this did take place.*

1. In its design, the project considers the replication of its strategies as an integral element of the project activities and measures its outcome through the indicator O6 (Increase in the number of PAs and adjacent landscapes at a national level with the planning and management of project instruments that the models and learned lessons of the project include). The activities that were implemented to achieve this indicator (mainly the declaration of the ACUS in Carchi, Imbabura, Azuay/Loja and sustainable production projects with the goal of conservation of wildlife in the wetland La Tembladera in El Oro) were managed directly by the project. While they were successful, their replication value is questionable: generally, replication is understood as the adoption and application of examples or lessons by other actors in other places and/or at other scales, beyond the control of the project management. When replication is implemented as a part of the project design, including its financing and coordination, it cannot be considered in the sense of adoption by others. On the other side, there are other replication strategies inherent in motivating other actors, in other places to replicate the project strategy, such as the communication of outcomes that may motivate other actors in other places to apply the same practices; or the assistance that the project has given to other protected areas, or to other communities, municipalities, provinces (i.e. Sápara communities and the Municipality of Otavalo) to support the creation of capacities or the use of good practices. These replication actions were effective, but were not a direct part of the project design. Finally, another replication activity that was not planned, was the use of good practices of the project in other jurisdictions than where the project worked, with GAD’s own funds (for example, GAD Imbabura destined funds to replicate good practices of cattle management in the eastern parishes of the province, along with other parishes; ¶93).

### 3.1.6. Corporate Advantage of the UNDP

*D9. MAE invited the UNDP as GEF implementing agency for its experience with GEF projects, its presence in the country and its closeness with the DNB.*

1. According to interviewed persons in the MAE who participated in the project design, when the need to develop a GEF project with the subject of wildlife was identified, the UNDP was chosen as the ideal implementing agency. Being a project with a new focus, a need for an agency with trajectory in the country and in biodiversity subjects was needed, with staff present in the country and a good personal and professional relationship with the DNB in the MAE, and with the ability to mobilize different sectors and stakeholders. Given that the UNDP has implemented several GEF projects in the country, with a professional team permanently present and with a long trajectory of collaborating with the DNB and civil society stakeholders, was the ideal agency. Other potential implementing agencies had less experience in biodiversity management and others who did have it, were not present with a professional team in the country or had less experience in GEF. Something that is not explicitly mentioned in the Prodoc is that the UNDP has a comparative advantage because it has several projects, knows how to combine human development, and has an excellent relationship with the state, the MAE and also handles PROAmazonía, a project that relates directly with the activities of Landscapes - Wildlife Project.

### 3.1.7. Project Management Arrangements

*D10. To accomplish efficiency and agility, the execution and governance of the Project involved relatively few agencies. MAE executed the project through an independent Management Unit together with WCS as responsible partner. These organizations, alongside the Implementing Agency and CONGOPE, participate in the Steering committee of the Project, as the highest authority of decision-making.*

*D11. For administrative reasons two components were added to the Landscapes – Wildlife Project before the National Registry. One component (converted into component 3 of the project) was for the important public counterpart funding for “management of wildlife kept in captivity”. The execution of this components coordinates actions with the GEF project, without it being governed by the Steering Committee. Another component was added to the present project to locate the GEF project for conservation of amphibians. This component has no operational or strategic coordination with the project. The responsibility of both components lies with the project manager, but he has no control over its activities.*

1. The project was executed over a period of five years under the National Implementation Modality (MIN) with the UNDP as implementing agency (IA) of the GEF and the MAE as Main Executing Entity. In this role, the MAE took control of the program supervision as well as administrative and financial management and has been responsible for the approval of the project outputs previous to the presentation of the reports to the UNDP and the GEF. The project aligns with the System of Basic Agreement of Assistance (SBAA) between UNDP and the Ecuadorean Government.
2. As implementing agency of the GEF, the UNDP is ultimately responsible for the delivery of the outcomes, which are also subject to approval from MAE as the Main Executing Entity. The UNDP offers management services of the project cycle defined by the GEF Council. A main role in the UNDP is that of offering a guarantee for project quality and to provide timely support to the Steering Committee of the Project through the execution of independent supervision and monitoring.
3. WCS is the responsible partner for the delivery of certain project outputs, mainly those associated with censuses, monitoring and management of wildlife. UNDP makes transferences via HACT to WCS for the implementation of the components under its authority and this NGO has total control over the practice of the aspects of the projects for which it is responsible for (subject to supervision of the National Project Manager and the Directing Project Committee). It can use its own supply channels for the recruiting and hiring of personnel. During the implementation, and reviewing the advance of activities the parts (MAE and WCS) agreed that it would be more efficient for certain activities under WCS responsibility were hired by the Project Management Unit. In this way, in the last two years of the project, the human team for the monitoring and management of conflicts was hired by MAE, but the work was coordinated by WCS. Even though this, according to involved personnel that was interviewed, causes certain management challenges, it did result more efficient especially because the team felt more connected with the project and got more direct support from their colleagues from the Management Unit.
4. The Project Steering Committee is the projects decision-making organ. It is conformed of the MAE (whom presides the committee), UNDP, WCS, and CONGOPE. It meets on a quarterly basis with the goal of assuring that the project activities lead to the required outcomes just as they were defined in the project document. It charged with supervising project execution, approving work plans and budgets provided by the National Coordinator, approving important changes in the project plans; approving the main project outputs, moderate conflicts that may arise, and is responsible for the external evaluations of the project. According to the Prodoc, the Steering Committee would also integrate a representative from the beneficiaries (The Association of Municipalities of Ecuador[[30]](#footnote-30)) but this did not happen.
5. The Project Management Unit established a technical committee comprised of MAE functionaries (DNB and Wildlife Management Unit) and WCS. Normally, this informal committee was convened generally each week to coordinate project activities. According to the different members of the Management Unit and of WCS, during the first years, it decreased the frequency of its meetings for agenda reasons of the participants. After the MTE observations regarding the lack of coordination amongst project instances (MAE, Management Unit, and WCS) the manager ensured a greater frequency of these meetings which then promoted a better communication and coordination.
6. For administrative reasons, two components were added to the project that are not included in the prodoc. The reason was that the Ecuadorean Government assigned the project an important amount from fiscal funds, to carry out complementary activities regarding the management of wildlife in captivity. In order to channel and administer these funds to the project, it was necessary to present them before SENPLADES and create a specific account in National Registry, that cannot be shared with the GEF project. For this reason, component 3 was created for the project with a separate objective “Strengthening the sustainable wildlife management in a biological, sanitary, social and economic context in urban and rural territories”. This component, though handled by MAE, operatively is separated from Landscapes - Wildlife Project; it is not directed by the Landscapes - Wildlife Project Steering Committee and it does not report or have a relationship with UNDP. Nevertheless, before MAE and SENPLADES, the coordinator of the Landscapes - Wildlife Project is responsible for the administration of the fiscal funds of this component. In practice, GEF and the Implementing Agency consider a project of two components, but MAE and SENPLADES consider it has three. This aspect evidently causes confusion and challenges in the coordination and reporting lines.
7. The component 3 (or “fiscal component”) implements a budget of USD 964,034 of co-financing of fiscal funds to the project and employs the experts of wildlife financed by the MAE (¶0). The staff of this Component 3 is located in the same space as the Project Management Unit and has permanently coordinated activities. The evaluator considers that the activities of this component (medical veterinary attention to animals who have been affected by trafficking, create regulations for the management of Wildlife Management Centers, elaboration of a database of diseases of animals held in captivity), are definitely complementary to the Landscapes - Wildlife Project because they are important elements for the conservation of wildlife in general terms. Though there points of coincidence between Component 3 and the other project activities, it only indirectly contributes to the general objective of the project because the activities are mainly directed to the veterinary attention to animals in captivity and there is little relation to the targeted territories or with a landscape[[31]](#footnote-31) vision.
8. Once the project was underway, another GEF/UNDP project was approved (Amphibians and their Genetic Resources Project) that also receives fiscal funds. In 2016, these resources were located in the same account of Landscapes - Wildlife Project by SENPLADES and is considered by them as component 4 of the Project. The management of this project has no operational relationship or strategic relationship with the Landscapes - Wildlife Project . It does not have any administrative relationship to GEF or UNDP. Nonetheless, the Project Manager of Project Landscapes –Wildlife is also responsible of the fiscal funds of this component but has no control over its activities.
9. The evaluator considers that the contribution of MAE to the project with fiscal funds is highly positive. Nevertheless, the arrangement to administer the fiscal components (components 3 and 4) of the project, complicated its execution. The coordinator of the project cannot be responsible for the funds of another project (in the case of component 4) over which it has no control and has no strategic or administrative relationship. It is also a risk to hand over responsibility of a component that has no administrative relationship with the project (component 3) but that is not supervised by the same Steering Committee, which is the instance to which the coordinator renders accounts to. In practice, there has been several positive aspects, such as the contribution to the everyday collegiality and the continuity of the project brought by component 3 (¶85) but at the same time it is an additional risk, considering that the performance of another GEF projects affects the funding for the Fiscal Components of Landscapes - Wildlife Project (¶90).

Conclusion 1. The project has been well designed regarding its general logic, involvement of stakeholders, and institutional management arrangements. It possesses a detailed, well defined and ambitious array of indicators at the level of outcomes and objectives. The identification of assumptions and risks was incomplete.

Conclusion 2. The geographic and subject range of the project is wide, for which it is considered ambitious. The strategic response was to divide the activities in different landscapes, which was effective, but which has also generated a disperse execution.

Conclusion 3. Although the co-financing with public funding and the component 3 was executed well, the administrative arrangement of adding two components to the project has caused confusion and unnecessarily pressures the efficiency and effectiveness of the project.

## 3.2 Project Implementation

### 3.2.1. Adaptive Management as a response to changes in the context and/or monitoring and evaluation

*PI1. As a response to the monitoring of project progress, important changes in project implementation were made in order to timely respond to multiple changes in the context.*

1. During the project execution period, there were several important changes in the context (¶29). The evaluator has observed how the project has adapted to changes, and transformed some of these in opportunities for accomplishing impact. Additionally, during the execution of the monitoring of the project, it identified some factors that threatened its effectivity which were resolved through corrective or adaptive measures (Table 2).

*Table 2. Adaptive response on behalf of the project to changes in the context and adjustments based on project monitoring*

| Change in context | Effect to the Project | Project Management Response |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Economic deceleration of the country and a smaller budget for MAE and Socio Bosque. | Socio Bosque with no possibility of increasing conservation areas. | * Identifying other conservation models: formation of ACUS, municipal and Ramsar site reserves, in collaboration with the WWF and CONDESAN. |
|  | Smaller MAE budget destined towards activities and wildlife personnel during and after the project. | * Adjusting activities from component 3 to manage it with 5 technicians instead of 10. |
| MAE Restructuring | Insecurity of the structure of the national environmental authority in the future, including the technical units and the decentralized addresses. | * Developing a proposal for a wildlife management model, adapting it to possible scenarios of different institutional structure. |
| Change in environmental legislation | Elaboration of the proposal of the Environmental Organic Code (COA), which gathers all of the environmental laws within a single legal body. | * Instead of focusing in reforming existing legislation (TULAS), supporting MAE and the National Assembly in the preparation of COA elements. This included several different or additional activities/studies. |
| Strict control of bushmeat sales in the Amazon markets. | Dismantling of the bushmeat sales in these markets for which indicator 03 was unable to be measured. | * Measure the indicator through the seized bushmeat in the MAE control checkpoint. |
| Insecurity issues in the Pacific Coast – North Frontier. | Impossibility of the UNDP personnel under contract to carry on with the field activities in part of landscape 1. | * Initially, the follow-up was done by no-UNDP personnel, applying the same principles for everyone was decided. It is about using existing data and including missing elements in future projects (Jaguars GEF) |

| Lesson in monitoring | Effect to the Project | Project Management Response |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Unplanned delay at start of the project. | The opportunity to influence the PDOT in 2015 was lost. | * To support SENPLADES in the inclusion of focus principles of landscapes and management of the wildlife in development of the PDOT; while collaborating with the GAD in the preparation of the PDOT update in 2019. |
| Observations by SETECI regarding the managed amount by WCS. | WCS was not able to arrange for part of the funds necessary to implement activities under their responsibility. | * The MAE took over the expenses of these funds, including the hiring of responsible personnel. Agreeing with WCS to continue to offer supervision and technical support. |
| The initial monitoring team had no experience nor enough induction. | Low quality in the first scan of threatened species. | * WCS decided to continue with the collaboration of the team of volunteers from the United Nations, and hired a new team of technicians with more experience in biological monitoring who were specialized in different animal groups. |

### 3.2.2. Arrangements of the association with relevant actors in the country.

*PI2. The project progressively included relevant actors in the project implementation.*

1. The project started with the inclusion in the implementation of the mentioned actors in the project design, achieving an adequate and efficient arrangement of execution with three institutions and with a collaboration with some actors who were pre-identified as important (¶56). During the execution, the project increased its timely collaboration with different institutions, without raising the institutional execution of the project. At first instance, the project included a representation of the local governments (CONGOPE) in its Steering committee. According to members of the CD who were interviewed during this evaluation, this helped so that CONGOPE had concepts of sustainability and a landscape vision in its support to province governments. Representatives of the province governments confirmed that CONGOPE helped linked them to the project and especially with MAE in general. The evaluator observed that a positive factor for this arrangement is the fact that the focal person in CONGOPE is an ex functionary of MAE known by the different environmental entities at a national and province level. Thanks to this arrangement, the project intensified its collaboration with provincial GADs including them since the start and establishing contact with others.
2. In part, due to a good collaboration with CONGOPE and a team of provincial GADs, but also due to management of the project itself, the contact and the collaboration with the Parish GADs has been extended and these developed as main stakeholder of the project execution and part of the future sustainability. An excellent indicator of the commitment of GAD with the project is the concrete co-financing that they have dedicated to the support of the execution, replica, and continuity of the project (¶ 91, 93, 110).
3. The landscape approach implies working the natural areas as much as the productive areas. With this goal, and for different activities in order to mitigate the human-wildlife conflicts, the project promoted several sustainable production projects. It accomplished to effectively include MAG functionaries in the support of these activities. While this inclusion was limited only to local functionaries and not to management agreements at a central level (despite several attempts from MAE, according to the Project Management Unit), this collaboration between MAE and MAG was labeled as unique. The project also included installing capacity in other organizations, especially regarding experts in the field of wildlife management. Among others, it collaborated with the San Francisco University of Quito, and the Universidad Técnica Particular of Loja, the Universidad Técnica del Norte, the Universidad Técnica de Machala, the Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador, working groups of Condor and primate experts, and NGOs such as Aves y Conservación.

*3.2.3. Project Financing*

*PI3. The financial management of the project was correct and efficient. There are some examples of changes in the use of the funds for the technical and management activities.*

*PI4. The co-financing was materialized, although not according to what was initially planned. There was more cash contribution from the Government and a considerable additional amount of co-financing from GAD.*

1. The financial management has been correct, transparent, and efficient. The basis of the management of the funds is the AOP, presented and approved by the project Steering Committee. The GEF funds for the MAE are in a UNDP account. The Management Unit has an administrative/financial officer, for each expense instructed by the project manager, who makes the disbursement request according to the AOP. The UNDP approves and makes the disbursement. The funds for the activities under WCS responsibility are managed directly by this organization. They submit quarterly advance funds request and elaborate expense reports before creating a new disbursement request. In both budgets (MAE and WCS) for large expense items (consultancies and equipment) UNDP procurement rules were applied correctly. The project has had to adapt in several instances to changes in context (¶6868) and for these changes in activities, it has managed to make budget adaptations. The evaluator observed in the AOP management that this done in a correct and agile manner with the approval of the Steering Committee. The committee members who were interviewed confirmed this. The project is audited by the internal audit of the UNDP (¶117) [[32]](#footnote-32). The evaluator checked the Unit Management account books which are according to and aligned with the AOP and found them up to date. The project expense pace is close to what was planned. The disbursements graph (see PIR 2018) shows that due to the delay in the start of the project (¶19), the project spent late but the pace was according to planning in the Prodoc. At the time of closure of that report (June 2018), the project had reached an expense of 3.8M US$ or 85% of what was planned in the Prodoc, which is acceptable considering the execution was extended until March 2019.
2. The evaluator identified some examples were the expenses for project management were included in the budget lines for technical activities. For example, the expenses for audits, according to Prodoc part of the Project Management, was included in activity 1.1.h. In the 2017 and 2018 AOPs, there had been a high budget (approx. US$ 300,000/year) in activity 2.3.c, with the description “Support in the institutionalizing process in the MAE the promotion of sustainable biodiversity management” and “exit strategy”. According to the management unit and confirmed by the implementation agency in these budget lines were included some project operational expenses such as project team fees, travel expenses, office rental, truck maintenance, among others, which hold no direct relationship with activity 2.3.c (‘Promoting options of production and friendly habitats with connectivity’).
3. The co-financing of the project was achieved successfully (Table 3), but the co-financing sources were different from what was estimated. The main change was that the Ecuadorean state decided to contribute with US$800,000 in cash, for the support of personnel and travel expenses for component 3 (¶63), an amount which was not initially committed. The contributed amount from the PASNAP project was double what was originally expected. On the other hands, the funds associated to the program Socio Bosque[[33]](#footnote-33) were almost 2 million USD less than expected and these funds were not destined to the increase of areas under supervision, as it was planned, but rather to comply with the acquired commitments with the community and private conservation areas in the five landscapes. It is debatable if these funds can be considered co-financing or if they should be considered as part of the baseline.
4. From the other agencies that committed co-financing the project, WCS fulfilled its commitment and Ecofondo almost doubled its contribution to conservation projects in the territories. UNDP reported far less funds of co-financing from what it committed to. WWF contributed with US$ 15,000 for the process of declaration of the Ramsar site in the Amazon. A series of local actors, beneficiaries, and project collaborators have contributed with their own funds, which was not originally expected. These are mainly parish-level GAD that in total contributed with US$ 435,843, from which US$ 141,830 were in cash.

*Table 3. Agreed cofinancing (according to Prodoc) and accomplished (checked)*

| Source | Type | Agreed (US$) | Accomplished (US$) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| National Government |  |  |  |
| Fiscal Budget | cash | 0 | 803,282 |
| SNAP support program | cash/species | 828,000 | 1,601,531 |
| Forest conservation and REDD program (KfW) | species | 17,237,000 | 4,009,013 |
| Socio Bosque program | species | 0 | 11,576,553 |
| Other (inter)national actors |  |  |  |
| UNDP | species | 89,000 | 40,000 |
| Other UNDP projects | species | 361,000 | 10,000 |
| Ecofondo | species | 1,000,000 | 1,818,973 |
| WCS | species | 250,000 | 260,393 |
| WWF | cash | 0 | 15,000 |
| Local actors |  |  |  |
| El Oro Provincial GAD | species | 0 | 70,553 |
| Imbabura Provincial GAD | cash/species | 0 | 44,830[[34]](#footnote-34) |
| Cosanga Parish GAD | species | 0 | 23,676 |
| Malacatos Parish GAD | species | 0 | 32,503 |
| Cuyuja Parish GAD | cash/species | 0 | 26,400 |
| Sardinas Parish GAD | species | 0 | 23,937 |
| Sabanilla Parish GAD | species | 0 | 16,105 |
| Sigsipamba Parish GAD | species | 0 | 40,833 |
| Mariano Acosta Parish GAD | cash/species | 0 | 29,070 |
| Angochagua Parish GAD | cash/species | 0 | 31,820 |
| La Paz Parish GAD | cash/species | 0 | 28,363 |
| Art and Nature Foundation (Esmeraldas) | cash/species | 0 | 36,532 |
| Intag River Coffee grower’s association | species | 0 | 23,000 |
| Cruz Loma Community | species | 0 | 7,221 |
| Total |  | 19,765,000 | 20,569,588 |

### 3.2.4. Evaluation monitoring: design and implementation

*PI5. The project has a complete monitoring and evaluation plan which was implemented according to planning.*

*PI6. The technical progress reporting was done adequately through Project Implementation Reports (PIR), which included detailed data on the progress of activities, an achievement of indicators and adaptive management measures based in the monitoring.*

1. The Prodoc explains the design of the monitoring and evaluating system of the project (Table 4). According to revised information by the evaluator, the project implemented the monitoring and evaluating system perfectly and according to planned. There have not been any delays in key meeting, technical reports and plans. The revised PIR by the evaluator show a highly detailed level of the progress of the activities, the accomplishments of the indicators and the challenges and adjustments in the execution.
2. The project had an adequate adaptive management (¶68); this was part of an outcome of the good execution of the monitoring and evaluating system. The evaluator noted that the observations in the PIR were discussed in the Steering Committee meetings (according to the revised minutes) and were reflected in the subsequent AOP. How the MTE recommendations were implemented was also made evident.
3. The project had a good interaction with other projects, specifically those implemented by MAE. Meetings were held almost weekly among managers which, according to them, helped in the exchanging of experiences and feedback for the management of the entire program portfolios a lot. The learning from the collaboration with other organizations who implement similar projects (WWF, CONDESAN, etc.) helped include new concepts in the project, as the ACUS and the planning of the Ramsar sites.

*Table 4: Project Monitoring and Evaluating System*

| *Frequency* | *Activity* |
| --- | --- |
| Start of Project | * + The inception workshopof the project within the first two months for socializing and for preparing the annual work plan of the project of the first year.   + The resulting inception report is a key reference document for the detailed planning of the project. |
| Monthly | * + Follow-up meetings among UNDP and the Project Management Unit for the continuous evaluation of pending subjects and resolving bottlenecks at a short-term period. |
| Quarterly Basis | * + The project progress is supervised in the UNDP optimized results-based management platform.   + Based on the risk analysis presented initially, the registry of risks is updated periodically in ATLAS (the corporate system of UNDP project management).   + Based on the registered information in ATLAS, Project Progress Reports (PPRs) are generated in the classifying system or UNDP executive review.   + Other ATLAS registries are used to monitor the issues, lessons learned, etc. |
| Semiannually | * + Meetings with the Project Steering Committee analyzing the general progress and the general  *vis à vis* (Prodoc) planning and Annual Operating Plans (AOP) and check the PPR/PIR, and if necessary, make decisions about adjustments. |
| Annually | * + Annual Project Revision/Project Implementation Report (APR/PIR). This is the main reporting document. It is elaborated alongside and among execution and implementation agencies and sent to the GEF by UNDP. The reporting period is July 1st-June 30th.   + Based on the progress and the general planning, the AOP is elaborated, and is to be approved by the Steering Committee. |
| Intermediate Cycle of the Project | * + The project underwent a Midterm Evaluation in May 2017. The Midterm Evaluation determined the progresses that were being accomplished with the goal of accomplishing the outcomes, and identified recommendations for the direction and management of the project.   + During the midterm evaluation cycle, the METT and the Financial Management Board were also completed. |
| End of the Project | * + On December of 2018, three months previous to the final Steering Committee meeting, the present Final Evaluation has been taking place, and is of accordance with the UNDP and GEF guidelines. |
| Periodically | * + Meetings between MAE project managers to secure alignment, coordination and mutual support (depending on the MAE authorities; up to weekly.   + Periodic follow-up through on-site visits. The Country UNPD office and the UNDP Regional Management Unit make visits to the project sites according to the agreed inception report/AOP of the Project with the purpose of evaluating project progress in person.   + Learning and exchange of knowledge of the project outcomes which will be disseminated within and beyond the intervention zone and through data exchange networks and existing forums. This, among others, with the objective of having the project entities exchange experiences and data for useful learning and project execution. |

*The evaluator rates the design and implementation of the monitoring and evaluation system as “highly satisfactory”.*

### 3.2.5. Project Management and Governance (Implementing and Executing agencies’ performance, coordination, and operational issues)

*PI7. The project execution and implementation agencies have fulfilled their agreed responsibilities, ensuring an effective an efficient management. The interaction among the partner institutions has been positive.*

*PI8. The team members from the different agencies is of high technical level with enough capacity to manage the different project components.*

*PI9. Project execution was slow at the start and the delivery of some outputs were delayed. Nevertheless, this has been compensated and a complete fulfillment is expected by project closure.*

*PI10. The practical interaction with the additional component funded by public funds (component 3) has been positive because its implementation is more flexible, supporting the achievement of some outputs and contributing to sustainability.*

1. The evaluator has revised the execution of the different technical, administrative and supervision activities on behalf of the implementation and execution agencies and observed that they have fulfilled what was identified in the Prodoc. The MAE selected and supervised the Project Management Unit and facilitated the collaboration with the DNB, with the different PA administrations, with the different provincial directions, and with the other ongoing projects. It also facilitated the interaction of the project team with the development of new legislation. WCS has demonstrated capacity and commitment in the execution of its activities in the technical support to the other activities. According to the staff responsible for project management, the management challenges between WCS and MAE pointed out by the MTE were mainly a subject of different work styles and perception of priority activities. During the past year, the project manager and the person who is responsible for the project activities of WCS paid specific attention to improving the communication and management, and both parties manifested that this had taken place successfully. Due to administrative reasons, for the past two years, certain WCS-activities were executed by the Project Management Unit, but, under WCS supervision (see MTE and (¶61) This change helped improve the continuous coordination. The administrative challenges for WCS that were labeled as risky (¶117), were overcome (¶72). The evidence of the good institutional relationship among agencies is evidenced by the new collaboration in the development of the new GEF regional project on the conservation of jaguars.
2. The Project Management Unit hired by MAE is considered of high technical quality and of adequate administrative ability. The best indicator for this is the good rating for the criteria effectiveness and efficiency given by the MTE and by the present evaluation. The project manager is a recognized expert in wildlife conservation who has immediately become familiar with the logic and the priorities of the project. His trajectory in the country with different organizations, specifically with WCS, helped establish effective working relationships among different agencies who were related to the project. According to some persons from the agencies who were involved with the project implementation, not enough attention was paid to the administrative and managerial capacities for the selection of the manager. This brought initial administrative challenges, as was identified by the MTE. At the end of the project, the same informants manifested that this capacity grew notably and the administrative management supervised by the Manager has been satisfactory. The general project management has depended a lot on the technical officer for monitoring and evaluation. The person who initially occupied this position was hired as project manager at the MAE, which evidences his high capacity. The person who replaced him has managed, in short time, to become the main administrator of the project knowledge. This is evidenced by the fact that during the present evaluation she was the main -and highly efficient- communications channel for the evaluator towards the different documents, data, and persons.
3. The other project staff was are also highly qualified. This included i) the technical officer in charge of the human-wildlife conflicts, specifically between Andean bear and cattle, and ii) the technical officer specialized in the implementation of sustainable production systems for the reduction of the pressures on wildlife. Both persons had years of field experience with MAG, implying an adequate additional capacity, many times overseen in other conservation projects. These technicians have received very good commentaries on behalf of the local informants who were interviewed during this evaluation. In most cases, the beneficiaries manifested that they provided the adequate, timely and continuous support to the different activities implemented with the communities. The only critical observation, heard by the beneficiaries from the provinces which are the farthest away from Quito, was that to facilitate immediate response, it would be better to have the project technicians located in the region and not based in Quito.
4. The project has accomplished a clear gender balance. There is a gender balance in the project team and a higher participation of women among the wildlife officers at the MAE headquarters in Quito. The project has empowered local female leaders such as the interlocutors in the Imbabura, Carchi, Malacatos, and Cuyuja GAD.
5. The performance of UNDP as the implementing agency was satisfactory. The different actors involved in the project execution have praised the UNDP technical capacity and the quality of their supervision and advice. The opinions regarding the performance of two responsible program officials were very positive. The evaluator observed the direct and constant supervision of the project: the official responsible for the implementation has been present in every project management meeting and has been proactive in offering support to management, without interfering with the decision-making of MAE or the Management Unit. The administrative staff from the different agencies mention the correct handling and transparent management of the financial and reporting matters. Though some of the acquisition processes were considered to be slow and sometimes a barrier for the efficient management (for example, the acquiring of camera-trap trap teams lasted eight months, delaying the planning of wildlife monitoring jobs), everyone was aware of the fact that it is common practice of the management of international funds, and even the UNDP has managed it more efficiently than other multilateral agencies.
6. Project execution was slow at first. The main reason was the approval and co-financing of the project by SENPLADES who made the effective start to last half a year longer than planned. Other minor and not so critical reasons, pointed out in the MTE and confirmed by informants in this evaluation, were the lack of induction of the Management Unit and the slow process of acquisition. The project has also had some challenges with the contractors. Particularly the team of volunteers who made the first monitoring did not have the expected technical capacity, which resulted in challenges during the first census. This was solved through hiring of a team of trained professionals and more supervision from WCS (¶68, MTE). Finally, all of these challenges were overcome, and the project closed on time (the time extension of four months was mainly for methodological reasons to finish a third field monitoring and to analyze the data). Having said this, some outputs are being developed at the end of the project and it is possible to have a shortage of time for its consolidation.
7. Even though the implementation arrangement with the additional component included to harbor public funds (component 3) was considered a challenge (¶65, 66, 67), it also had many positive aspects. In practice, everyday management among teams has been considered positive. The involved staff mentions a mutual benefit from working among two teams in the same physical space with themes related to wildlife. The Manager of component 3 as well as the project Manager have both provided continuous support to the wildlife unit in the DNB. Certain elements (for example, the work with feral dogs, or the veterinary support for control checkpoints) contributed directly to the GEF project outputs. The addition of the component 3 has also provided some operational advantages: in 2014 this component was able to start faster with the hiring of staff (2 to 3 months) than the components implemented by the UNDP and due to this, it supported the entire project in preparing project implementation. Finally, it is in an ability to assure some continuity after the closing of the project (¶126).

Conclusion 4. The project has been well managed: it has staff that well-performed in the technical and administrative aspects. The inter-institutional collaboration has been positive and some challenges which arose during the first years were overcome in the second half of the project. The support from the implementing agency has been timely, adequate, and highly appreciated by the executing agencies.

Conclusion 5. The project has a good financial performance: at achieved an adequate pact of disbursement according to planning. The in-cash co-financing, with fresh funding, provided by national and local governmental agencies is highly commended.

Conclusion 6. The project has had a high adaptive capacity in the technical management as well as in the financial management which contributed to its effectiveness.

*The evaluator rates the governance and management (execution and implementing agency performance) of the project as “satisfactory”.*

## 3.3 Project Results

### 3.3.1. Overall Results (attainment of objectives)

*GR1. The MAE staff in the headquarters, the provincial directions, and the management of protected areas have included elements from the landscape approach in their thinking and practice. Nevertheless, the collaboration among the different divisions within MAE and the alignment of the conservation strategies among protected areas of the SNAP and other elements of landscape and wildlife management has been limited.*

*GR2. During the implementation of the project, MAE has contributed significantly with actions, funds, and staff for the management of wildlife. The future of this collaboration is uncertain due to the decreased funds and low number of permanent staff dedicated to the theme.*

*GR3. The project and its local allies achieved the establishment of new conservation areas (three ACUS in the Andean region and a new Ramsar site in the Amazon region).*

*GR4. The project supported the replication of its approach in two landscapes. There has not been an enabling environment for replication in additional landscapes, mainly because of lacking funds and stakeholders with the capacity to replicate the approach*

*GR5. The project has accomplished many positive outcomes in gender equity on a community level through the promotion of productive activities with high participation, control, and benefit to women.*

1. According to the Theory of Change, rebuilt to guide this evaluation (see annex 6, inception report) the general objective of the project (The PA system of Ecuador applies landscape approach to increase its effectivity of globally important wildlife conservation) is considered an umbrella objective. It is presented like this because it includes final outcomes and the impact in the ToC because it represents several aspects which are reflected on the 02, 03, 04, 05, 06 indicators (Table 5).
2. In general, the project has managed to contribute significantly to the objective-level indicators. It accomplished to contribute with more than 500,000 hectares of new areas included in different conservation models. These were not incorporated by Socio Bosque like it was originally planned, but rather through a Ramsar site and three ACUS. Socio Bosque only contributed with 37,750 hectares from the originally planned 300,000 hectares. The consequence of the strategy change was that the new areas were not distributed among the different landscapes, but rather concentrated: 60% of the indicator value was accomplished with the declaration of a Ramsar site in Landscape 4; the other 40% was distributed among three ACUS in Landscapes 2 and 3, and in a replica Landscape. Another consequence of the strategy change was a greater collaboration with third parties because both the Ramsar site and the Project ACUS were associated with initiatives of Non-Government Organizations (WWF, CONDESAN, Ecopar, Nature and Culture International - NCI) and other funds (GEF, Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund – CEPF) to accomplish the establishment of conservation areas. This implies that the success cannot be attributed solely to the Landscapes - Wildlife Project, but at the same time it indicates an effective collaboration among several organizations, GAD, MAE, and communities.
3. The modified goal of indicator 03 was also accomplished. Considering this is a proxy indicator (see also ¶115), the evaluator notes that it only proves there were less confiscations of illegally transported animals. It might indicate less overall illegal commerce, but is not an objective proof (there is a theoretical possibility that by implementing controls, traffickers may seek other routes).

*Table 5. Achievement of general objective[[35]](#footnote-35) indicators*

| *Indicator* | *Target* | *Fulfillment at the end of the project* |
| --- | --- | --- |
| O2. Increases in coverage of vegetation in corridors/buffer zones of all 5 target landscapes of value for habitat and connectivity for target wildlife species. | * An additional 300,000 ha of forest/ native vegetation included in Socio Bosque program in 2 target landscapes, and managed in accordance with project guidelines in support of wildlife conservation * 2 municipal PAs gazetted (landscapes 1 & 3); combined area of ~ 50,000ha   + - * Other areas remain stable. | The way of accomplishing this indicator changed due to a decrease of available funds in the Socio Bosque Program for which the expected project contribution with the total of the new areas under protection was not fulfilled. In response, the project focused on other conservation categories, as are the Ramsar and ACUS sites. In this way, it accomplished the target. An increase of 509.830 has of forest and other natural vegetation in selected landscapes under some conservation category was accomplished in total, exceeding the goal by 135,000 has. This includes the designation of 776,116 has of the Wetland complex Cuyabeno-Lagartococha-Yasuní as a Ramsar site (293,246 has within Landscape 4; collaboration with WWF) and 33,759 has of forest and native vegetation in the Socio Bosque program until October 2015, which are within the targeted landscapes of the Project. As for the conservation areas declared by the GAD, a combined area of 182,326 has was added in the provincial ACUS of the Eastern Carchi Mountain Range (Landscape 3; with CONDESAN), the ACUS Intag-Toisán (Landscape 2; with Ecopar, and CEPF), and ACUS of Andean Condor (replica landscape, with NCI).  There has not been a decrease in the area of land of the protected areas. These areas remain stable. |
| O3. Reductions in levels of illegal bushmeat trade in three target landscapes (1, 3, 4) covering 5,289,900ha. | Quantities of bushmeat sold in markets in 3 target landscapes (1, 3 and 4) are reduced by 30% over the project period  . | Due to a strict control in the sales of hunting meat in the markets, at the start of the project execution period, the means of verifying this indicator were changed. No data was used from the market, rather than the data on the amount of confiscations of wild fauna incoming from five forest and wildlife control checkpoints located in the project intervention areas was analyzed. Between 2016-2017, it decreased from 574 to 385; a 33% reduction. While it is a different indicator, the goal was achieved. |
| O4. Increases in levels and sustainability of financial resources in support of the sustainable management of wildlife. | * MAE covering salary costs of the 10 wildlife technicians in 5 target landscapes ($75,684/year total). * SNAP budget has specific earmarking for wildlife conservation * 5 GADs have allocated budget to replicate livelihood production activities in additional communities in target landscapes with the aim of reducing pressures on wildlife.   12 GADs in Project landscapes have specific budgetary provisions for wildlife conservation/ management. | The Ecuadorean Government, through the MAE, has assigned the budget to staff and travel expenses of ten (2015-2016) and six (2017-2018) technical officers, representing a cost of $111,654 USD. These are professionals dedicated to the project, under temporary contracts.  For the management of the State Subsystem of Protected Areas (SEAP) for the years 2017-2018, budgets of $21,667 USD and $65,636 USD were assigned respectively, designated to the management of wildlife in the seven protected local areas of the project.  A total of eleven GAD (provincial GAD El Oro and Imbabura, parish GADs of Cosanga, Malacatos, Cuyuja, Sardinas and Sabanilla, La Paz, Mariano-Acosta, Sigsipamba, and Angochagua) assigned budgets for the implementation of sustainable production initiatives aiming at reducing the pressures on wildlife. This is important as project co-funding and contributes to the continuation of the project initiatives, the different GADs assigned a total budget of approximately US$ 436,000. |
| O5. Existence and application of normative instruments regarding conservation and management of wildlife. | The current normative framework includes illegal trafficking, commercial hunting, sport hunting norms and is under application nationwide | The development of the Environmental Organic Code (COA) created an excellent opportunity to the project for proposing legal instruments on the matter of wildlife conservation and apply it in National Legislation. The project contributed to the formulation of the COA and prepared the following elements, which were all included in the actual proposal of the COAs: the bylaws required to apply the dispositions on the sanctioning power of the MAE and the bylaws regarding conservation, management, and sustainable use of the urban fauna and fauna in the wild. Furthermore, the project participated in the revision and generation of Articles in subjects related to the planning and management of land use, *in situ*, and *ex situ* conservation. The project also defined the concepts and limits for subsistence hunting and established a template for the agreements of sustainable subsistence hunting.  Additionally, together with the DNB Wildlife Unit, the project has developed other technical tools which will contribute to the strengthening of wildlife management such as the action plans for the conservation of the white lipped peccary, the Andean condor and for the Ecuadorian primates. All these will be formalized by the MAE through a Ministerial Decree. The project also produced the technical guidelines on the management of wildlife for the use in development plans and land usage plans which were handed to SENPLADES and will be used to create an environmental criteria guide which will be considered in the PDOTs.  Through these actions, the project in collaboration with Wildlife Unit and the Protected Area Unit of the DNB, have managed to successfully achieve this indicator. |
| O6. Increases in number of PAs and adjacent landscapes nationwide with planning and management instruments incorporating project models and lessons learnt project | 2 PAs and 2 Provincial GADs (other than those directly targeted by the project) have planning and management instruments which incorporate the models and lessons learnt which are generated through the project | The project directed several replication initiatives in other protected areas and other landscapes: it updated the management plans of the Cayambe-Coca National Park and the Sangay National Park and trained their rangers as well as staff responsible for wildlife management in the provincial directorates of Sucumbíos, Tungurahua, Chimborazo, Cañar and Morona Santiago. The creation of the ACUS of the Andean Condor and the actions for the management of the La Tembladera wetland (with El Oro GAD) are considered a replica in other landscapes. With these outcomes, the proposed indicator was accomplished. |

1. Indicator 04 has been partially accomplished. The MAE has succeeded in its contribution to the project through the location of technical personnel for the component 3 of the project representing a budget of more than 100,000/year. This, nevertheless, is not a sustained investment because these are temporary positions and there is no guarantee nor signed agreement for this staff to continue contributing to the lines of work of the project as foreseen by the MAE[[36]](#footnote-36). In December 2018, the MAE was committed to continue financing the staff of the component 3 during 2019, ensuring continuity for the work of the project. However, this continuity is in doubt, because the low expense level of the public funds in another project (GEF amphibians, associated to the present project as component 4) resulted in a penalty of the public funds for the different projects included in the same account in SENPLADES. Furthermore, with the decrease of the general budget to the MAE, component 3 can contract 6 persons until September 2019.
2. The evaluator considers that the limited budget of MAE[[37]](#footnote-37) and the low amount of staff dedicated permanently to the conservation of wildlife within the landscape approach, is a barrier for the sustainability of the project. The study elaborated for proposing the wildlife management model[[38]](#footnote-38), identified 45 management tasks for the MAE (15 of direction, 2 of planning, 8 of control, and 20 of management) regarding subjects varying from invading species and hunting to education, establishment of red lists and research. It is hard to consider that all this can be executed with a team of only eight persons in headquarters who in addition, are expected to apply a change of overall approach. If there is no proper budget, no increase in the size of this team will take place and no integration of the management of different units will take place. Moreover, the frequent management changes in the ministry (during the project execution, there were six ministers, and a similar number of National Biodiversity Directors) has not helped give continuity to the strategies, actions, and processes.
3. The contribution of funds on behalf of GAD has been concrete and higher than expected. In total, they have contributed with US$ 400,000 in project and replicating activities (¶75). Some of them already have an assigned and confirmed budget for at least a year after the project. Though what will really happen with this agreement after the local government change is unsure, the fact that a project can count on concrete GAD contributions during the execution is a rarely seen before fact in conservation and development projects in Ecuador.
4. Indicator 05 was accomplished, mainly thanks to the opportunity created by the formulation of the COA. According to the persons in the MAE involved directly with the formulation of the COA, the Project Management Unit succeeded in positioning itself as an important and permanent technical advising entity. It contributed with many texts, and with technical data that assured the inclusion of wildlife management in the new Ecuadorean environmental legislation. Moreover, the project has generated a series of normative, regulatory and policy documents at a national and local level; several of them adopted and applied. In total, the existence and application of normative instruments in the matter of conservation and management of wildlife has increased. The evaluator observes that most of the documents are of good quality and are directly related to wildlife management as much as to illegal trafficking, necessary regulations for subsistence hunting and action plans for specific threatened species. A minor number of instruments was generated to guide and regulate elements of a landscape approach (territory management which promotes the conservation of wildlife): mainly limiting the formation of three ACUS and the establishing of the (Sangay-Podocarpus) corridors.
5. The replication activities were successful (indicator 06): a more effective conservation of the Tembladera wetland was achieved, four ACUS were established with different GAD, and the management plans of two National parks were updated; all this was not originally included in the project. Nevertheless, these outcomes were controlled directly by the project and due to this, its replication value is lower. Some examples of replication within the project (activities and practices by project partners, in the same landscapes, but outside of the scope of project implementation) are available. For example, the application of the lessons in four Eastern parishes of Imbabura will be applied in other parishes, thanks to the GAD Imbabura management. Something similar has happened in El Oro with studies and inventories of fauna were done with their own means. Application of lessons by other stakeholders has not been registered, mainly due to the assumption that an enabling environment for replication exists, did not hold: it seems like there are few localities in the country where there is an informed GAD and agreed to applying an integrated approach without there being an external project that contributes with funding and technical support.
6. There are several evidences of the contribution to the project towards gender equity, mainly at a working at parish and community level, even though this has not been clearly included in project design (as mentioned in the MTE) and without having clear indicators. According to GAD representatives, the sustainable production projects like domestic animal breeding as an alternative source of protein and the greenhouses for fruit growing are themes that are easily accepted by women in the communities due to its close relationship with health and nutrition. For example, 80% of the sustainable production projects visited in Cuyuja were managed by women, including the decision-making and the financial management, contrary to the classical community activity (mixed cattle) that is handled by men. Something similar happens in Cosanga and Malacatos, though a lower percentage of women (50% and 60%, respectively). According to the interviews with the beneficiaries, cattle management in Imbabura and Carchi to avoid conflicts with Andean bears, benefited mainly the women because they are in charge of herding cattle. As an additional outcome to the improvement of grasslands and irrigation systems is that women do not have to walk to the páramo with cattle, which saves them up to 4 hours daily, time that they can dedicate to other activities.
7. Although they have achieved indicator goals, the evaluator cannot confirm that the objective has been achieved. The evaluator noticed that the MAE functionary discourse has changed on every level, and that they know how to work with a landscape vision and a personal commitment form several functionaries to apply the focus is being fulfilled. In effect, according to functionaries there is a greater communication among divisions, and, for the first time, a communication with the Ministry of Agriculture. Nonetheless, there is a fluctuating interpretation of what is understood by this focus (understood as it is presented in the Prodoc[[39]](#footnote-39) and summarized in the introduction of this document (¶26). Twelve interviewed MAE representatives were asked how they understood the landscape approach. Only three mentioned something similar to “the integrality of the planning and participative management of a group of protected natural areas, unprotected natural areas, and productive areas in a way in which the entire landscape conserves its biodiversity (wildlife) and its ecosystem services [[40]](#footnote-40)”. The other representatives, limited their description to the connectivity and corridors, management of buffer zones versus the core zone or the conservation in productive/cultural landscape areas.
8. In practice, no evidence exists that MAE applied a landscape approach in the management of SNAP to increase its effectiveness for the conservation of wildlife. The positive project outcomes, such as improved knowledge of the species and its distribution, the increase of legal and normative instruments, improved control of wildlife trafficking and hunting, and the improvement in human-wildlife conflict management, are not directly focused in the landscape. Other positive outcomes that can be identified as more clearly associated to the landscape approach (design of corridors and new areas under conservation) are limited to some locations of the five landscapes and are not translated yet in national legislation.
9. In order to effectively apply a landscape approach, coordination and collaboration between the different units of DNB is required. The evaluation observed that regardless of the increase and personal commitment with the application of an integral focus, in practice concrete cooperation between the wildlife unit staff and the protected areas unit is limited. According to the interviews, the wildlife unit staff has not participated in the initial development of the current strategic plan for protected areas and also did not yet participate in the meetings for the development of a new strategic plan of protected areas, where conservation of wildlife elements must be included. The local staff of protected areas have had an increase in interaction with their wildlife and MAG colleagues during the project. Nonetheless, none of these areas had a planning or alignment of strategies with natural or productive areas further than its buffer zones. For example, in the Antisana Ecological Reserve the once existing collaboration agreement between the reserve management and other important reserves managed by the Quito municipal company of water (EPMAPS) and the Water Fund (FONAG) or the Jocotoco foundation, was lost. One of the reasons for the lack of coordination, manifested by one functionary, was that “*they focus only on one thing: water or birds. We focus on everything*”. While this can be true, this could be an ideal theme to resolve in a coordination platform. Finally, the lack of budget assignment for the follow-up actions is another indicator that the integrated landscape approach is not yet applied.
10. While the collaboration of the project with GADs and with communities, generated good outputs and contributed to certain wildlife management elements, at this level of governance there also is no integration of a landscape approach. No representative from the GAD or local community has been able to describe the different characteristics of the landscape focus for the conservation of wildlife in a satisfactory way. According to the evaluator, this is an outcome of the geographical scattering of the project in which no complete suite of activities was implemented in any location (¶46). The interviewed GAD representatives and the local beneficiaries only knew of the other activities from socializing or coordination events organized by the project, but did not apply other lessons or concepts in their reality.

Conclusion 7. The project has contributed to positively changing the reality of wildlife management in the country although it did not manage to internalize the landscape approach in the SNAP or GAD management.

Conclusion 8. The limited financial capacity and the low number of dedicated staff in the MAE are a barrier for the effective and continuous conservation of wildlife.

Conclusion 9. There is an adequate inclusion of general normative instruments regarding wildlife in the new Environmental Organic Code and specific instruments at MAE, SENPLADES, and community level.

*The evaluator rates the general results as “moderately satisfactory”*

### 3.3.2. Relevance

*R1. The project was designed and is implemented in response to the national demand, it focuses on the local and national priorities for conservation and rural development, and it is aligned with the GEF strategies.*

*R2. The project managed to adequately and effectively adapt to the institutional and economic changes in the context.*

1. Ecuador is a territory for multiple, worldwide recognized emblematic species of wildlife, like the Condor, the Andean bear, the Amazon manatee, and the jaguar. There are also less widely known species, but not less important like the black caiman, the Andean fox, the white-lipped peccary or the black-faced ibis. Many of these are found in different categories the UICN red list of threatened species. Being a mega diverse country of a relatively small area[[41]](#footnote-41), Ecuador has an enormous responsibility of conserving its territory as the habitat for these globally important species. For this reason, the approach of the project to support a group of wildlife species and its habitats is highly relevant for the global priorities of biodiversity conservation. For the selection of the species, several global risk level (state of threat according to UICN), scientific criteria (heterogeneous requirements of habitat size and ecological role), and national and local criteria (socio-economic importance) were used. This too, widens its global and national relevance.
2. The diversity of landscapes and the high population density caused that the natural areas, especially in the Andes and in the coastal zone, are relatively small and fragmented. Due to this, the management of wildlife and the application of a landscape approach is adequate for the management of wildlife in Ecuador. This approach is based in the management of an entire greater landscape with a biodiversity conservation vision, combining strategies for the protected areas, natural and unprotected areas and sustainable productive areas. The landscape approach is aligned with the concept of forest landscape conservation, currently under development at a global[[42]](#footnote-42) level. By combining the landscape approach, including the protected areas, with the conservation of species, the project contributes to the outcome 1.1 (greater effectiveness of the management of existing and new protected areas”) of objective BD1 (“improve the sustainability of protected areas) of the GEF in its fifth period of replenishment. In reality, the results of component 2 is more aligned to the BD2 objective of the GEF5 (internalizing the conservation of the biodiversity and sustainable use in landscapes and productive areas), specifically for their contribution to outcomes 2.1 (increase of sustainably managed landscapes which incorporate the conservation of biodiversity), and 2.2 (measures for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity which are incorporated in policies and regulation frameworks).
3. The Prodoc explains how the project is aligned with the national environmental and development policy during the progress of the project. It demonstrates how the project contributes to the Ecuadorean National Development Plan for the period of 2009-2013, “which guarantees the rights of nature and promotes a healthy and sustainable environment”, and the policies and strategies of National Environmental Policies, particularly the integrated management of the ecosystems, the incorporation of the social dimension in the field of the environment and the strengthening of the institutional framework for environmental management. The focus of the work with decentralized governments fits the dispositions of the Strategy of Decentralization and Local Development. The project aligns with the updated National Strategy of Biodiversity and Action Plan which adapts to the dispositions of the Norms of the CDB Plan for 2012-2020. It is also aligned with the Strategic Plan for the National Protected Area System (2007-2016) which recognizes the government obligation to support the alternatives for the sustainable development of the protected areas and its cushioning zones as forms of increasing social participation in the management of SNAP, alleviate conflicts, and contribute to the fair distribution of the benefits.
4. The general environmental approach of the two new National Development Plans of Ecuador for the periods of 2013-2017 and 2017-2021, and which were launched during the implementation period of the project, did not change drastically, and the project is still aligned with these plans. For example, the current plan *(“Todo una Vida”)* [[43]](#footnote-43) continues to promote the concept of “living-well (or *“buen vivir”)* based in the realization and peaceful co-habitation of people, starting from their diversity, and in harmony with nature. The project directly contributes to the Plan’s Objective 3 “Guarantee the rights of nature for current and future generations” and is particularly in line with Policy 3.1 “Conserve, recuperate, and regulate the use of natural and social, rural and urban heritage [...] which assures and protects the rights of the present and future generations”. Under the last Development Plan, Ecuador is developing a new Environmental Organic Code, and the project is actively collaborating to the formulation of this new law, with information, lessons, and proposals of norms (¶92). In this way, the project is taking advantage of a privileged position to ensure alignment and influences in environmental and national policies.
5. The institutional and economical context changed during the execution of the project (¶29) and the project could adapt timely and effectively to these changes. The decrease of public funds brought, among others, a de-financing of the Socio Bosque Program which was planned as an important contribution for the indicator 02 (increase of protected vegetation cover). The project has compensated this void left by the Socio Bosque Program through the generation of other conservation models (ACUS, Ramsar, ¶68). On the other side, the decrease in the MAE budget does threaten the financial sustainability for a future and reduces the possibilities of MAE complying with its role and commitments. The present project, in its final phase, barely has a partial response to this decrease of public financing (¶126). The new institutional structure (outcome of the SENAGUA and MAE fusion, that will no longer take place, (¶121), and the new legislation was used proactively by the project to influence these processes with project inputs. The opportunities created by the start of the PROAmazonía program were used, trying to include the continuity of a part of the project actions in the Amazon region (sustainable production projects, control checkpoints).

Conclusion 10. The project is highly relevant to the global and national environmental debate, and is aligned with the national environmental priorities.

*The evaluator rates the project as “Relevant”.*

### 3.3.3. Effectiveness

*E1. The project has achieved most of its planned outputs. Due to the, generally adequate, adaptive management some outputs where different from what was planned.*

*E2. The assumptions on the quality of the outputs and on the interest and commitment of local stakeholder for the completion of the outputs, did hold.*

*E3. The project contributed to an increase in effectiveness of the management of the protected area with which it collaborated, including the efficiency of wildlife management.*

*E4: The local communities have adopted and are implementing different wildlife conservation agreements and sustainable production projects. The authorities have adopted them, but have not yet included them in the area management.*

*E5. The project has managed to effectively implement a series of sustainable production projects with rural communities. There are indications that this improved the conservation of wildlife and the decrease of the human-wildlife conflicts.*

*E6. In several municipalities and parishes within the landscapes, specific measures have been accepted and localized to support wildlife management.*

1. The project has achieved the generation of its outputs, just like it was presented in the Prodoc and guided by the respective Annual Operational Plans (AOP), approved by the Steering committee. The project design did not count with indicators at the output level (¶48) for which it is harder to evaluate the quality or temporality of the outputs. Furthermore, the technical reports (PIR) presented the project progress (including the outputs) in the format of indicators of objectives and outcomes, for which it is harder to obtain a clearer idea of the output generation like it was presented in the format of the results framework and in the Prodoc. On the other hand, because the indicators at a level of outcomes were generally achieved (¶107, 110), it can be assumed that the outputs were adequate to generate the outcomes. Moreover, the evaluator had been able to verify that the project has generated a great volume of publications, management plans, training events, normative and legal proposals and concrete initiatives in the field. To show this, it compiled the illustrative outputs in a table for each activity and some observations regarding the achievement of the activities (Table 6).

*Table 6. Generation of some illustrative products for each activity[[44]](#footnote-44)*

| 1. *Activity* | 1. *Output observations about its generation* |
| --- | --- |
| * 1. 1.1 Adaptive-management framework to guide cost-effective implementation of wildlife conservation | |
| 1. a) Definition of wildlife conservation priorities, targets, corridors and dispersal areas | 1. The actual design of the project already includes an analysis of the conservation priorities with the aim of selecting species, landscapes, and actions. This activity produced the necessary data needed mainly for the planning and public proposals of the project; such as the compilation and analysis of the available cartographic data on the landscapes and the identification of Priority Areas for the connectivity of the five landscapes. |
| 1. b) Financial strategy for the implementation of the framework (in coordination with the PA financing project) | The project is progressively developing a financial strategy for wildlife management. Different outputs have been developed, the most recent one, to be completed at the start of 2019, “The financial sustainability strategy for the management of wildlife: i) Wildlife funding cycle in the framework of the FIAS ii) Socio-Environmental corporate responsibility mechanism for wildlife, iii) Policy proposal of Socio-Environmental corporate responsibility focused on the productive and business sector. |
| c) Information management and decision support system based on updated and reliable data and traditional knowledge | According to interviews with the project staff and with INABIO, a data management and delivery strategy is currently being developed. Also, administrative-financial modules, research permits, and wildlife management were developed to be interested in the Biodiversity Information System SIB. This data is not reflected in the indicators. |
| 1. d) System level monitoring of listed species | 1. One of the main contributions to the project in information-generation is the census and the monitoring of the focus species, as it is explained in the treatment of indicator 01 (¶128). While the monitoring is not providing the level of necessary data to establish trustworthy trends, the fact of having generated not previously existing baseline and species distribution data is already a highly valuable contribution. |
| 1. e) Definition of permitted uses and activities in different management categories, in relation to wildlife. | 1. An example of a directly relevant output is “Analysis and proposal for the zoning of protected areas and for the re-definition of the management categories for the PANE[[45]](#footnote-45)”. The Protected Areas Unit of the DNB has validated the proposal and is using it in the all of the SEAP areas. The interviewed MAE personnel informed the evaluator that there has been a continuous interaction between the project Management Unit personnel and the MAE Protected Areas Unit, at headquarters and individual PA level. The technical support and advisory from the project have been highly valued by them. |
| 1. f) Nationwide protocols, and emergency action plans for highly threatened wildlife. | 1. The project has generated protocols for the monitoring censuses of 11 species of fauna and developed 6 emergency action plans. These were published and written at an adequate level for field technicians. |
| 1. g) Planning and regulatory framework for subsistence hunting by local communities | 1. The project contributed to the COA with the text for the Article on the concept and limits of sustainable subsistence hunting. And, along with the Protected Area Unit of the National Biodiversity Directive (DNB) updated the guidelines document for the elaboration of community management in Protected Areas, which includes contents and guidelines about subsistence hunting for its application by PA management teams. Currently, there is no indication that these guidelines have been applied beyond of the context of the project. |
| 1. h) Monitoring and evaluation | 1. Midterm evaluations and final evaluations, the systematization of the financial audits have been included in this activity. In reality, these are part of project management and could have been considered there. |
| * 1. 1.2 Emplacement of wildlife conservation in key PAs | |
| 1. a) MAE staff capacity development for ensuring the effective application of the regulatory framework for wildlife conservation, and monitoring | The project has achieved a diverse set of formal (courses, workshops), and informal training (bilateral talks, participation in field activities). According to data provided by the project, more than 300 persons have been trained (41 MAE staff – technical officers and park rangers from the 7 focal Protected Areas and of the 2 replica PAs, and of provincial directions; 31 MAE functionaries – AgroSeguro; 31 MAE functionaries – SocioBosque; 54 CONGOPE fiscal functionaries; 100 UPMA functionaries, and 60 fiscal functionaries). Development and implementation of the virtual platform in “Wildlife Management in Ecuador”. |
| 1. b) Strengthened platforms for dialogue, coordination and technical support at local level | 1. This is one of the few outputs of which the evaluator considered was under-accomplished. The strengthened platforms did function at a level of the producer groups who participated in the project. The evaluator has been able to verify how the participants in the four visited sites (Cuyuja, Angochagua, Tembladera, Malacatos) have organized themselves in associations. Nonetheless, the way in which they were established (not in response to an endogenous process, but to a process of participation in a project with defined funds and time) includes the risk of discontinuation when the activity funds end. Other supported platforms were the protected area management groups. Neither the advance reports, nor the interviews with the MAE personnel in the region mentioned the processes with these Management Committees. A reason can be that, because they were executed alongside the PASNAP project, the eventual effect was that it was not attributed to Landscapes - Wildlife Project. |
| 1. c) Expanded PA management plans to include wildlife conservation, landscape approaches and new zoning for dispersal corridors within PAs | The project has supported updating the management plans of two protected areas (Cayambe-Coca and Sangay National Parks), including the wildlife management objectives. With GAD El Oro, several landscape strategies have been developed focusing on the conservation and sustainable use of the La Tembladera wetland. The project also produced the management plan for ACUS Andean Condor.  The model of “Subsistence Hunting Community Agreements”, was included as part of the guidelines for the elaboration of Community Management Planes in Protected Areas. |
| 1. d) Specific wildlife conservation plans with emergency actions/protocols for highly threatened species in targeted PA. | Three action plans for threatened species were elaborated and published (peccary, condor and primates). The component 3 also contributed to the output with a series of protocols for the exchange of species of fauna, the reproduction of fauna in captivity, feral species control, freeing wildlife species, etc. |
| 1. e) Cross-sector program for awareness raising and communication. | 1. The project has worked directly in the sensitizing at a community level regarding the need for fauna conservation, conflict reduction, and hunting control, etc. |
| 1.3 Community-based management schemes reduce pressures from subsistence hunting in three target landscapes | |
| a) Community-based plans, governance and dialogue on hunting and alternatives | The project has made plans and signed agreements regarding sustainable subsistence hunting in seven communities. Four have received follow-up. Moreover, wildlife management plans have been implemented (hunting agreements) in 12 communities: nine Kichwa, and three Sápara. Regarding the Kichwa communities, this initiative also includes the generation of alternative protein sources. |
| 1. b) Alternative protein sources to reduce pressures on the sustainability of wildlife populations resulting from hunting | 1. An animal breeding plan was implemented in the landscapes of the Coast and Amazon as alternative sources of protein. In total, 5 communities produce chicken, tilapia, and river shrimp. These projects were successful regarding meat production for the consumption of families. The relationship with an eventual reduction of wildlife exploiting it is not supported by data, but by community expressions. |
| 1. 2.1 Enforcement-system strengthened for reducing illegal hunting: | |
| a) Clarification and coordination of institutional roles and responsibilities for enforcement, system-wide | This output goes beyond the theme of illegal hunting and includes illegal trafficking of species. A series of legal instruments and specific guides for the control of hunting and trafficking have been produced: Guide for the identification of wildlife species subject to illegal trafficking and illegal bushmeat trade; Guide for administrative and penal processes for the control of illegal wildlife trafficking, constitutive elements and biological material; Binational Strategy for the prevention and control of illegal wild flora and fauna trafficking in the frontier integration zone Ecuador-Colombia; Species records of threatened wild fauna included in the Fiscal research System and COA Articles (bylaws necessary to apply the dispositions over the sanctioning power of MAE; bylaws to apply established dispositions in COA regarding the conservation, management, and use). |
| 1. b) Local institutions strengthened for enforcement and monitoring, system-wide | 1. In this activity the MAE personnel have been primarily trained (the GAD has been trained in processes associated to 2.2). Wildlife Modules have been developed in SUIA, automatizing of METT and PGOA. Formal delivery of the developed modules and programming and use manuals, strengthening capacities related to technical and legal tools linked to wildlife management – MAE, judicial power (Prosecution, Judiciary Council), and the Police, Virtual Platform in Wildlife Management in Ecuador. |
| 1. c) Wildlife control units in 2 PAs | The project has opportunely chosen to improve the infrastructure of the forest control checkpoints (stable and mobile) and equip them for wildlife traffic control. 58 technicians of 14 stable posts and 8 mobile posts where trained on management, confiscation, and first aid for the control of wildlife trafficking.  The process of accreditation of honorary inspectors (at least 500 persons), who supported the traffic control of wildlife was also achieved.  The campaign against illegal wildlife trafficking, which was implemented at a national level by different media and communications sources and supported by different organizations and zones, resulted in the project’s most visible activity and was widely picked up. |
| 1. 2.2 Land-use planning norms in place to protect habitats key for wildlife dispersal | |
| a) Joint identification (PA authorities and GADs) of key habitats, restrictions and monitoring programs, and agreements for their implementation | In this activity, a general guidelines manual was elaborated for the application of Policies regarding the Management for the Conservation of Wildlife in GADS.  Support and implementation were also provided for the annual operational management plan of protected areas and specific management actions for wildlife in the seven focal PAs and 2 additional PAs.  Support for the wildlife management in GAD El Oro and GAD Pichincha was provided. |
| 1. b) Inclusion in land-use planning processes of specific standards and practices for protecting habitats critical for wildlife dispersion; | Due to a relatively slow start of the project, the standards and the wildlife practices in the current GAD administrations have not been able to be included in PDOT. As an adequate alternative, the project has worked together with SENPLADES and has prepared the guidelines during its execution for the inclusion of the PDOTs which must be formulated in 2019. This resulted in the documents “General Guidelines Manual for the application of Management Policies for the conservation of Wildlife in GADs”. And “Guide for the incorporation of technical criteria based in policy of wildlife in territorial ordering and development plans”. |
| c) Municipal ordinances on wildlife hunting and trade, land uses and land use practices, and infrastructural developments | 1. Work has been made in seven municipal GAD to incorporate specific measures to reduce the pressures over wildlife, through municipal ordinances: Nabón, Oña, Santa Isabel, and Saraguro (who ACUS declared Condor Corridor), Cotacachi (which ACUS declared Intag-Toisan), Carchi (ACUS East Mountain Range), Mejía, and Francisco de Orellana. Ibarra also worked in the project, but did not produce an ordinance. |
| 1. 2.3 Functional connectivity in landscapes important for wildlife dispersion | |
| 1. a) Strengthened incentive systems for set-asides on private and community lands (building on Socio Bosque programme) | 1. The Socio Bosque program had a much smaller budget than originally expected. Only in the last year of the project, Socio Bosque had new funds and collaboration was restarted. During the final stage of the project, an agreement was signed with the program for the sustainability of the productive activities with the partners of the project landscapes. |
| 1. b) Municipal PAs gazetted, covering 50,000ha, in buffer-zones and corridors identified as critical for wildlife dispersal | The declaration of three ACUS was supported “Conservation and Sustainable Provincial Use from the Eastern Carchi Mountain Range”, “Conservation and Sustainable Use Area of the Andean Condor”, “Municipal Conservation and Sustainable Use Area Intag – Toisan”. The guidelines were created in support and for the creation and management of conservation areas and sustainable use, autonomous, decentralized, private and community; research of land holding for the creation of the ACUS Eastern Mountain Range; management Plan for the creation of ACUS Condor. |
| 1. b) Promotion of habitat and connectivity-friendly production options | Nine sustainable production initiatives were installed in the locations of Santo Domingo de Onzole; Intag; Cosanga, Sardinas, Cuyuja, and El Triunfo; Malacatos an Sabanilla; and, Santa Rosa. In each of them, one or two initiatives were worked on, for example, greenhouses in Cuyuja, Malacatos guinea pigs, compost, and fish farming in la Tembladera. In support of this, a series of outputs were produced, as a document of good practices and lessons learned during the implementation of the productive initiatives; production infographic process, according to the activity of each initiative; Financial instructions for the implementation and follow-up of productive initiatives.  In this activity, the project exit strategy has been included. This strategy, presented as a spread sheet with outputs, responsible outcomes and actions, was at advanced draft format at the moment of the evaluation. |
| 1. d) Programs for reduction of human/wildlife conflicts in association with the Ministry of Agriculture | In three parishes in Imbabura, and one in Carchi, best practices were implemented for cattle management to reduce of conflicts between the Andean bear and the cattle. As support, a series of reports and manuals were produced, among them a guide for good cattle practices for small producers of the Andean region and the systematization of the implementation process of the sustainable cattle initiatives.  Other publications on the human-wildlife conflicts are a guide for the identification of attacks towards domestic animals caused by large carnivores and factors which influence perceptions regarding the Jaguar in the Ecuadorian Chocó. |

1. Even though there are no clear indicators regarding the quality and temporality of the outputs (¶104), the evaluator observed that the assumptions associated to the quality of the outputs where achieved. According to the opinion from the different users of these technical outputs -like the monitoring protocols, the action plans for threatened species, the alternative protein sources projects and the sustainable production projects- these are of good quality, and are based on available, useful data for the user. According to the professional opinion of the evaluator, the following is validated: in a country with relatively few primary data and far less publications on wildlife, the technical-academic outputs of the project are a valuable contribution. The sustainable production projects are based on previous experiences and knowledge and experience of technical officers. Although most of the sustainable production projects (fish farming, guinea pigs, birds, and harvesting) are not innovative, they are adequate and feasible. The focus of the projects regarding human-wildlife conflicts, is innovative because the aim to control the underlying causes of the conflict rather than controlling the “problematic” wildlife. This has been the base of an effective reduction of the conflicts (¶0).
2. The assumptions related to the collaboration and interest of the local stakeholders did hold as well. The number of families who are actively participating in the different sustainable production activities is higher than was initially planned (¶112). The commitment from the GAD is evidenced with the contribution of their own funds for project activities (¶0). The simple fact that each interviewed GAD during this evaluation participated with its maximum authority involved is another indicator of the level of interest in the commitment. The risk is, nevertheless, that the interest can change with the entrance of new authorities. While there are some signed agreements, like the ongoing budget from last year and the ordinances for municipal reserves or for the management of wildlife on behalf of the municipalities, the effective implementation of these ordinances depends on the willingness and designation of funds form by the incoming administrations (¶123). The evaluation report of the socio-economic and environmental impact of the sustainable production initiatives of the project (incl. in activities 1.3a, 2.3.c, and 2.3.d)[[46]](#footnote-46) revealed that there had been 625 benefited families, implying more than 3100 individuals. Although this study did not use primary data to demonstrate impact (data of state of fauna, or real income), its estimations and manifestations point to a total reduction of incidences with fauna (conflicts, hunting). All of the families seemed to have had a higher income thanks to their participation in sustainable production projects.
3. Table 7 presents the achievement of the indicators for outcome 1. All of the indicators were accomplished except for one partial achievement in the fifth indicator. By logic of the Theory of Change, this also confirms that the developed outputs under component 1 were adequate and produced in a timely manner (¶104). Especially the indicators on management effectiveness are important for the outcome of component 1 (PA contribute effectively to the conservation of threatened wildlife). Due to this, it can be stated that in principle, the project accomplished the outcome.
4. The METT is a useful tool for the monitoring of the project interventions. Its adaptation for the issue wildlife management is a welcome innovation. Its application evidences that there is consensus among many local stakeholders that the management is improving. Nevertheless, for two reasons, objectively spoken it is inconclusive to respond to the question if the protected areas are definitely and efficiently contributing towards the conservation of wildlife[[47]](#footnote-47):
   * + 1. The final figure is composed of a series of criteria like planning, input, context and results. In both indicators, (effectiveness of area management and effectiveness of wildlife management), “results” is the criterion with the least positive increase, while this is the one that measures the real impact. Also, while the relative increase is important, in absolute terms the effectiveness of the management is not yet optimal and a lot of important elements are missing. For example, six of the seven PAs lack an updated management plan, a same number does not have a formal wildlife monitoring system, and a limited availability of biological and cultural information for the management of this protected area. So, while there is an increase in the effectivity indexes, this does not mean that the wildlife conservation is positive in absolute terms.
       2. The management effectiveness tools include many subjective questions and the result of its application depend on the opinion of the group of persons who are participating in the relevant workshops. The collective opinion can be influenced by the composition of the group, by the instruction of the person applying the tool or by context elements. The METT outcomes in the project include some striking outcomes which can indicate the influence of subjective opinions. For example, though the budget of the areas did not significantly increase between 2017 and 2018, both criteria associated to this (availability and budget security) were scored as “inadequate” (1) in 2017, and “acceptable” (2) in 2018 for all of the areas. Something similar happened with the education and awareness question: even though the project did not apply an education and awareness plan around the protected areas in question (and neither did other initiatives), all of the areas received their best scores in 2018.

*Table 7. Achievement of Outcome 1 indicators [[48]](#footnote-48)*

| *Indicator* | *Target* | *Final Project Achievement* |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1.1 Increases in sustainability of extraction of bushmeat for subsistence consumption, in one community in Pambilar WR (Landscape 1), one in Cofán Bermejo ER (Landscape 3) and three in Yasuni NP (Landscape 4). | Plans for sustainable subsistence hunting under implementation (including controls for hunting in source areas; breeding females and of juvenile individuals) in the mentioned communities | Agreements for wildlife conservation are in place in four indigenous communities of Landscape 4 and one in Landscape 3. For certain species, it was evident that there was a reduction of extraction rates (woolly monkey, white-lipped peccary, the lowland tapir, the Spix Guan, and the Savin curassow).  Wildlife management implementation of plans are implemented in 12 communities, nine Kichwa and tree Sápara. In the case of the Kichwa communities, this initiative also including the generation of alternative protein sources. |
| 1.2 Increases in numbers of community plans and norms applied to wildlife management (e.g. types and timing of offtake) in target landscapes | 17 communities covering ̴ 230,000ha in 3 target landscapes applying community norms for wildlife management | 21 communities, which cover 247,293 has in three landscapes are applying community norms for the management of wildlife. These norms include zoning of community territories, reducing the extraction of the most vulnerable species, the generation of alternative protein sources (chicken and fish) and, the reduction of hunting activities.  The project generated alternative protein sources in four Amazon communities (Landscape 3) and one in the coastal region (Landscape 1[[49]](#footnote-49)). A total of 4250 kg of meat was produced which represent 20 gr/person/day corresponding to a third of the daily intake of bushmeat. |
| 1.3 Increase in wildlife management effectiveness index | Average total score for 7 target PAs 58.43 out of a possible 76 | The last evaluation of management effectiveness (METT, GEF), adapted to wildlife, indicated that the average effectiveness of the management of wildlife in the seven focal protected areas of the project was scored at 47 points, an increase of 17 over the initial situation of the project. Specifically, the management plans, existence of data on wildlife and specific projects with communities which contributed to the increase of the indicator. |
| 1.4 Increases in ratings of Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool in 7 target PAs. | Average total score for 7 target PAs: 52 out of a possible 102 | During this period, the evaluation of the effectiveness of the management of the focal protected areas, METT-AP-GEF, obtained an average of 66 points, an increase of 28 points and exceeding the target of this indicator by 14 points. According to the document “METT 2018 PPVS Report”, the management effectiveness increased specifically in the planning of processes and supplies, but still scores low in “results”. |
| 1.5 Increases in capacities of PA staff in relation to the conservation and management of threatened wildlife | -Two additional technical personnel/ target PA trained and assigned specific wildlife functions  -Provisions exist in MAE for the long-term institutionalization of these capacities. | This indicator has been achieved in terms of number of trained staff (63; 29 MAE technicians and forest rangers; 34 GAD environmental technicians). If all of the participating persons who have participated in the training events of the project are added up, this amount increases to more than 150. Four of the trained staff have specific wildlife management functions (pertaining to RECC, REEA, RECB, and GAD Napo). MAE initially hired ten additional technical officers (later reduced to 5) to work on the management of wildlife subject in the PAs of the different landscapes. These officers were assigned the component 3 and there are no installed provisions for institutionalizing this ability. |

1. In general, the assumptions related to the achievement of the outcomes hold. The community agreements regarding sustainable hunting were accepted and implemented by the communities in the focal protected areas, including the monitoring of these agreements, and the eventual adaptation. The model of these agreements was included by the DNB as part of the guidelines for the elaboration of community management plans within protected areas, which awaits to be applied in practice. The action plans for threatened species needs to be revised and implemented within the PGOA frameworks, but this has not yet been achieved. According to MAE officers, this was mainly a matter of time, given that the action plans are very recent. Meanwhile, a better coordination between the communities and the PA’s administration has been accomplished thanks to the support of the project. This was confirmed by interviewed MAE staff, the interviewed farmers, and the METT. The text for the COA regarding subsistence hunting is included in the draft of the code. An agreement has been signed with the Socio Bosque of MAE to give continuity to part of the community agreements (follow-up to the campaign against illegal trafficking, conflict management between Andean bear-cattle, and the replication of sustainable production projects).
2. The project has continued the management of the unprotected areas in five selected landscapes contributing to the conservation of threatened wildlife. This, nevertheless, is not an integral task at a landscape level, that articulate elements such as the strengthening of the capacities, control communication, monitoring, and productive alternatives. The indicators for outcome 2 have been achieved (Table 8). An exception is 2.1 because a better number of GAD that counted on norms and instruments for the management of threatened wildlife. The main reason was the diphase between the PDOT update and the start of the project, which was explained in detail in the MTE. Nonetheless, the project established good relationships with a series of parish GADs and managed to be prepared and ready to include regulatory instruments in the PDOTs in 2019. This has the weakness of dependence on the continuity of the local management after the sectional elections, and increases in risk of discontinuity due to changes in administration. Despite not having achieved updated PDOTs, the project has indeed managed another type of measures and formal agreements with 6 GAD.

*Table 8. Achievement of Outcome 2 indicators [[50]](#footnote-50)*

| *Indicator* | *Target* | *Achievement by project closure* |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2.1 Increases in # of Decentralized Governments (GAD) in target landscapes with planning, regulatory and normative instruments (and associated budgetary provisions) that incorporate specific provisions for reducing pressures on threatened wildlife | 5/12 GADs in target landscape with TLUP that incorporate specific provisions for reducing pressures on wildlife, and 5 (1 per landscape) apply ordinances which regulate and sanction illegal hunting and trafficking of wildlife, harmonized with the national norm, with associated budgetary provisions. | This indicator did not accomplish its target because it did not manage to interact with the processes of PDOT updating in 2015. For the update in 2019, two documents were elaborated for the incorporating of technical criteria in the PDOT (Table 6, ¶a). The project contributed directly to the generation of 6 ordinances: (1) ordinance that regulates and controls urban fauna (2) four ordinances that make up the ACUS of the Andean Condor” (Santa Isabel, San Felipe de Oña and Nabón, and Saraguro[[51]](#footnote-51)); (3) An ordinance that regulates and controls the management of fishing in the Francisco de Orellana District. These, nonetheless, are not the type of ordinances that the indicator describes. |
| 2.2 Increase in the percentage of detected illegal actions (transporting wildlife and bushmeat, or selling bushmeat in markets) in pilot landscapes that are successfully sanctioned. | 50% increase on baseline % of successful sanctions. | This indicator was achieved successfully. In 2016, 129 administrative processes were started (in 11 provinces of project influence) from which 100% of them ended in penalizing. This amount has increased: from 54 processes with 50% of them ending in sanctions during 2014, 30/53 in 2016, and 129/100% in 2015. In 2017, 141 procedures were started, and by the time of presenting the PIR, there was a 58% effectiveness in sanction resolution. Considering that an additional 59 processes are still at the research stage. The percentage will probably increase. |
| 2.3 Reduction in detected incidence of wildlife and bushmeat trade per unit of effort at pilot enforcement points. | 50% reduction in detection/unit effort, due to the deterrent effect of the enforcement points. | While the expected level has not been achieved, the rate of detection of illegal trafficking event/unit of effort reduced. During the last reporting period, a reduction of 36,8% in detection/unit of effort in in ten permanent forest control and wildlife posts. This is equivalent to 2.8 confiscations/100 hours of work (decreasing from 3.8 in average between 2014-2016). |
| 2.4 Increases in # families in communities adjoining PAs in target landscapes, participating in livelihood /´productive activities demonstrated to reduce pressures on wildlife | * 20% of families in 7 communities adjoining PAs target landscapes 1,2, 3,4,5 | Nowadays, 264 families, 22% of the families in the selected adjacent communities to the PA, participate in the nine initiatives to improve their production, overcoming the objective of this indicator in 24 families. These families are in Santo Domingo of Onzole (Landscape 1); Intag (Landscape 2); Cosanga, Sardinas, Cuyuja, and El Triunfo (Landscape 3); Malacatos and Sabanilla (Landscape 5); and, Santa Rosa (in the Province of El Oro, project replica). The study of socio-economic impact informs that, in all of these zones, the incidents involving wildlife decreased, for which it can be assumed that the initiatives contributed effectively to the reduction of pressure on wildlife. |
| 2.5 Reductions in frequency of conflicts between fauna and agricultural and/or ranching activities, in all 5 target landscapes | 50% reduction in frequency of reported attacks by wild fauna on cattle, due to awareness raising and the introduction of improved management practices for agriculture and ranching | This indicator was only reported for the issue of conflicts with bears in landscape 3. According to the information given by the MAE, during the last period covered by the PIR 2018 report, the Provincial Directions for the Environment of Carchi and Imbabura did not register bear attacks to cattle in the parishes were cattle management was implemented. |

1. Indicator 2.1 has been achieved at a parish level (approx. 15) and in the communities where the project has been implemented, and not in the whole of the focal landscape. This is a logical consequence of the project strategy, that, due to availability of financial and human resources, and time, had to select and focus their actions in the geographical area of most incidence of Andean bear – domestic cattle conflict, instead of covering an entire landscape. While the project has collaborated with government agencies to widen the landscape vision, include local initiatives in the planning and disseminate experiences, by not having an escalating immediate strategy, the outcomes of this component are limited to the level of locations and cannot be concluded if it has been achieved at the landscape level.
2. The project achieved the target of the other four indicators. The evaluator was able to verify that, in effect, the sustainable production projects were well installed and adopted by the communities and the interviewed producers who explained they have stopped intervening in the forest or protected area. The socio-economic impact study of these activities concludes a successful application and reduction of interaction with the natural areas and with the wildlife. Although these observations are based on the secondary information and are not supported by data, it is likely that these activities have reduced the intervention of the inhabitants of the forest who have contributed to its conservation. The evaluator made two observations that could have influenced in the success of this activity.

The selection of beneficiary families was done in collaboration with the GAD. Sometimes the selection was based on landscape considerations: for example, in Angochagua the participants for the initiative of human-wildlife conflicts were selected according to the most exposed lands). In other cases, the selection was not based on landscape considerations or socio-economics. For example, in Cuyuja, the selection was one through the lottery between potential beneficiaries interested and in Malacatos. The participants were selected through an open call of interests. This resulted in families who were included were not necessary the ones who interacted the most with the wildlife of the area nor the ones that needed the most support from the project. For example, one of the interviewed beneficiaries has never interact with wildlife; he had several productive activities that make believe that this project did not imply a lot of additional value in economic terms. If the goal is to accomplish project acceptance, it is a good decision to leave the selection with the local agencies. This, however, can imply a challenge for the strict application of the landscape vision and sustainable development for the communities.

While focusing solely on one productive activity (guinea pigs, fish, etc.) to reduce pressure on wildlife, a risk exits of other forms of threats over natural areas. For example, an interviewed beneficiary proudly manifested that he stopped hunting thanks to the productive project, but the evaluator observed that he used relatively large volumes of wood, extracted from the forest, to be used in another productive activity. The outcome was a positive change for one activity (hunting) but not in all of its entire livelihoods.

1. Indicator 2.5 was achieved: the cattle management actions which have been well-accepted by the producers, and have resulted in improved income as well as the reduction of human – wildlife conflicts according to the registries of the MAE provincial directorates. The evaluator highlights the change of paradigm in the management of conflicts. Recent academic literature regarding the subject confirms that avoiding the conflict (through good agricultural practices, for example) is more effective and less expensive than other measures like economic compensation or removing the animal “cause” from the conflict[[52]](#footnote-52). In Ecuador, this vision is relatively new – MAE functionaries confirmed that up to now there were provincial directorates where the main action of conflict managements was to consider the bear as the problem and not the people, which resulted in activities to remove bear or scare him away. The application in the project of measures to avoid conflict has demonstrated its effectiveness, which was confirmed by the evaluator in interviews with beneficiaries. Moreover, the project of improved grasslands to maintain the cattle in the community had additional benefits, including a better production (which, was duplicated in some cases), but was also time-saving for herders by not having to take the cattle to the high zone for additional fodder. This especially benefits women of the community who generally direct this activity.
2. A determining factor for the sustainable production initiatives was the existence of a social basis for activities contributing to the indicator 2.3 as well as 2.5. According to the project Management Unit staff, the production initiatives tried to show the direct benefit for families, even before demonstrating their positive effect on wildlife. This is illustrated by the expression of a producer: *“I love learning and much better when it is to produce better and cleaner produce. When any course is given here, I am the first to participate. From the project Landscapes-Wildlife we also learn about the animals of the field, which is beautiful”*. Being able to show the concrete and immediate benefit, the acceptance of the owners was high (for example, in Cuyuja there were three times more interested families than possibilities to participate) and as well as their permanence (according to informants, the desertion was less than 20% in all four initiatives which were visited during the evaluation). Furthermore, in each of the four visited initiatives, the evaluator could verify that there is a demand from other families to participate in the initiatives. This indicates that the assumption associated with this outcome was fulfilled, and that there is a social basis for the productive activities in the management of wildlife.
3. Indicators 2.2 and 2.3 refer to the effectiveness in the detection and sanction of legal procedures and the reduction in the detection of trafficking of wildlife. Both indicators were achieved, though 2.3 in a lesser percentage than the target. With this, it can be assumed that the control of illegal actions associated with wildlife has improved during this period. Although this is probably true, these indicators do not tell in absolute terms if there were fewer illegal actions in practice. It must be considered that these are a type of proxy indicators which do not display the phenomenon of interest directly (decrease in the number of legal actions) but indirectly through an indicator which approximates or represents the phenomenon (the amount of detections of infractions and the efficiency of the sanction). The same goes for indicator 2.5: the amount of conflicts is not measured directly, but rather the register of the reported conflicts is taken. Proxy indicators include the risk of what is being observed from another phenomenon, for example, that, in reality, there is no reduction of conflict but a reduction of complaints. Nonetheless, the field visits and the interviews with producers convinced the evaluator that the conflicts, possibly not eliminated, have been reduced.

Conclusion 11. The project has been effective in terms of the generation of outputs and achievement of outcomes.

Conclusion 12. The generation of knowledge, planning instruments and conservation and development projects with communities living in or around protected areas, resulted in a significant contribution in the management effectiveness of these protected areas. This, among other things, contributed to a better conservation of wildlife in several locations in the five landscapes.

Conclusion 13. Despite the fact that there is a no inclusion of normative in the territorial ordering and development plans (PDOT) of the local governments, the collaboration with the development of ten concrete plans has generated a greater attention and commitment for landscape management for wildlife management.

Conclusion 14. The support towards the capacity of detection and sanction resulted in positive indicators of the control of wildlife traffic.

Conclusion 15. The sustainable production projects have increased the economic and social indicators of more than 250 families in five landscapes, which additionally, is related to less negative interactions among humans and wildlife.

*The evaluator rates the “effectiveness” of the project as “satisfactory”.*

### 3.3.4. Efficiency

*Ef1. The ample experience of the partner agencies in managing international cooperation projects has contributed to the project being implemented in line with internationally accepted norms and standards.*

1. MAE has a wide experience in the management of GEF projects. According to the database of projects[[53]](#footnote-53), Ecuador has participated in 62 projects (29 just in Ecuador, 33 among various country) and MAE as focal GEF point was responsible for all of them. The UNDP is one of the initial implementation agencies and has an important project portfolio from different financial sources in Ecuador (¶41). Being part of the United Nations, international standards guide all of its operations. This combination of implementing agency (UNDP) and executing agency (MAE) has guaranteed an efficient and correct management.
2. WCS is a non-governmental organization that works at an international level with a wide project portfolio in the biodiversity conservation. Its history and portfolio in Ecuador is not very large but for its specific experience in wildlife management, it offers an important additional value to the project (¶38, 52). The risk of leaving part of the project responsibility with a less experienced organization was recognized among the Prodoc risks (¶50). WCS received an *ex-ante* micro evaluation to highlight possible deficiencies in management and its administration received a closer follow-up. Regardless of this, some administrative challenges took place for which it was necessary to hire a specific audit for WCS that resulted in some minor observations[[54]](#footnote-54). The administration and implementation of the WCS activities had other challenges, among others due to the relatively high percentage of the budget managed by this organization. The project partners agreed on a change in administration, through which the activities of monitoring and conflict management would be administered by the MAE Project Management Unit. The involved parties (MAE, WCS and the functionaries whose contract was changed) mentioned that this adaptation was satisfactory and that it helped the efficiency of these activities.
3. The evaluator perceived that the project in general had a positive benefit-cost balance (achieved products and results vs. investment of human and financial resources). The benefit is relatively high: the effectiveness of the project (achievement of outputs and outcomes) was rated as satisfactory, which is positive considering that it had a great thematic variety (study and monitoring, control and legislation, training, sensitizing, productive activities, update of management plans) and a wide geographical range (5 landscapes, 21 parishes, 11 provinces, nine protected areas) where the project indicators would be met. The cost was relatively low, considering a duration of five years and a modest budget in comparison with other GEF projects of a large size. The project itself analyzed the balance benefit-cost of 18 sustainable production activities [[55]](#footnote-55). This study identified that all of the initiatives generated environmental and social important benefits (¶106). Furthermore, participating families obtained additional income: in general, monthly income increased around 7 to 20%, although in two cases (Malacatos and Sardinas) the estimated family incomes was duplicated. Nonetheless, in all cases this economic benefit was less than the cost of implementation of the activity: out of nine agricultural analyzed initiatives, 5 had a benefit/cost of less than 10% and the five production projects for alternative protein sources, had an estimated benefit/cost rate of 39%. This socioeconomic study has some limitations, specifically due to the lack of exact data, and the short implementation period of the initiatives. Moreover, the social and environmental valuable benefit of these investments is mentioned, but not quantified. For this, the productive initiatives seem not to be profitable yet from the economic point of view, but they do form the social and environmental points of view.

Conclusion 16. The project has been executed with efficiency, resulting in a positive benefit/cost balance considering the environmental and social results of the project in general.

*The evaluator rates the efficiency of the project as “satisfactory”.*

### 3.3.5. Country ownership

*CO1.The government of Ecuador took ownership of the project because it was the main agency for its design, execution and financing. This ownership increased during the execution with the active participation of GADs.*

1. Interviews with the representatives from different organizations involved with the design of the project confirmed that the concept of the project initiated within the MAE Wildlife Unit; they identified the need for external funds to improve wildlife management in the country, and due to this, together with MAE’s international cooperation unit, invited the UNDP to develop a GEF project. They also invited WCS for its specific expertise. The development of the PIF and PPG project was a collaborative process between MAE, WCS, UNDP, and consultants. In the implementation, MAE was responsible for the execution of the project, and directly carried out most of the activities. The Ecuadorean state contributed with some 18M USD in counterpart, approx. 4 times more than GEF. Additionally, there was a positive ownership from the GAD involved in the project because they took an active role in the implementation and contributed with additional funds (¶74). Due to this, it was verified that the project had country ownership from the start and during the execution. On the other side, the country has not yet taken responsibility for providing sustainability and continuity for the project outcomes (¶89, 90).

Conclusion 17. The country adopted the project execution and contributed with funds and important efforts, although its support to the continuity of the outcomes is uncertain in the near future.

### 3.3.6. Sustainability

*S1. The development of new legislation contributes to the sustainability of the project. The norms, regulations, and instruments developed by the project ensure some permanent improvements to the management of wildlife.*

*S2. The general social basis for wildlife management shows a progressive increase that contributes towards the consolidation of outcomes.*

*S3. Due to the uncertainty of the future structure and budget of MAE, at this time the commitments for providing continuity to the outcomes and activities is uncertain.*

*S5. There is a tendency of decreasing available national government budget for the management of wildlife and consequently, the continuity of the results is progressively depending on international funding.*

*S4. The ownership of the project at a GAD level assures continuity of the actions and outcomes which were supported by them, but a change in administration could interrupt the actions.*

*S6. The project has a detailed sustainability plan which was developed by the end of the project, but it is not being implemented yet.*

1. The socio-political sustainability is positive. During the last decade, Ecuador has characterized itself as innovating in environmental policies. The constitutional declaration of the rights of nature has been applauded worldwide[[56]](#footnote-56). Form this, political support towards large initiatives in environmental subjects like Socio Bosque, Yasuní ITT[[57]](#footnote-57), and ONU-REDD[[58]](#footnote-58) arose. Despite the success of these initiatives was not always categorical, subsequent political administrations decided to continue to create a politically favorable environment. For this reason, the formulating of the COA arose, with the goal of renovating the environmental legislation (¶92). These developments show the sustainability of the political will for projects like the present and the moment of legislative renovation provides an opportunity to hold the main norms and instruments.
2. The political wish for being innovative in environmental subjects reflects the social basis for these subjects and contributes towards a general socio-political sustainability for results of a project like this. In the zones of the country were the project is implemented (rural landscapes among protected areas and agricultural zones), organized communities exist with experience in rural development and community management of natural resources. In the project, this was evidenced by the good social basis and the easy adoption of sustainable production projects and of wildlife management practices and by the collaboration community and parish governments in the development of local regulations and normative (¶106, 118). The project even managed to increase this base progressively, through the support of more parishes and communities than was originally planned, support to the GADs who replicated actions by their own means (¶93), responding to the demand of additional families in the same zones (what the evaluator observed in Cuyuja, Angochagua, and Malacatos), and in other zones (for example, support to the management of the reserves Taita Imbabura and Toisán, or the development of the ACUS Cariyacu-Culugá in Urququí). Other indications for positive environmental awareness of the Ecuadorian society was the approval in a national referendum with two thirds of the votes, of both questions directly aimed at the conservation of protected areas (ban of metal mining in the PPAA and increase of the intangible zone of the Yasuní[[59]](#footnote-59)) and the recent commotion of the two cases of Condor deaths[[60]](#footnote-60).
3. In contrast to the socio-political sustainability, the institutional and governance sustainability is far less likely and seems to constitute the main barrier for a positive wildlife management in the future. Since August 2018, several change processes were started in the environmental institutional structure of the country, among others a fusion of MAE and SENAGUA, formalized by executive decree on October 3rd 2018. As a first change, the Minister resigned and the Secretary of Water assumed the post as acting Minister of Environment. On December 3rd, a new Minister of Environment was sworn in and on January 2019, the presidency communicated to the MAE personnel that there will no longer be a MAE-SENAGUA fusion. The continuous insecurity regarding a change of structure and authorities affects the sustainability of the project and the consolidation of its outcomes. While the new legislation is in progress and presents an opportunity, the structural insecurity caused that there is are signs of possible future structure, roles and responsibilities of the different directions, and units. According to interviewed representatives of MAE, at the moment of the evaluation, it was not even known with certainty if in the future there would be a wildlife unit, provincial directions, or if the roles of control and sanction would be in the DNB or if they would be transferred to an independent control agency.
4. As one of the activities to support the sustainability of project outcomes and activities, the project hired the elaboration of a Management Model for the Wildlife in Ecuador[[61]](#footnote-61). This effort reflects the institutional insecurity: At the start of 2018 the consultancy had analyzed two scenarios that were considered to be the most likely at the time (the creation of a Regulation and Control Agency, and a Public company complementary to MAE). Nonetheless, inn April 2018 at a workshop with MAE personnel it was requested to include a third scenario, of no institutional change. The proposed model redefined the faculties and responsibilities of the wildlife unit, and its relationship with other units, levels and sectors. This model, which implies little structural change towards the existing situation, demands more labor in the tasks of monitoring and controlling, and management and coordination. Because of this, an increase in personnel, funds, and of a strategic planning tool was proposed. At the moment of the presentation of the document including the management model (May 2018), it was already considered that the institutional reform process had not yet finished for which it would be necessary to keep a permanent presence and a continuous discourse within this process. After this date, together with the announcement of the fusion (August 2018) and the subsequent cancelation of it (January 2019), this reform process intensified, and possibly the considered third scenario will not be realistic. Apart from the insecurity of the general financial sustainability (¶124) together with the security in the decrease of national government budget (¶29) it is unlikely that the model proposed by the project, even its most basic shape, could be implemented in 2019. Whichever the structure of the institutionalism may be. For this, it must be concluded that the model is not applicable in the present situation and more clarity in the institutional structure must be expected in order to adjust the document to the future scenario. Furthermore, the model focuses on the management of wildlife and must widen to cover the landscape focus of the conservation of wildlife.
5. The support provided by GAD are a dimension of the institutional and governance sustainability that has the highest likelihood. The evaluator has verified a good level of adoption of commitment on behalf of the parish-level and some provincial-level GAD, in order to preserve several actions in the field, replicate to other zones, and designate human and financial resources to secure their sustainability (¶91, 93, 111, 118). There is uncertainty in the sustainability due to the possible change in administration in the jurisdictions after the 2019 local elections. If there is a budget assigned for this year and some activities and outcomes have been formally declared, then the effective implementation depends on the continuity of the political management and the inclusion of the principle of wildlife management in the new PDOTs. Despite the project has done as much as possible to prepare this inclusion (¶110), it is uncertain if this will take place after project closure.
6. Considering that it is strongly related to the institutional situation; financial sustainability is unlikely. The national public funding to environmental subjects is decreasing (¶29), including the contribution to wildlife management in the MAE. This creates an apparent paradoxical situation: while there is a growth in political and social sustainability and an evident commitment to improve environmental managing, the state budget allocated for these activities is each time less and there is a greater dependence to external funds.
7. The project has realized two processes in the elaboration of a financial strategy for wildlife management. In 2016[[62]](#footnote-62), the first process mainly analyzed the situation and the demand. This study identified that around US$ 12 million would be required per year in order to develop and implement several instruments for wildlife management. With the budget of 2016, there would already be a gap of US$ 3-4 million per year only in actions strictly related to the management of wildlife without considering landscape management. Due to the abovementioned institutional insecurity in 2018 (¶121), and the evident increase of the funding gap, a second part of the financial sustainability[[63]](#footnote-63) study was created, with a greater focus on the identification of sustained external funding. In the absence of more public funds, the most likely source is the creation of a specific wildlife fund managed by the FIAS. The FIAS has committed to the subject and is effectively creating the fund and is currently identifying sources for their replenishment. Some social corporate responsibility mechanisms are considered, which would allow to channel funds from the private sector to the fund. Though the evaluator considers that the effective functioning of the fund and its financing is likely, it is unlikely that this could cover the gap entirely, especially when the national government is not showing financial commitment by sustaining an adequately equipped wildlife unit. Also, when the already difficult economic situation gets more complicated so does the attainment of financing from private entities (businesses, NGOs, among others).
8. In addition to the possibility of long-term financing, there are some sources that are assuring immediate continuity. The first are the public funds for component 3 that, on December 3rd, were confirmed for the project budget for 2019. Nonetheless, at the time of the elaboration of the present report, it is uncertain because under the expense level of another GEF associate project (amphibians) it affected the Component 3 budget. Other sources are the funds of the GAD for 2019. Additionally, the project has signed agreements with other initiatives (PROAmazonía, Socio Bosque) to provide the possibility of continuity for some activities and outcomes in certain areas (Socio Bosque reserves, sustainable production projects, and strengthening of the campaign against wildlife trafficking). With the exception of PROAmazonía, the rest of the funds are limited, disperse, and short term (a maximum of a year). Because of the lack of certainty over Socio Bosque funds in the present scenario of re-structuring of the MAE, this program can also not ensure sustainability.
9. The project has elaborated an exit strategy draft, among others, to seek for greater sustainability for the outputs and outcomes. This strategy is complete regarding the landscape focus because it is based on the project indicators, and not only on wildlife management activities, like in the studies of the management models and financial stability. Nonetheless, it was elaborated towards the end of the project and actions within the implementation period of the project were not included. The draft consulted by the evaluator (January 2019 version) showed an advanced strategy and has identified possible partners, agreements, terms, budgets, and contracts necessary to maintain the action lines that the Project is currently covering (like it was recommended by the MTE). Some elements are still missing to make it totally executable, specifically a definition of the necessary actions and the responsible actors per action.

Conclusion 18. The socio-political sustainability is likely because there is interest and willingness from the government as well as from civil society to support positive initiatives for the conservation of biodiversity in Ecuador.

Conclusion 19. The institutional and financial sustainability is unlikely because the government commitment has not yet been translated into a structure or solid budget for the conservation of landscapes and wildlife.

Conclusion 20. There is a wide and growing gap between the finance needs for the conservation of landscapes and wildlife, and the public funds allocated to this matter.

Conclusion 21. The project developed an exit strategy late during its implementation. Although it is not complete, it has advanced a lot. Due to the lack of commitment and financing from MAE, the implementation of the exit strategy is uncertain.

*The evaluator rates the sustainability of the project as “moderately unlikely”.*

### 3.3.7. Impact

*I1. Lots of important data on abundance of the priority wildlife species in the landscapes have been generated, but these are inconclusive to identify any trends in species abundance.*

*I2. The improvement of management effectiveness of the protected areas included in the project and the management of new conservation areas indicates that the project has contributed to an increase of coverage of natural vegetation effectively conserved.*

*I3. The main threats to biodiversity in certain landscapes (deforestation and unplanned expansion of the agricultural frontier, exploration for hydrocarbon mining) and at a global level (climate change) continue to pressure the natural areas and the wildlife of Ecuador.*

1. According to the reconstructed ToC for this project, there is one single indicator in the outcome framework associated with the impact (01). The project is contributing to the achievement of the target for this indicator. However, there are not enough data to verify its achievement until date, (Table 9). A group of species (spectacled bear, puma, mountain tapir, lowland tapir, peccary, paramo fox) is being monitored through relative-abundance measurement techniques (camera traps, rates of encounters). The project[[64]](#footnote-64) recognized that this methodology has limitations to identify absolute abundance and changes in abundance of populations. The abundance of other species (condor, ibis, coastal spider monkey, manatee, green macaw, black caiman, paiche) is measured through repeated censuses: direct observations to the number of individuals of a certain species at a national level or in a determined area. Until date of the report, data from two or three censuses[[65]](#footnote-65) have been reported, while the third census waits completion between the end of 2018 and the start of 2019. The project has recognized that it is not possible to detect trends of a population of wildlife in only 2 or 3 sampling periods, and the results can only be considered a comparison of two or three moments. This is why the difference presented in Table 9 between both censuses of bandurrias showed an increase of 50%, and the caiman a 38% increase. Both condor censuses gave an increase of up to 100% in three years. Nevertheless, these differences are not real increases of population but rather an effect of a more detailed census than the second sampling. For example, the great difference in the increase in number of condors between both censuses can be due to a more intensive census (138 vs. 70 roosts). The other species do not display significant differences that, in the case of low reproductive species, is the goal.

*Table 9. Achievement of indicator O1 (impact)[[66]](#footnote-66)*

| *Indicator* | *Target* | *Achievement by project closure* |
| --- | --- | --- |
| O1. Maintenance or increases in abundance of target species in target landscapes. | In all target PAs, corridors and buffer zones   * 0% negative change in abundance of species with low reproductive rates * 10% increase in abundance of those with high reproductive rates. | The results in the comparison between two or three censuses (between 2016 and 2018) in abundance of species with low reproductive rates:   * Black faced ibis (three censuses): difference of approx. 50% in 2018 vs 2016. * Coastal spider monkey (two censuses): no significant differences. * Manatee (three censuses): no significant differences. * Green macaw: Very low general density, without trustworthy data regarding differences.   The results in high abundance of species with high reproductive rates:   * Black Caiman (two censuses): difference of approx. 36% in 2018 vs 2016. * Paiche (three censuses): no significant differences.   The project also reported the data of the two national censuses of Andean condor[[67]](#footnote-67). Between 94 and 102 individuals in 2015 based in a census of 70 roosts. In August 2018, based on a census of 138 roosts a population of 140 and 270 individuals was estimated. |

1. Regarding the achievement of indicator 01, it must be accepted that by the end of the project, there will be trustworthy data on abundances but it will not be possible to estimate any population trend (increase or maintenance) given that this implies a long-term monitoring (¶47). Nonetheless, it is normal for a project to achieve the impact indicator at a long-term and it is acceptable that there is no measurable change during the execution. In this project, the efforts of the censuses and the monitoring have managed to establish a baseline of population data of the focal species, which was previously unavailable. Furthermore, with the established protocols, trained persons, available field teams, the identified DNB tasks (according to the project exit strategy) and the collaboration from organizations such as the Andean Condor Foundation and the Group of Primate Studies of Ecuador, there is an enabling environment adequate for maintaining the monitoring system in the future.
2. Another impact of the project is the conservation of the landscape which forms a natural and positive habitat for wildlife. According to the reconstructed ToC, this would be achieved if indicator 02 (Increase of vegetation cover in the corridors/buffer zones) would be achieved and that the conservation of this vegetation becomes effective. There are indications that the project achieved a better effectiveness in the management of the seven PAs with which it collaborated (¶107). In the new conservation areas this is less evident. While it was evaluated as an effective adaptation to the changes of context, it must be concluded that an effective conservation is stronger ensured by the Socio Bosque program (based on a legal contract of conservation) than with the ACUS (based in a municipal ordinance, but with no clear normative or a budget) or with a Ramsar site (declaration by decree, but with no national status or public funding). Only with a major formalizing of ACUS and Ramsar sites and after some years of monitoring the management effectiveness of these, it might be concluded that they positively contribute to the conservation of wildlife. That said, at the moment of this evaluation it was observed that in general, there is a positive contribution of these new areas to the conservation of habitat and wildlife in the landscapes.
3. The project focuses on five landscapes, and seeks collaboration with communities for an integral management of the landscape to better preserve wildlife. According to the ToC, if this is well executed it would generate the impact of a greater abundance of these species, in case there was no other type of pressure, beyond the control of the project. But in fact, there are other pressures on biodiversity that are not attended by the project with an uncertain impact on wildlife. Although Ecuador has advanced in environmental subjects, deforestation and the illegal encroachment of the agricultural limit, the population increase, unplanned mining, and hydrocarbon exploration are affecting the natural areas, and due to this, also its wildlife. The same is true for the effect of climate change that in theory can affect the distribution of species and the permanence of the habitat. All of these factors interact with the project possibilities to generating impact.

Conclusion 22. The project has generated valuable data regarding the distribution and abundance of wildlife. Nonetheless, a much longer period than the project implementation period is needed to be able to establish trustworthy trends.

Conclusion 23. The project has contributed to the increase of the area of natural vegetation cover under different conservation schemes and has contributed to its conservation in protected areas and other important natural areas for local governments.

# 4. Lessons and recommendations

## 4.1 Lessons

1. During the present evaluation, a series of lessons has been identified, based on good practice -and other not so adequate practice- for the design, implementation and governance of the project . These lessons are worthy of being considered by the executing and implementing agencies in future similar projects.

* Lessons regarding the project design

1. Indicators that directly measure the state of a conservation object (in this case, the abundance of fauna) generate valuable data on environmental management, but need a much longer monitoring time (10-20 years or more; much more than the typical execution period of a regular GEF project) in order to be able to show its impact.

* Lessons regarding project management and implementation

1. A public institution such as MAE can handle a project efficiently under an implementation arrangement such as in the current project: relying on a technical team physically and administratively independent, but under Ministerial coordination and supervision.
2. In the selection of a project management team like this one, it is important to value administrative capacities as much as the technical capacities, even when the objective and the activities have a high technical content.
3. Create a coordination platform between MAE and its associated projects is not only beneficial for the communication and alignment among projects but also for creating a wider team to support policies and projects of MAE itself.
4. Parish-level GADs associate easier to a field-level project then “high”-level government agencies, because of their more closeness with people and field practices, their shorter communication lines and decision-making processes.
5. All provincial and parish GADs who have had an effective coordination with the project, were integrated by highly committed individuals. The presence of this committed staff is equally as important as formal institutional agreements.
6. MAE definitely has a political commitment with the integral management of the landscape, but at the same time, it has little ability to give institutional and financial sustainability to the outcomes of this project. This shows that for a change in paradigm (vision, approach) at the level of a public entity, more than good intentions, a better discourse and examples of field practices are required; it also requires commitment at every level, an adequate structure and an experienced team, with good management capacities and a corresponding budget.

* Lessons regarding project outcomes

1. The management of human-wildlife conflicts is more effective and provides more (economic and social) co-benefits when it seeks a change of human conduct (good production practices) linked to direct benefits, rather than controlling wildlife. The effective collaboration among environmental and agricultural authorities helps to generate these multiple environmental and social benefits.
2. For the adoption of local practices which are positive for the management of wildlife it is important to secure and demonstrate the direct benefits for the communities at the same time or even before environmental benefits.
3. To avoid that sustainable, wildlife-friendly production practices become isolated from the greater environmental objective, they need to coordinate with or inserted in a larger environmental management and policy context.
4. Considering the gender dimension in the selection of diverse agricultural practices can create more social and environmental co-benefits.

## 4.2 Recommendations

1. Based on the findings and conclusions of this evaluation, the evaluator elaborated a series of recommendations that can help consolidate the project results and increase the probability of generating impact:

During the last months of the project (before March 2019), the Management Unit Team must complete the exit strategy with roles, budgets, or dates for each of the necessary actions. The exit strategy needs an adjustment to the actual capacity, particularly of MAE, considering their current reality in terms of structure and budget.

Once the exit strategy is agreed upon, the DNB-MAE must ensure the concrete agreements for the implementation of each of the proposed sustainability actions, based on the actual and measurable commitments from the different MAE units and other actors. The DNB must supervise and monitor the achievement of these agreements, at least until there is a model for wildlife management implemented in the new institutional structure.

Once the institutional structure is defined, the MAE must contract an update of the model for wildlife management and adjust it to the reality of that new structure. This model must be widened to include a landscape approach in the wildlife management and must be combined with the financial strategy for this model. The necessary funds for the update could be provided by public funding components of this project (components 3 and 4) or from PASNAP, given that the outcomes contribute to the objectives of all of these projects.

The Management Unit staff who will continue during 2019 with public funding, can supervise the inclusion of the landscape approach and wildlife management texts in the new national legislation along with the upgrade of the model for wildlife management

Before ending the project (March2019), the DNB, MAE, and UNDP must secure that the ongoing programs (Socio Bosque and PROAmazonía) include formal agreements and operational mechanism in their AOPs, to provide continuity to the positive actions initiated in the present project and to provide sustainability to the outcomes

During 2019 the DNB and the UNDP must seek a way through which the new projects currently under development (with GEF funds, or others, such as REDD Early Movers, and the Regional Program for the conservation of the jaguar) include the consolidation of part of the positive results from Landscapes - Wildlife Project.

In order to strengthen the institutional capacity at a long term, during 2019 the MAE must look for forms of living up to its initial expectation[[68]](#footnote-68) of including personnel trained by the project within their regional teams. In absence of a specific budget for the increase of the MAE personnel, at least, preference could be given to the trained personnel in the regular calls for technical staff.

By the end of the species monitoring activities executed by the project, the UNDP must ensure the delivery of the equipment used by the project to MAE, and MAE must ensure the availability of this equipment so that It can be managed by the DNB personnel (especially in the focal protected areas) in a way that these are used for future monitoring activities.

In the final project phase, the Management Unit and WCS must continue to seek for agreements with universities and species specialist groups beyond the working group ton Condor or the Study Group of Primates, so that they collaborate with DNB in the monitoring of wildlife. A formalizing on behalf of MAE, of their role in the monitoring protocols will consolidate their collaboration. The coordination with the Species Survival Commission of the UICN can help making an inventory of expert and management groups at national and international levels.

Before the end of the project, the Project Management Unit must assure that all the data on wildlife generated by the project is delivered to INABIO, who must assure an adequate infrastructure and human capacity to administer and manage these data in the future.

MAE should make use of the formulation of the new legislation and the new institutional structure to consider the ACUS becoming part of the SNAP and for larger national support for Ramsar sites.

It is important that technical criteria, based on the wildlife policy, are included in the updating of the PDOT. For this, during 2019 CONGOPE could provide support to the implementation of these guidelines by SENPLADES. The can also assist the provincial GADs, and through them, the parish GADs in the update, at least in the GAD with whom the Landscapes - Wildlife Project collaborated with.

To assure consolidation of the outcomes of the different sustainable production projects to decrease the pressure over wildlife, which were started in this project, during 2019 the parish GADs and the local MAG functionaries should provide technical and financial support to these initiatives. The MAE staff from the regional directions could support by monitoring the activities and inclusion of the projects in a broader environmental management context.

During 2019, MAE must take on the responsibility of collaboration with the FIAS aiming at consolidation and financing the wildlife fund. In order to include the experience of Landscapes - Wildlife Project, FIAS could establish a technical group of actors that were involved in this project to advise this fund.

In case future projects need to include additional components, for administrative reasons, MAE has to ensure that these are designed and implemented fully within the framework of the project: they need to be contributing to the project’s general objective, its execution should be under the full responsibility of the same Manager and should be supervised by the same Steering Committee. If this is not possible, the component should be managed as a separate, parallel project.

The design of future projects that include indicators for the changes in status of wildlife populations, measured through monitoring, should ensure a long enough implementation period to allow for the generation of meaningful information on these changes.

In future GEF projects, UNDP must consider including a Theory of Change to explain how the strategies and activities of the project produce in a logical and causal manner a series of results that contribute to achieve the desired impacts. This ToC should specifically include the identification of assumptions and risks from the context of the project in a way that their monitoring informs adaptive management.

# 5. Annexes

Annex 1. Terms of Reference

Annex 2. Itinerary

Annex 3. List of persons interviewed

Annex 4. Summary of field visits

Annex 5. Consulted documents

Annex 6. Inception report

Annex 7. Template applied to semi-structured interviews

Annex 8. Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

## Annex 1. Terms of Reference of this Evaluation[[69]](#footnote-69)

Terminal Evaluation Terms of Reference

Project No.: 00087256

Project Title: Advancing landscape approaches in Ecuador's National Protected Area System to improve conservation of globally endangered wildlife

Functional Title: Wildlife Corridors - SNAP Effectiveness

Contract Type: NEX

Location: Ecuador

Duration: 5 years

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Advancing landscape approaches in Ecuador's National Protected Area System to improve conservation of globally endangered wildlife* (PIMS #4831).

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | *87256* |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion*  *(Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | *4831* | GEF financing: | *4,450,472* | *4.445.472,00* |
| Country: | | *Ecuador* | IA/EA own: |  | *17.000* |
| Region: | | *Latin America and the Caribbean* | Government: |  | *803.281,74 (Presupuesto fiscal- personal MAE)*  *1.601.531,20 (Programa de Apoyo a SNAP).*  *4.009.012,81 (Programa de conservación de bosques y REDD)*  *11.576.553,05 (Programa Sociobosque)*  *Total: 17.990.378,80* |
| Focal Area: | |  | Other: |  | *260.392,94 (WCS)*  *1.818.973,31 (Ecofondo 2014-2015)*  *Total: 2.079.366,25* |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | |  | Total co-financing: |  | *20.086.745,05[[70]](#footnote-70)* |
| Executing Agency: | | *United Nations Development Program - Ecuador* | Total Project Cost: |  | *24.532.217,05* |
| Other Partners involved: | | *Ministry of Environment, Implementing Partner.*  *Wildlife Conservation Society, Responsible Partner.* | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | Proposed:  September 2013 | Real:  November 2013 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed:  November 2018 | Actual:  March 2019 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to:

The terminal evaluation will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The terminal evaluation will assess the implementation and performance of the project by looking at the potential impact and sustainability of results. This includes contribution to conservation of wildlife and the attainment of global and country specific environmental goals.

The evaluation is expected to review the project´s progress with the main stakeholders: Ministry of Environment of Ecuador (MAE), Consortium of Decentralized Provincial Autonomous Governments of Ecuador (CONGOPE), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Biodiversity National Institute (INABIO), Sustainable Environmental Investment Fund (FIAS), Decentralized (local) Autonomous Governments (“GAD” for its acronym in Spanish) of Imbabura, Angochagua, El Oro, Cuyuja, Loja, Malacatos, Environment Provincial Directorate of Imbabura and Azuay, and the Antisana Ecological Reserve.

Additionally, it is considered as a significant opportunity to provide donors, government and project partners with an independent assessment of relevance and achievement of objectives and impact indicators, to determine progress being made towards the achievement of outcomes.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as project document, project reports, project budget revisions, midterm review, Progress reports, GEF area of interest tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, sustainability strategy and any other material that the evaluator considers useful for this analysis, conclusions and recommendations for preparing the project evaluation´s final report.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[71]](#footnote-71) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in* [*Annex C*](#_TOR_Annex_C:)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project Steering Committee members, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to *(Quito (Pichincha), Ibarra and Angochagua (Imbabura), Loja and Malacatos (Loja), Machala (El Oro) and Cuyuja (Napo)),* including the following project sites:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| City | Site / distance from the project office / means of mobilization | Interviews will be held with the following stakeholders at a minimum |
| Quito | *Ministry of Environment (MAE) / 2 km / taxi* | *Alfredo López, Undersecretary of natural heritage.*  *David Veintimilla, National Biodiversity Directorate (2018)*  *Esteban Falconí, Legal*  *María Belén Durán, GEF Operational Focal point (2018)*  *Janeth Olmedo, Wildlife Unit Coordinator/Gabriela Montoya, Especialist of Wildlife*  *Marcela Torres, Protected Areas Unit Coordinator*  *Pablo Drouet, Coordinator of PASNAP*  *Santiago Kingman, Coordinator of Sociobosque Program* |
| Quito | *PNUD / 6 km / taxi* | *Nuno Queiros, Deputy Resident Representative of UNDP in Ecuador*  *Mónica Andrade, Responsible Environment and energy area*  *Ana María Núñez, Programme officer*  *Alexandra Fisher, Regional Technical Adviser (vía skype)* |
| Quito | *CONGOPE / 2 km / taxi* | *Henry Guzman, Environmental Management Directorate* |
| Quito | *WCS Ecuador (Calle Paris y Av. De los Granados) / 5 km/ taxi* | *Sebastián Valdivieso, Director WCS*  *Galo Zapata, Scientific Director WCS*  *Esteban Suárez, Consultor USFQ (Visita oficinas WCS)* |
| Quito | *Oficinas del INABIO Ecuador (Pasaje Rumipamba N. 341 y Av. de los Shyris, Parque La Carolina) / 3 km / taxi* | *Francisco Prieto, National Biodiversity Directorate (2014-2016)* |
| Quito | *Oficinas del FIAS* | *Santiago Silva, National Biodiversity Directorate (2016-2018)* |
| Quito | *Oficinas de la Unidad de Gestión del Proyecto (Edificio Alisal de Orellana, Av. Orellana y Av. 6 de diciembre)* | *Karina Ron, Component 3 Coordinator*  *Víctor Utreras, Project Coordinator*  *Diana Cabrera, Monitoring Technician*  *Diego Quishpe, Monitoring Technician (2015-2017)*  *Jorge Campaña, GAD Relationships Technician (2015-2017)*  *Hernán Vargas, Representative - Grupo de Trabajo del Cóndor Andino.* |
| Ibarra (Imbabura) | *Oficinas de Dirección Provincial de Ambiente – Imbabura / 118 km / vehículo del proyecto* | *Marcelo Pantoja, Wildlife Unit Responsible of the Provincial Environment Directorate of Imbabura (MAE).*  *Damián Ponce, Responsible of El Ángel Ecological Reserve and Wildlife Unit Responsible of the Provincial Environment Directorate of Carchi (MAE)*  *Bolivar Leverone, Responsible of El Pambilar Wildlife Refuge* |
| Ibarra (Imbabura) | *GAD provincial Imbabura (Ibarra) / 2km desde DP / vehículo del proyecto* | *Ing. Dora Cuamacás, Head of Natural Heritage of the provincial GAD of Imbabura.* |
| Ibarra (Imbabura) | *GAD parroquial Angochagua / 18 km desde Ibarra / vehículo del proyecto* | *Dr. Hernán Sandoval, President of Decentralized Autonomous (local) Government of Angochagua parish (GADs for its acronym in Spanish).*  *Ing. Jesús Goveo, Technician of Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG for its acronym in Spanish) of Imbabura.*  *Blgo. Andrés Laguna, Technician of GAD of Angochagua and Director of Foundation Big Mammals Conservation.*  *Sra. Mayra Perugachi, President of the interest group and President of the Sectorial Farmers Council of Imbabura province.* |
| Cuyuja (Napo) | *GAD parroquial Cuyuja / 85 km / vehículo del proyecto* | *Fausto Manitio, President of GAD of Cuyuja parish.*  *Dr. William Guerrero, Responsible of the Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG) of Baeza.*  *TBD, Producer and representative of the beneficiaries of this initiative.* |
| Pintag (Pichincha) | *Reserva Ecológica Antisana office / 60 km desde Cuyuja / vehículo del proyecto* | *Patricio Taco, Responsible of Antisana Ecological Reserve / Augusto Granda, park ranger of Antisana Ecological Reserve.* |
| Machala (El Oro) | *GAD provincial El Oro / 534 km / vía aérea* | *Darwin González, Ambiental Management Directorate of provincial GAD El Oro*  *TBD, Producer and representative of the beneficiaries* |
| Loja (Loja) | *Oficinas de Dirección Provincial de Ambiente – Loja / 685 km / vía aérea* | *Wladimir Placencia, Provincial Environment Directorate of Loja (MAE).*  *Silvio Cabrera, Natural Heritage Coordinator of Provincial Environment Directorate of Azuay (MAE) vía skype.*  *Fernando Juela, Wildlife Unit Responsible of Provincial Environment Directorate of Azuay (MAE), vía skype.* |
| Malacatos (Loja) | *GAD parroquial Malacatos / 33 km desde ciudad de Loja / vía terrestre* | *Lcda. Sandra Rodriguez, President of GAD of Malacatos parish / Sr. Edgar Ochoa, President of San Felipe Agricultural Production Association (ASAPROSANFE), and representative of the beneficiaries of this initiative.* |

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see  [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:). And a total/averaged rating obtained from the ratings of the following table must be presented for the project.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation Ratings: | | | |
| 1. Monitoring and Evaluation | *rating* | 2. IA& EA Execution | *rating* |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of UNDP Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Implementation / Execution |  |
| 3. Assessment of Outcomes | rating | 4. Sustainability | rating |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental: |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing (mill. US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * In-kind support |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender[[72]](#footnote-72).

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[73]](#footnote-73)

The project expect to answer, at least, the following questions:

* Is the Ministry of Environment incorporating the criteria of landscape management into its new projects?
* What is the level of ownership of the project results by the Ministry of Environment and the different stakeholders involved?
* What has been the impact of the campaign against Wildlife trafficking in the awareness of citizens and in the involvement of different actors?

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Ecuador and the Project Unit. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator, as per requirement of the Project and the Ministry of Environment. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

The Evaluator will be responsible for all logistics arrangements that his/her field visit could imply (assignment, including daily fee, per diem and travel costs). In addition, he/she will present all documents including main report and annexes in Spanish first, once they are approved, the Evaluator will translate them and present them in English.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *45* days according to the following plan, the time that the reference group, composed by the project´s Steering Committee members, takes to review the reports/findings and other documentation is not taken into account in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Activity | Timing | Completion Date\* |
| Contract signing |  | *October 15th, 2018* |
| Preparation | *05* business days | *October 22th, 2018* |
| Evaluation Mission | *15* business days | *November 23th, 2018* |
| Draft Evaluation Report | *15* businessdays | *December 28th, 2019* |
| Final Report | *10* businessdays | *January 25th, 2019* |

\*These are tentative dates. MAE and UNDP will send comments on deliverables within 8 business days, once its reception.

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| Inception Report | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method, in Spanish | No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to reference group, composed by the Project´s Steering Committee members. |
| Presentation | Initial Findings, in Spanish | End of evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to reference group. |
| Draft Final Report | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes in Spanish | Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission. | Evaluator submits to reference group. Also, to be reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFP, others |
| Final Report\* and Management Responses | Revised report in Spanish | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft. | Evaluator submits to reference group for revision and approval. |
| Final Report and Management Responses\* | Revised report in English | Within 10 days of approval of report in Spanish version. | Evaluator submits to reference group for final approval and prior to for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

Team Composition

The evaluation team will be composed of *(1 international evaluator).* The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Evaluator must present the following qualifications:

• University degree in environmental sciences, economics, administration or other related fields.

• Minimum ten (10) years of relevant professional experience evaluating development and/or biodiversity projects.

• Experience in evaluation of at least three (3) wildlife projects.

• Knowledge of UNDP and GEF Principles and Projects.

• Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;

• Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system and GEF projects will be considered an asset.

• Fluency in reading, speaking and writing Spanish will be necessary.

• Excellent English and Spanish communication skills.

• Knowledge in the basic computer programs, such as Microsoft Office.

Evaluator Ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines)

Payment modalities and specifications

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| % | Milestone |
| *40%* | Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report. |
| *60%* | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report. |

EVALUATION CRITERIA \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Technical proposals (P11 and technical offer) will weight a maximum of 70% and only the consultants that meet the technical phase with a minimum score of 49/70 or more, will continue to the review of economic proposal, which will weight a maximum of 30%.

The evaluation criteria are the following:

| *Rating parameter* | *Criteria* | *Score* | *Percentage* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CV | *Knowledge:* | | *30%* |
| University degree in environmental sciences, economics, administration or other related fields. | *10* |
| Knowledge of UNDP and GEF Principles and Projects | *5* |
| Fluency in reading, speaking and writing Spanish will be necessary.  Excellent English and Spanish communication skills | *10* |
| *General experience:* | |
| Minimum ten (10) years of relevant professional experience evaluating development and/or biodiversity projects. | *15* |
| Previous experience with results‐based monitoring and evaluation methodologies | *10* |
| *Specific experience:* | |
| Experience in evaluation of at least three (3) wildlife projects. | *40* |
| Project evaluation experiences within United Nations system and GEF projects will be considered an asset. | *10* |
| TOTAL: | *100* |
| Technical Proposal | *Methodology, agenda and implementation schedule:* | |  |
| How much the offeror understands the nature of the work and conforms to the Terms of Reference? | *25* | *40%* |
| Does the offeror’s portfolio demonstrate experience in the development and elaboration of products similar to those described in the ToRs? | *25* |
| Is the methodology, established to achieve the products defined for the consultancy, described in depth? | *20* |
| Is the methodology adequate to achieve the products defined for the consultancy? | *15* |
| Has a clear presentation been made? Is the sequence of activities and their planning logical and realistic? Does it lead to an efficient implementation of the consulting objective? | *15* |
| TOTAL: | *100* |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Economic proposal* | *Score* | *Percentage* |
| The highest score (30%) will be awarded to the most economical offer and the inverse proportional to the other offers.  Only the technical proposal that meet the technical phase with a minimum score of 49/70 or more, will continue to the review of economic proposal, which will weight a maximum of 30%. | 100 | 30% |

## Annex 2. Itinerary (Spanish)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Actividad | Fechas | Producto final |
| * Fase de preparación   + Reunión con comité directivo | 19-30 noviembre  29 nov | Informe de preparación (30 Noviembre) |
| * Levantamiento de datos   + Revisión de documentos   + Entrevistas en Quito   + Visita Cuyuja, Antisana   + Visita Imbabura   + Visita El Oro   + Vista Loja * Desarrollo de hallazgos iniciales | 26 nov -21 dic  26 -30 nov  3, 4 dic  5 dic  6 dic  10-11 dic  12 dic  13-14 dic | Hallazgos Iniciales (14 diciembre) |
| * Elaboración de informe borrador   + Procesamiento de datos   + Redacción de informe borrador | 17 diciembre-22 enero  17 dic - 4 ene  7 - 22 ene | Informe final en versión borrador (22 enero) |
| * Elaboración de Informe final:   + Recepción de comentarios sobre el informe borrador   + Edición de informe | 1-15 febrero  1 feb  1-15 feb | Informe final en versión definitiva (15 febrero) |
| Elaboración del informe final en inglés:   * Traducción |  | Una semana después de aceptar informe en español |

## Annex 3. List of interviewed persons during this evaluation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Ana Maria Nuñez | UNDP | Oficial de Programa de Ambiente y Energía |
| Nuno Queiros | UNDP | Representante Residente a.i. |
| Mónica Andrade | UNDP | Responsable del Área de Ambiente y Energía |
| Alexandra Fisher | UNDP | Regional Tecnical Advisor |
| Gabriel Jaramillo | UNDP | Anterior Responsable del Área de Ambiente y Energía |
| Víctor Utreras | Management Unit | Coordinador |
| Karina Ron | Management Unit | Coordinadora componente 3 |
| Gorki Ríos | Management Unit | Técnico de vida silvestre |
| Jose Miguel Molina | Management Unit | Técnico agropecuario |
| Diana Cabrera | Management Unit | Técnica de Seguimiento y Monitoreo |
| Nathalie Avila | Management Unit | Administradora |
| Paola Guijarro | Management Unit | Comunicadora |
| David Veintimilla | MAE DNB | Director |
| Alfredo López | MAE | Subsecretario Capital Natural |
| Esteban Falconí | MAE | Asesor legal de despacho ministerial |
| Adriana Matamoros | MAE DNB | Punto Focal Operativo del GEF |
| Janeth Olmedo | MAE DNB | Unidad de Vida Silvestre |
| Gabriela Montoya | MAE DNB | Unidad de Vida Silvestre |
| Pablo Drouet | MAE DNB | Programa Apoyo al SNAP |
| Marcela Torres | MAE DNB | Unidad de Áreas Protegidas |
| Luisa Machada | MAE Antisana | Especialista |
| Augusto Granda | MAE Antisana | Guardeparque |
| Marcelo Pantoja | MAE Imbabura | Especialista Vida Silvestre |
| Damián Ponce | MAE El Ángel | Jefe de Área |
| Bolivar Leverone | MAE Pambilar | Jefe de Área |
| Silvio Cabrera | MAE Azuay | Responsable Patrimonio Natural |
| Wladimir Placencia | MAE Loja | Director Provincial |
| Sebastián Valdivieso | WCS | Director Ejecutivo |
| Galo Zapata, | WCS | Director Científico |
| Esteban Suárez | USFQ | (Consultor por WCS) |
| Santiago Kingman | Socio Bosque | Gerente de Programa |
| Francisco Prieto | INABIO | Subdirector (ex Director DNB) |
| Santiago Silva | FIAS | Áreas protegidas y Vida Silvestre (ex-Director DNB) |
| Juan Carlos González | PROAmazonía | Gerente de Programa |
| Rómulo García | MAG Napo | Técnico |
| Jaime Enrique Aymara | MAG Imbabura | Técnico |
| Braulio Pilataxi | MAG Imbabura | Técnico |
| Rosa Elena Salagaje | Cuyuja | Productora |
| Mayra Perugachi | Zuleta | Productora, Presidenta del grupo de interés Angochagua |
| Juan Toala | La Tembladera | Productor |
| Rodrigo | La Tembladera | Productor |
| Edgar Ochoa | Malacatos | Productor, Presidente de Asociación San Felipe |
| Henry Guzmán | CONGOPE | Director de Gestión Ambiental |
| Piedad Manitio | GAD Cuyuja | Vice presidente |
| Dora Cuamacás | GAD Imbabura | Técnica de Gestión Ambiental |
| Hernán Sandoval | GAD Angochagua | Presidente |
| Darwin González | GAD El Oro | Coordinador de Secretaría de Gestión Ambiental |
| Alexandra Chigoe | GAD El Oro | Técnico de manejo y conservación ambiental |
| Sandra Rodriguez | GAD Malacatos | Presidente |
| Maria Augusta Ojeda | GAD Malacatos | Administración |
| Danner Arévalo | GAD Malacatos | Técnico de producción |

## Annex 4. Summary of evaluation meetings and field visits (Spanish)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Jueves 29 de noviembre de 2018 | Quito |
| Reunión de inicio con el grupo de referencia para la evaluación: David Veintimilla, Sebastián Valdivieso (Pablo Viteri en representación de WCS), Henry Guzmán, Ana María Núñez, Víctor Utreras (4to piso). | Presentación de enfoque, metodología y cronograma propuesto para la evaluación. Retroalimentación por parte del grupo de referencia |
| Lunes 03 de diciembre de 2018 | Quito |
| Reunión de inicio con Nuno Queiros, Mónica Andrade, Ana María Núñez y Víctor Utreras (PNUD=. | Presentación general de objetivos y enfoque de evaluación. Retroalimentación de representatne residente |
| Ana Maria Nuñez (PNUD) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Alexandra Fischer (PNUD) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Reunión con Unidad de Gestión del Proyecto: Víctor Utreras, Karina Ron, Diana Cabrera, Diego Quishpe, Gorki Ríos, Jose Miguel Molina, Paola Guijarro | Reunion grupal para entender la historia de implementación del proyecto, el rol de las diferentes personas, la coordinación interna y externa |
| Martes 04 de diciembre de 2018 | Quito |
| Alfredo López (MAE) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Esteban Falconí, Adriana Matamoros, Janeth Olmedo, Gabriela Montoya, Marcela Torres, Pablo Drouet (MAE) | Reunión grupal para analizar el rol de MAE y sus diferentes direcciones, su colaboración con otras organizaciones socias y el alineamiento del proyecto con políticas, prioridades y planes de la autoridad nacional |
| Santiago Kingman (Programa Socio Bosque) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Henry Guzman (CONGOPE) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Sebastián Valdivieso, Galo Zapata (WCS) Esteban Suárez (USFQ) | Reunión grupal para entender rol y colaboración de WCS con proyecto, análisis del desempeño de la ejecución de las actividades bajo su responsabilidad y apoyo USFQ |
| Francisco Prieto (INABIO) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Miércoles 05 de diciembre de 2018 | Cuyuja - baeza - antisana |
| Piedad Manitio (GAD Cuyuja) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Rómulo García (MAG Napo) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Rosa Elena Salagaje (Productora Cuyuja) | Visita a finca de la señora Salagaje, en compañía de la vice presidenta de la GAD Parroquial (Sra Manitio). Observación de un invernadero para verduras y frutas, construido con apoyo del proyecto y del GAD. Entrevista de evaluación a la Sra. Salagaje |
| Luisa Machada, Augusto Granda (MAE Antisana) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Jueves 06 de diciembre de 2018 | Imbabura |
| Marcelo Pantoja (MAE Imbabura) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Damián Ponce (MAE Carchi) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Dora Cuamacás (GAD Imbabura) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Hernán Sandoval (GAD Angochagua) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Mayra Perugachi (Productora Zuleta) | Visita a predio de la Sra Perugachi. Observación de medidas para el mejoramiento del manejo ganadero con la finalidad de reducir conflicto humano-vida silvestre. Entrevista de evaluación a la Sra Perugachi |
| Jaime Enrique Aymara, Braulio Pilataxi (MAG Imbabura) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Lunes 10 de diciembre de 2018 | Machala-la tembladera |
| Darwin González/Alexandra Chigoe (GAD El Oro) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Juan Toala, Rodrigo (La Tembladera) | Visita al Humedal la Tembladera en compañia de la Sera Chigoe. Observación de manejo del Humedal, piscicultura y producción de abonos, Entrevistas a los dos socios de la asociación. |
| Martes 11 de diciembre de 2018 | Quito |
| Silvio Cabrera (MAE Azuay) | Entrevista de evaluación (teléfono) |
| Nathalie Avila (Unidad de Gestión) | Entrevista de evaluación (aspectos administrativos) |
| Santiago Silva (FIAS) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Miércoles 12 de diciembre de 2018 | Loja, Malacatos |
| Sandra Rodriguez, Maria Augusta Ojeda, Danner Arévalo (GAD Malacatos) | Reunión grupal para entender el historia de colaboración del GAD con el proyecto y analizar su apoyo a las actividades, inclusión de visión de paisaje y sostenibilidad. |
| Edgar Ochoa (Productor Malacatos) | Visita de campo en compañía del Sr Arévalo. Observación de criadero de cobayos. Entrevista de evaluación al Sr. Ochoa |
| Wladimir Placencia (MAE Loja) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Miércoles 13 de diciembre de 2018 | Quito |
| Bolivar Leverone (MAE Pambilar) | Entrevista de evaluación |
| Miércoles 14 de diciembre de 2018 | Quito |
| Gabriel Jaramillo (PNUD) | Entrevista de evaluación (parcial, concentrando en diseño e implementación inicial) |
| Juan Carlos González (PROAmazonía) | Entrevista de evaluación (parcial, concentrando en colaboración del proyecto con PROAmazonía) |

## Annex 5. Consulted documentation[[74]](#footnote-74)

Fundamental project documents

Project Identification Form (PIF)

Proyecto Docuemnt (PRODOC) and annexes

Request for CEO endorsement

Scientific and technical advisory panel review

GEF secretariat review

Carta de acuerdo entre el PNUD y el Ministerio del Ambiente del Ecuador para la provisión de servicios de apoyo a la implementación del Proyecto

Acuerdo de cooperación relativo a un proyecto entre PNUD y WCS

Dictamen de prioridad Proyecto “Desarrollo ... extinción mundial”

Delegación técnica para el Proyecto GEF/PNUD/MAE “Desarrollo .... mundial” al coordinador

Adenda al acuerdo de colaboración del Proyecto “Desarrollo ... mundial” entre PNUD y WCS

Carta MAE - PNUD Solicitud de Socio Implementador (WCS) Proyecto Vida Silvestre

Project Management Documents

Annual Operative Plans 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018

PIR and annexes 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018

Actas del Comité Directivo

Informe de evaluación de Medio Término

Document "cambio de indicadores PPVS"

Exit Strategy (draft, January 2019)

Audit Reports

Microevaluación WCS

Declaraciones de contraparte MAE, EcoFondo, PASNAP, Programa Socio Bosque, WCS, PNUD, GAD Imbabura, GAD Sisgipamba, GAD Mariano Acosta

Tabla de contraparte total, elaborado por la Unidad de Gestión del proyecto

Combined Delivery Report 2015, 2016, 2017. 2018

Project Outputs

Lineamientos ambientales para la gestión descentralizada de la vida silvestre en el Ecuador.

Modelo de Gestión para la Conservación in situ y ex situ de la vida silvestre en el Ecuador

Desarrollo de la Estrategia de Sostenibilidad Financiera para la gestión de la vida silvestre mediante

Evaluación del impacto socioeconómico ambiental de dieciocho iniciativas productivas agropecuarias sostenibles y de alternativas de proteína implementadas en el marco del Proyecto Paisajes

Protocolo para el censo y monitoreo de la Bandurria Carinegra, Caimanes , Cóndor andino , Manatí amazónico , Paiche, Primates, Guacamayo verde

Protocolo para el manejo de datos

Protocolo para el muestreo de fauna silvestre a escala de paisaje, utilizando trampas fotográficas y conteo de huellas

Planes de Acción Cóndor y Pecarí de labio blanco

## Annex 6. Inception report, including final evaluation questions

INFORME DE PREPARACIÓN

Evaluación Final del Proyecto

“Desarrollo de Enfoques de Manejo de Paisajes en el Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas del Ecuador para mejorar la Conservación de la Vida Silvestre en Peligro de Extinción Mundial”

(UNDP PIMS 4831, GEF ID 4731)

Robert Hofstede

Noviembre 2018

1. Introducción

1. Este documento presenta el informe de preparación para la evaluación final del proyecto PNUD/GEF "Desarrollo de Enfoques de Manejo de Paisajes en el Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas del Ecuador para mejorar la Conservación de la Vida Silvestre en Peligro de Extinción Mundial" (en adelante "Proyecto Paisajes"). Contiene una revisión del contexto actual del proyecto y de las conclusiones y recomendaciones de la evaluación de medio término (EMT). También presenta un borrador de teoría de cambio reconstruida, y con base a estos elementos y conversaciones con actores principales del proyecto, se desarrollaron las preguntas exactas de evaluación, la metodología para responderlas y una propuesta de plan de trabajo para las próximas fases de la evaluación.
2. De acuerdo a los [lineamientos de PNUD para la evaluación de proyectos financiados por GEF](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf), y a los Términos de Referencia (TdR) para esta tarea, la evaluación final es ejecutada cerca a la finalización del proyecto con el objetivo de determinar el logro de sus resultados y de extraer lecciones que puedan mejorar la sostenibilidad de los beneficios de este proyecto y ayudar en el progreso general de la programación de PNUD. La evaluación analizará la implementación y desempeño del proyecto, identificando el impacto potencial y la sostenibilidad de los resultados. Esto incluye la contribución a la conservación de la vida silvestre y la contribución a las metas ambientales globales y específicas del país. La evaluación del desempeño del proyecto se ejecutará con los principales actores del proyecto: El Ministerio de Ambiente del Ecuador (MAE), el Consorcio de Gobiernos Autónomos Provinciales del Ecuador (CONGOPE), *Wildlife Conservation Society* (WCS), Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad (INABIO), Fondo de Inversión Ambiental Sustentable (FIAS), y los Gobiernos Autónomos Descentralizados (GAD) de las provincias y parroquias de las áreas de intervención del proyecto.
3. El Proyecto Paisajes es una aproximación innovadora del país al tema de conservación de vida silvestre. Es la primera vez en Latinoamérica que se desarrolla un proyecto GEF enfocado a la gestión integral de vida silvestre, y es la primera vez que se aplica una visión de paisaje en la gestión del Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas (SNAP). El objetivo de este proyecto es lograr que el sistema de AP del Ecuador aplique enfoques de paisaje para aumentar su efectividad en la conservación de la vida silvestre de importancia mundial. Esto le permitirá mantener la conectividad de los hábitats en áreas lo suficientemente grandes, así como también mantener diferentes tipos de hábitat para la dispersión de fauna clave con el fin de reducir la presión de la caza y la recolección ilegal de la vida silvestre en los corredores de conectividad.
4. Para lograr el objetivo se trabajará en dos niveles, dentro de dos componentes estrechamente integrados e interdependientes, de manera que la acción coordinada necesaria para adoptar este cambio pueda ser dirigida desde el interior de las instancias e instituciones apropiadas y se entregue un conjunto de productos relacionados entre sí que cumplan colectivamente este desafío. Cada uno de estos componentes tiene un resultado deseado, y una serie de productos. Componente 1 - Resultado 1: Las AP contribuyen eficazmente a la conservación de la fauna silvestre amenazada. Producto 1.1: Marco de manejo adaptativo para guiar la implementación rentable de la conservación de vida silvestre. Producto 1.2: Emplazamiento de las acciones específicas de conservación de la vida silvestre en las áreas protegidas, Producto 1.3: Los esquemas de gestión basados en la comunidad reducen las presiones de la caza de subsistencia en 3 áreas protegidas. Componente 2 - Resultado 2: Conservación de la vida silvestre en el paisaje Sistema de aplicación de la ley reforzado para combatir la caza ilegal, Producto 2.2 Planificación y normas de uso del suelo para proteger hábitats vulnerables. Producto 2.3. Conectividad funcional en las áreas que se encuentran entre las AP focales.
5. El proyecto genera beneficios ambientales globales porque busca la conservación de vida silvestre emblemática y vulnerable, mediante una visión de paisaje en la gestión de sistemas de áreas protegidas. De esta manera, el proyecto ayuda a aumentar la cobertura de los ecosistemas amenazados y las especies amenazadas, que es un indicador para el objetivo estratégico GEF BD1 "Mejorar la sostenibilidad de los sistemas de áreas protegidas". El proyecto también contribuye a la consecución de resultados del Programa de País del PNUD, en particular "La reforma institucional y la mejora de la capacidad de las autoridades para priorizar e incorporar en el Plan Nacional de Desarrollo temas en materia de conservación, de acceso y uso sostenible de la biodiversidad y de planificación del ambiente"

2. Contexto del Proyecto

1. A pesar de su tamaño relativamente pequeño, Ecuador es considerado como uno de los diecisiete países "megadiversos" del mundo. Sus cuatro regiones geográficas principales (las Islas Galápagos, la Costa, los Andes y la selva amazónica) están sujetas a numerosos sistemas climáticos, dando lugar a zonas de topografía, clima y vegetación diversos, como los manglares y las marismas de la costa tropical, los valles interandinos exuberantes, y las áreas de los Andes o páramos alpinos. Como resultado de estas condiciones ecológicas y climáticas, combinadas con factores paleogeográficos, posee una enorme riqueza de especies y el segundo nivel más alto de endemismo en el mundo.
2. Ecuador ha invertido significativamente en el establecimiento de áreas protegidas, las cuales representan actualmente cerca del 20% de la superficie terrestre del país. El Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas (SNAP) del Ecuador incorpora cuatro subsistemas (i) el Patrimonio de Áreas Naturales del Estado (PANE), (ii) las Áreas Protegidas Privadas (APPRI), (iii) las Áreas Protegidas Comunitarias, Indígenas y Afroecuatorianas (APC), y (iv) las Áreas Protegidas del Gobierno Regional (APG). Las categorías de AP incluidas en el PANE tienen restricciones y los usos permitidos en las diferentes categorías de áreas protegidas no están claramente definidos en la legislación ecuatoriana. El Texto Unificado de Legislación Ambiental Secundaria (TULAS) de 2003 contiene disposiciones generales para los tipos de actividades permitidas en las áreas protegidas, pero no hace distinción específica entre las diferentes categorías de AP en cuanto a su gestión y su relación con los objetivos de conservación de vida silvestre. Las áreas protegidas PANE se establecen en tierras públicas y la mayoría están habitadas por una gran variedad de comunidades locales e indígenas. Estas comunidades por lo general se dedican a actividades de subsistencia y de producción a pequeña escala. La Constitución (2008) reconoce los derechos de estas poblaciones a utilizar los recursos naturales dentro de sus territorios y la Estrategia Nacional de Biodiversidad propone acciones que sean coherentes con los medios de subsistencia de las comunidades locales.
3. El Gobierno de Ecuador creó el Programa Socio Bosque, implementado por el MAE desde septiembre de 2008. El programa ofrece incentivos a los agricultores y las comunidades indígenas que se comprometen a proteger sus bosques nativos, páramos y otros tipos de vegetación; se da prioridad a las zonas con riesgo de deforestación, de alto valor de los servicios ambientales y de altos niveles de pobreza. A finales de 2012, Socio Bosque tenía un total de 2,002 contratos vigentes con los propietarios de tierras, incluyendo alrededor de 123,431 personas de 34,973 familias, y que cubren un total de 1,116,215 hectáreas de bosque nativo, páramos y otros tipos de vegetación. Es un complemento *de facto* al SNAP. El programa se centra en mantener la cubierta forestal y también incluye los procesos participativos de zonificación que definen las zonas habilitadas para la conservación, la caza, la pesca, la recolección, la residencia y el cultivo.
4. La diversidad faunística del Ecuador es particularmente rica. Sin embargo, la fauna ecuatoriana se encuentra cada vez más bajo presión. Las principales causas son la pérdida del hábitat por conversión a pastizales y a cultivos, la caza y la sobreexplotación de esta fauna, entre otras. Estas amenazas están vinculadas a procesos como la explotación del petróleo, el crecimiento demográfico y la migración, la explotación forestal y el avance del límite agrícola relacionado a mejor accesibilidad. Aparte de las amenazas relacionadas a la fragmentación y pérdida de hábitat, hay una serie de amenazas directas que enfrenta la vida silvestre en las áreas naturales. Son diferentes factores que se ven agravados por razones demográficas y económicas. Se destaca principalmente la caza de subsistencia, la caza silvestre (o carne de monte), la Caza comercial y captura, la caza deportiva, la cacería no sustentable, el Tráfico de especies de fauna silvestre, la matanza de fauna silvestre por conflictos entre humanos y la fauna silvestre (HWC, por sus siglas en inglés), la destrucción y fragmentación de hábitats por desmonte para la agricultura y ganadería.
5. La principal barrera para garantizar la protección eficaz de muchas especies y poblaciones de fauna silvestre autóctona, es la falta de capacidades adecuadas; conocimiento y sistemas que permitan a las AP funcionar eficazmente en la conservación de la vida silvestre de importancia mundial. A pesar de que las AP brindan protección a los hábitats a un nivel macro, la falta de una visión integral de paisaje, su ubicación y sus regímenes de gestión actuales forman una barrera para una conservación adecuada. Algunas especies de las categorías crítico (CR), amenazado (EN) y vulnerable (VU) son particularmente exigentes en términos de tamaño de espacios, de distancias de dispersión y de conectividad del hábitat. Esto aumenta la probabilidad de que entren en conflicto con los humanos y los hace altamente dependientes de la manera en cómo los paisajes circundantes y adyacentes a estas AP se gestionan.
6. Para superar estas barreras y brindar una solución a largo plazo a las amenazas a la vida silvestre, se requiere de un cambio de paradigma que vaya, desde los enfoques actuales de gestión de las AP basados en el sitio para la gestión de las AP, y a la adopción de un enfoque de paisaje más amplio. Este nuevo tipo de gestión debe basarse en información actualizada acerca de los requerimientos de la vida silvestre. Debe ser complementada con mejoras en el hábitat e incluir los habitantes de las áreas productivas para poner en valor la conectividad de los paisajes productivos que los rodean y separan.
7. Otra barrera para aplicar una visión de paisaje en la gestión de áreas protegidas en el territorio, son las débiles condiciones de gobernanza y planes de desarrollo deficientes en los paisajes circundantes a las AP. Esto se debe resolver mediante el apoyo a gobiernos locales e integrar conceptos de paisajes y conservación de vida silvestre en sus planes de desarrollo territorial y con la coordinación interinstitucional y entre escalas.
8. Otras barreras están relacionadas a las comunidades que rodean las áreas naturales y que interactúan con la vida silvestre: de un lado, hay poco control de la caza furtiva y comercial, no hay soluciones para los conflictos humano-vida silvestre y faltan alternativas productivas y alimenticias para las comunidades. Por esto, para volverse sostenible y eficaz, una solución tiene que ir acompañada de esfuerzos para reducir la caza y el comercio ilegal de vida silvestre; involucrar la participación activa de las comunidades locales en colaboración con las instituciones públicas fortalecidas (a niveles central y descentralizado), y brindar alternativas para seguridad económica y alimenticia.
9. La institucionalidad ambiental en Ecuador es liderada por el Ministerio del Ambiente (MAE). La Subsecretaría de Patrimonio Natural es la que está más directamente relacionada con el presente proyecto. Esta subsecretaría integra a la Dirección Nacional de Biodiversidad, que a su vez incluye a la Unidad de Áreas Protegidas, a la Unidad de Vida Silvestre y a la Unidad de Ecosistemas Frágiles; y a la Dirección Nacional Forestal. El MAE también implementa el programa Socio Bosque. Por ser punto focal técnico de GEF, avala y generalmente funciona como agencia de ejecución de proyectos GEF.
10. Entre las otras agencias gubernamentales nacionales relevantes para el proyecto se encuentra la Secretaría Nacional de Planificación y Desarrollo (SENPLADES), debido al enfoque de paisaje del proyecto porque es responsable de la coordinación del Sistema Nacional Descentralizado de Planificación Participativa, el cual promueve el desarrollo integral del país, la desconcentración y la descentralización, así como el establecimiento de planes, programas y proyectos de reforma institucional, territorial, la ordenación del territorio, la inversión pública y la planificación. El Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería, Acuacultura y Pesca (MAGAP) es la institución rectora multisectorial, para regular, normar, facilitar, controlar, y evaluar la gestión de la producción agrícola, ganadera, acuícola y pesquera del país. Es relevante para el presente proyecto ya que algunas de las amenazas que afectan a la vida silvestre y a su hábitat se originan en los sectores de la producción que atañen al MAGAP.
11. Los Gobiernos Autónomos Descentralizados (GAD) tienen la función de determinar la organización y el uso de la tierra a nivel local, como un elemento determinante de los planes de uso del suelo. Los GAD a nivel provincial y municipal son responsables de la generación de los planes de desarrollo y uso de la tierra, de la gestión ambiental, de la declaración de áreas protegidas provinciales y municipales, de la formulación de las normas ambientales locales y de la ejecución de proyectos de gestión sostenible de los recursos naturales.
12. El artículo 167 del TULAS prevé la creación de Comités de Gestión en todas las áreas protegidas, con el objetivo de promover la participación voluntaria de entidades públicas y privadas con intereses o responsabilidades relacionados con las AP (incluyendo implícitamente la gestión sostenible de la fauna silvestre dentro de sus límites).
13. Las Organizaciones No-Gubernamentales (ONG) ambientales tienen un rol importante en la gestión ambiental en el Ecuador. Ellas apoyan tanto al gobierno nacional, como a los subnacionales y a las comunidades con estudios, apoyo técnico, comunicación social, educación ambiental y programas de conservación directa (manejo de sitios, protección de especies). *Wildlife Conservation Society* es una de ellas, con experiencia específica en gestión de la vida silvestre a nivel global. WCS Ecuador, presente en Ecuador desde el 2001, participa como agencia responsable para la ejecución de varias actividades en el Proyecto Paisajes.
14. Durante la ejecución del proyecto, el contexto sufrió varios cambios, principalmente relacionados al nivel institucional y económico. El principal cambio ha sido la recesión económica desde el 2015, relacionada los con bajos precios de petróleo. Esto ha generado una disminución del presupuesto fiscal causando, entre otros, disminución de presupuesto del MAE y una falta de liquidez del programa SocioBosque que dejó de incorporar nuevas áreas. A nivel institucional ha habido un cambio en administración a todo nivel. Esto resultó en un cambio de autoridades, direcciones estratégicas e inclusive nombres. Entre otros, el Ministerio de Ambiente recientemente fue reestructurado, en vista de una posible fusión con la Secretaría de Agua. También, se formó el Fondo de Inversión Ambiental Sostenible como nueva entidad de manejo de fondos para temas ambientales. El gobierno actual decidió desarrollar el Código Orgánico Ambiental (COA) como nueva Ley Macro para temas ambientales reemplazando, entre otros, el TULAS. El cambio en los gobiernos locales generó un desfase del proyecto con el desarrollo de los planes de desarrollo de los gobiernos. Otro cambio que generó nuevas oportunidades es el inicio del Programa Integral Amazónico de Conservación de Bosques y Producción Sostenible (PROAmazonía), ejecutado por el MAE y MAGAP, financiado por el Fondo Verde del Clima y GEF e implementado por PNUD.

4. Teoría de Cambio

1. Basado en el documento del proyecto, el evaluador reconstruyó una teoría de cambio (TdC) que implícitamente sostiene el proyecto (Figura 1). Esta reconstrucción fue hecha usando el enfoque de la Oficina de Evaluación del GEF para la identificación de la probabilidad de impacto basado sobre los conceptos de Teoría de Cambio/cadenas causales/caminos de impacto. Para ello, el evaluador identificó las metas finales del proyecto (objetivo, indicadores de impacto), revisó el marco de resultados (actividades, productos, resultados, objetivos y sus indicadores y supuestos mencionados) y con base en esto, diseñó los caminos de impacto en una forma lógica. Esto permite entender la lógica de cada relación causal y especialmente, identificar supuestos complementarios.
2. El TdC muestra como los diferentes elementos del diseño del Proyecto Paisajes están interconectados de forma lógica para lograr resultados e impacto. En cada paso hay unos supuestos, que complementan la lógica de "si se da A, y suponiendo que pasa B, se genera C"[[75]](#footnote-75). Así, empezando con los insumos (cuadro gris) y las actividades planificadas (cuadros amarillos) se generan los productos (cuadros azules) siempre y cuando se cumplen los supuestos mencionados (cuadros blancos). Así mismo, sigue la cadena de impacto de productos hacía resultados e impacto. Los resultados están distribuidos entre resultados directos, que son los cambios generados como efecto directo por el uso adecuado de los productos, y los resultados finales, que son resultados secundarios cuyo logro requiere de otros resultados (los resultados directos). El impacto es definido como un cambio notable en el estado de un objeto de conservación (especies, ecosistema, recurso). Generalmente se considera que el nivel de actividades y productos están dentro del control del proyecto, los resultados directos están dentro del ámbito de influencia del proyecto y los resultados finales y el impacto están dentro del ámbito de interés del proyecto; quiere decir que entre más avanzado esté el camino de impacto, menos control hay de las agencias de ejecución del proyecto y el logro depende más de otros factores y esfuerzos adicionales.
3. En el caso del Proyecto Paisajes, el objetivo general (“El SNAP aplica enfoques de paisaje para aumentar su efectividad para la conservación de la vida silvestre”) no es formulado como impacto en el sentido de los lineamientos PNUD-GEF[[76]](#footnote-76), pero representa varios aspectos que están representados por sus indicadores. Por este fin, se presenta este objetivo como sombrilla que incluye resultados finales e impacto. El evaluador considera que el impacto del proyecto está mejor representado por el primer indicador del objetivo (El mantenimiento o aumento de la abundancia de las especies prioritarias de vida silvestre en los paisajes). Los otros indicadores pueden ser considerados resultados finales, porque representan cambios importantes en el contexto, pero todavía no implican un cambio verdadero y medible del estado de un objeto de conservación. Por ejemplo, los indicadores O4 y O5 implican una mejoría en el entorno financiero y legal y el indicador O6 demuestra que los mismos enfoques y herramientas del proyecto están aplicados en otros corredores o áreas protegidas. Sin embargo, con el logro de estos importantes indicadores todavía no se garantiza que hay un mejor estado de especies o de ecosistemas naturales. El indicador O3 indica una menor presión sobre la fauna, pero la abundancia misma solo la indica O1. Un caso especial es el indicador O2: éste considera la cobertura de vegetación natural que está incluida en modelos de conservación (ej. Socio Bosque) en los corredores. Sin embargo, no necesariamente implica que esta vegetación está adecuadamente conservada. Falta un supuesto de que la inclusión en modelos de conservación efectivamente implica protección de la vegetación. Por esto, se incluyó un impacto adicional que explica el estado de conservación de la cobertura de vegetación natural. Este impacto a su vez, también ayuda a mejorar la abundancia de especies de vida silvestre. Así que el impacto final (abundancia de especies prioritarias) es generado por dos vías que pueden considerarse "caminos de impacto): (1) la gestión de territorio que resulta en mejor conservación de vegetación natural (tanto adentro como afuera de las áreas protegidas) y (2) por las diferentes acciones de manejo de vida silvestre (control de caza y comercio ilegal, inclusión de aspectos de manejo de fauna en planes locales). Ambos "caminos de impacto" se ejecutan en áreas protegidas (componente 1) y afuera de las áreas (componente 2).
4. Analizando los pasos lógicos del TdC, el evaluador ubicó los supuestos ya incluidos en el marco de resultados e identificó otros supuestos. Éstos están organizados por paso lógico en la Tabla 1, en donde es mencionado si el supuesto está principalmente dentro del control de las instituciones que implementan o ejecutan el proyecto (MAE, WCS, CONGOPE, PNUD) o fuera de control. Este análisis del TdC y especialmente sus supuestos, ayudan a dirigir la evaluación y detallar las preguntas de evaluación dentro de cada criterio.

*Tabla 1: Supuestos incluidos en la Teoría de Cambio del Proyecto Paisajes (los supuestos que fueron presentados en el Marco de Resultados del PRODOC están en itálicos; los otros son propuestos por el evaluador).*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Paso lógico en TdC | Supuestos (+ = bajo control de organizaciones del proyecto; - = fuera de control) |
| Insumo a Actividades | * Uso eficiente, transparente y correcto de recursos disponibles (+) * Disponibilidad de recursos humanos con buenos conocimientos y capacidades (-) * Interés continuo de colaborar entre diferentes instituciones participantes y beneficiarios (+) * Realización de cofinanciamiento (+) |
| Componente 1: Actividades a Productos | * Los estudios y herramientas generadas son de calidad (+) * La capacitación resulta en incremento de capacidades (-) * Planes y programas son consensuados por actores (-) * La sensibilización y comunicación llega efectivamente al público meta (+) * Fuentes alternativas de proteína son disponibles, factibles y aceptadas (-) * *Colaboración de comunidades beneficiadas es constante y favorable (-)* |
| Componente 2: Actividades a Productos | * Interés y colaboración (estratégica, técnica, financiera) continua de GAD y otros actores locales (-) * Procesos de normatividad y legislación activos y flexibles (+) * Sistemas de incentivos son presentes y activos (-) * Prácticas de producción son aceptadas y sostenidas (-) * Voluntad de diferentes actores para reducir conflictos fauna-humano |
| Componente 1: Productos a Resultados directos | * El marco de gestión, los planes y programas son aceptados y apoyados por las autoridades relevantes (-) * El monitoreo es implementado e informa la gestión adaptativa (+) * Se mantiene coordinación entre AP y comunidades (+) |
| Componente 2: Productos a Resultados directos | * La legislación y normativa es aplicada, incentiva y controlada (-) * Con cambio en administración en GAD se mantienen principales estrategias políticas (-) * Base social para gestión positiva de Vida Silvestre (-) |
| Resultados directos a resultados finales | * *Compromiso del MAE de dar continuidad a gestión, financiamiento, replicación y personal técnico (+)* * *Condiciones de gobernabilidad local favorables (-)* * Existencia de condiciones favorables en otras AP/corredores (-) |
| Resultados finales a impactos | * Inclusión de vegetación en áreas de conservación efectivamente asegura su protección (-) * La fauna no está afectada por otras presiones humanas o naturales que las identificadas en las estrategias del proyecto (-) * *Cambio Climático no afecta la distribución natural de especies de mayor forma (-)* |

**RESULTADOS FINALES**

* Los estudios y herramientas son de calidad
* Capacitación resulta en el incremento de capacidades
* Planes y programas son consensuados por actores
* Sensibilización y comunicación llega efectivamente al público meta
* Fuentes alternativas son disponibles, factibles y aceptadas
* Colaboración de comunidades beneficiadas es constante y favorable
* El marco de gestión, los planes y programas son aceptados y apoyados por las autoridades relevantes
* El monitoreo es implementado e informa la gestión adaptativa
* Se mantiene coordinación entre AP y comunidades

**IMPACTO**

**PRODUCTOS *(OUTPUT)***

**RESULTADOS DIRECTOS**

**ACIVIDADES**

**INSUMOS**

OBJETIVO: El Sistema de AP del Ecuador aplica enfoques de paisaje para aumentar su efectividad para la conservación de la vida silvestre de importancia mundial

1. Definición de las prioridades de conservación
2. Estrategia financiera
3. Gestión de la información y el sistema de apoyo de decisiones
4. Monitoreo a nivel de sistema
5. Definición de los usos permitidos
6. Protocolos a nivel nacional
7. Planificación para la caza de subsistencia
8. Monitoreo y Evaluación

Entorno favorable y replicación:

O4. Sostenibili-dad financiera

O5: aplicación de instrumentos normativos

O6: Aumento en el número de APs que aplican los modelos y lecciones

El aumento de cobertura de la vegetación efectivamente conservada

* Inclusión de vegetación en áreas de conservación efectivamente asegura su protección
* Fauna no está afectada por otras presiones humanas o naturales que las identificadas en la estrategia del proyecto
* Cambio Climático no afecta la distribución natural de especies de mayor forma

O1. El manteni-miento o aumento de la abundancia de las especies prioritarias de vida silvestre en los paisajes

1. Fortalecimiento de los sistemas de incentivos
2. Áreas Protegidas municipales declaradas
3. Promoción del hábitat y las opciones de conectividad de producción amigables
4. Programas para la reducción de conflictos entre humanos y fauna silvestre

* Compromiso del MAE de dar continuidad a gestión, financiamiento, replicación y personal técnico
* Condiciones de gobernabilidad local favorables
* Existencia de condiciones favorables en otras AP/corredores

1. Planes comunitarios, gobernanza y diálogo sobre la caza
2. Fuentes de proteína alternativas

O3: Reducciones en los niveles de comercio ilegal de carne de caza

O2: El aumento de la cobertura de la vegetación incluida en áreas de conservación en los corredores / zonas de amortiguamiento

1. Las APs contribuyen eficazmente a la conservación de la vida silvestre amenazada

2. La gestión de áreas no protegidas en 5 paisajes seleccionados contribuye eficazmente a la conservación de vida silvestre amenazada

1.2 Emplazamiento de la conservación de vida silvestre en Áreas Prioritarias clave

1.1 Marco de gestión adaptable para guiar la implementación rentable de conservación de la fauna

1.3 Sistemas de gestión comunitarios reducen las presiones de la caza de subsistencia en tres paisajes seleccionados

2.1 Sistema de aplicación de la ley para reducir la caza ilegal fortalecido

2.2 Normas de uso del suelo establecidas para proteger los hábitats clave en la dispersión de vida silvestre

2.3 Conectividad funcional en los paisajes importantes para la dispersión de la fauna silvestre

1. Capacitación del personal del MAE
2. Fortalecimiento de plataformas para el diálogo
3. Planes de manejo de áreas protegidas ampliadas
4. Planes de Conservación de la vida silvestre
5. Programa para la sensibilización y comunicación
6. Aclaración y coordinación de funciones y responsabilidades institucionales
7. Instituciones locales fortalecidas
8. Unidades de control de la vida silvestre
9. Identificación conjunta de hábitats claves, restricciones y programas de vigilancia
10. Inclusión de estándares y prácticas para la protección de los hábitats críticos
11. Ordenanzas Municipales sobre la caza de vida silvestre y el comercio

* Recursos Humanos
* Recursos Financieros
* Infraestructura/recursos materiales
* Sistema de gobierno del proyecto
* Colaboración inter-institucional
* Supervisión y apoyo técnico
* Planeación, reporte, monitoreo y evaluación
* Uso eficiente, transparente y correcto de los recursos disponibles
* Disponibilidad de recursos humanos con buenos conocimientos y capacidades
* Interés continuo de colaborar entre diferentes instituciones participantes y beneficiarios
* Realización de cofinanciamiento
* Interés y colaboración (estratégica, técnica, financiera) continua de GAD y otros actores locales
* Procesos de normatividad y legislación activos y flexibles
* Sistemas de incentivos presentes y activos
* Prácticas de producción son aceptadas y sostenidas
* Voluntad de diferentes actores para reducir conflictos fauna-humano
* La legislación y normativa es aplicada, incentivada y controlada
* Con cambio en la administración en GAD se mantienen las principales estrategias
* Base social para gestión positiva de Vida Silvestre

Figura 1. Teoría de Cambio reconstruido

5. Evaluación de medio término

1. Entre mayo y junio del 2017, se realizó la evaluación de medio término (EMT) de este proyecto. Esta evaluación, que se enfocó principalmente en el análisis de los indicadores, fue generalmente positiva y concluyó que el progreso en el logro de los objetivos globales y de las metas del componente 1 era satisfactorio, mientras que para el componente 2 era moderadamente satisfactorio. Una observación crítica fue que sería imposible medir el principal indicador de impacto (O1) porque no se puede determinar las tendencias de las poblaciones de las especies, menos aún su estado, ya que para esto se requiere al menos de 4 a 5 años de monitoreo. En adición, la evaluación concluye que es moderadamente improbable que existan factores de sostenibilidad financieros y socio-económicos establecidos al momento de la EMT: un principal limitante para lograr el objetivo general será lograr el aumento de los niveles y sostenibilidad de los recursos financieros para que el MAE asegure el manejo sostenible de la fauna silvestre. Aparte de una reducción del presupuesto del MAE y un problema de liquidez del Programa Socio Bosque, falta un marco de gestión adaptativa para la conservación y gestión de la vida silvestre, que se implemente e institucionalice por el MAE; y el desarrollo de un mecanismo de financiamiento para la gestión de la vida silvestre. Del otro lado, frente a la imposibilidad de incluir nuevas áreas en el Programa Socio Bosque, el proyecto ha encontrado una buena alternativa en las Áreas de Conservación y Uso Sostenible (ACUS).
2. La EMT observó que el diseño del proyecto y su implementación era bueno, aunque consideró que varios indicadores están sobredimensionados y son imposibles de medir[[77]](#footnote-77). También observó la falta de una clara visión de género. Otras observaciones críticas fueron la lenta iniciación del proyecto para los desafíos institucionales. Esto ha resultado, entre otros, que la vinculación con los GAD se hizo tarde y se perdió la oportunidad de incluir lineamientos para la conservación de vida silvestre en los planes de desarrollo y ordenamiento territorial (PDOT) de los GAD en el 2014, cuando entraron nuevas autoridades. La evaluación también concluyó que la coordinación, tanto entre las agencias que ejecutan el proyecto como entre ellos y actores locales (plataformas de diálogo) no es óptima.
3. Considerando que la EMT hizo una extensiva evaluación del diseño del proyecto y su implementación durante los primeros años, esta evaluación final no repetirá esta evaluación, pero la validará. Para las secciones relevantes del informe (diseño e ciertos elementos de implementación) se revisarán las conclusiones del informe de EMT y se les acepte, corrige o actualice basado en las observaciones durante la evaluación final.
4. En base a sus observaciones, la EMT hizo una serie de recomendaciones. En la presente evaluación final se considera el seguimiento de algunas de ellas que, a juicio del evaluador, tendrían una importancia particular sobre el desempeño final y la sostenibilidad del proyecto. Estas recomendaciones son presentadas en la Tabla 2.

*Tabla 2: Selección de las recomendaciones de la Evaluación de Medio Término del Proyecto Paisajes cuyo seguimiento será considerado en la evaluación final*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rec. # | Recomendación | Entidad responsable |
| B | Objetivo del proyecto |  |
| B.2 | Desarrollar al menos uno de los mecanismos de la estrategia de sostenibilidad financiera, alineado al marco de gestión de la vida silvestre. | MAE y WCS |
| B.5 | Enfocar las acciones encaminadas al incremento de la cobertura vegetal hacia todos los paisajes del proyecto, y apoyar a la creación de áreas dentro de otras categorías de conservación, que en el mediano y largo plazo puedan ser incorporadas dentro de los subsistemas comunitarios, privados y de GAD del SNAP. | MAE |
| B.6 | Apoyar a la DNB en la selección del personal que actualmente trabaja en las áreas protegidas, y que cumpla con un perfil específico, para entrenarlo como responsables del programa de manejo de biodiversidad, dentro del que deberán estar incorporados los procesos que el proyecto viene trabajando en relación a la conservación y gestión de la vida silvestre. | MAE y WCS |
| B.8 | Trabajar de manera coordinada con la DNB para facilitar la institucionalización de procesos clave dentro de la gestión de la vida silvestre a nivel de la Autoridad Ambiental. | MAE |
| C | Resultado 1 |  |
| C.1 | Establecer acuerdos con socios locales en territorio para contar con un equipo que se encargue de desarrollar las actividades relacionadas con acuerdos de cacería sostenible, y alternativas proteínicas, como parte de una sola estrategia integral del proyecto. | MAE y WCS |
| D | Resultado 2 |  |
| D.1 | Involucrar a actores como técnicos del MAGAP y de los GAD en el seguimiento y apoyo a las iniciativas productivas desarrolladas en los paisajes. | MAE |
| D.3 | Establecer acuerdos con socios locales en territorio para contar con un equipo que se encargue de desarrollar las actividades relacionadas con las alternativas productivas, mejora en el manejo de ganado, acuerdos de cacería sostenible, y alternativas proteínicas, como parte de una sola estrategia integral del proyecto. | MAE y WCS |
| E | Ejecución del proyecto y gestión adaptativa |  |
| E.1 | Considerar una extensión formal sin costo del proyecto hasta mediados de 2019, tomando en cuenta los retrasos que ocurrieron para el arranque del mismo, de modo que se pueda realizar el segundo monitoreo de las especies focales, así como llegar a analizar los resultados e impactos de la implementación de las alternativas productivas, las estrategias de mejoramiento del manejo del ganado, planes de cacería comunitarios y cambios propuestos en cuanto a consumo de proteína alternativa. | PNUD/GEF |
| E.3 | Desarrollar mecanismos que aseguren la coordinación interinstitucional entre MAE – MAGAP, MAE – Senplades; así como la coordinación multisectorial y la participación de los miembros de la comunidad y otros actores clave en la gestión de las áreas protegidas y de la vida silvestre. | MAE |
| E.4 | Mejorar los procesos de coordinación y comunicación entre el Equipo del Proyecto, el equipo de WCS y el personal de la Unidad de Vida Silvestre y la Unidad de Áreas Protegidas de la DNB. | MAE Y WCS |
| E.5 | Mantener un liderazgo estratégico, desde la coordinación del proyecto, para establecer alianzas con diversos actores a diferentes niveles, tanto a nivel de Ministerios (MAGAP, Senplades), como a nivel local, con instituciones públicas, proyectos de organismos de cooperación, y organizaciones de la sociedad civil que trabajen en los paisajes del proyecto en temas relacionados. | MAE |
| E.6 | Implementar un mecanismo sistemático de producción de información, sistematización de lecciones aprendidas, y difusión de esta información tanto a nivel interno del MAE y las partes interesadas, como hacia la sociedad civil, la academia, investigadores, y otros proyectos de cooperación en temas vinculados. | MAE Y WCS |
| F | Sostenibilidad |  |
| F.1 | Desarrollar una estrategia de cierre del proyecto que asegure el financiamiento a la gestión de la vida silvestre, la institucionalización de los procesos puestos en marcha por el proyecto a nivel de la Autoridad Ambiental, y los cambios culturales asociados con la reducción de las amenazas a la vida silvestre. | MAE y WCS |

6. Reuniones de fase de preparación

1. Durante la fase de preparación, el evaluador tuvo algunas reuniones con parte del equipo de coordinación del proyecto, con el PNUD y con el comité directivo. Con base en estas reuniones se identificaron algunas prioridades para la evaluación final. Principalmente, se acordó que la evaluación analizará y validará el progreso de los indicadores tal como fueron reportados en los *Project Implementation Report* (PIR) pero que se enfocará específicamente en los factores de éxito y las razones para el eventual no logro de los resultados. Entre los temas específicos de atención se menciona la el desarrollo e internalización de la visión de paisaje (tanto a nivel de autoridad nacional como su aplicación en el territorio), los desafíos de monitoreo de fauna, la coordinación interinstitucional, los modelos alternativos de conservación (RAMSAR y ACUS vs Socio Bosque y Reservas Municipales), el enfoque de género y la estrategia de sostenibilidad y de cierre del proyecto (cierre, sostenibilidad, y manejo del legado). En la reunión de inicio de la evaluación con el comité directivo del proyecto, se aprobaron estas prioridades y se añadió el análisis de sostenibilidad de los modelos e instrumentos propuestos para la gestión institucional de vida silvestre, considerando los cambios en el contexto. También se enfatizó la importancia de analizar el alcance de los recursos aplicados (con el concepto de valor por inversión) y la atribución de resultados al proyecto.

7. Marco de Evaluación

1. Con base en los elementos analizados en la fase de preparación (TdR, documentos de diseño y gestión de proyecto, reconstrucción de TdC, revisión de EMT, entrevistas con actores del proyecto y reunión de comité directivo) el evaluador desarrolló una serie de preguntas de evaluación. Los criterios y preguntas principales fueron tomados de los TdR y el evaluador incluye una serie de preguntas adicionales. En la Tabla 3 se presenta el marco de evaluación, en una matriz de las preguntas de evaluación, indicadores y fuentes de verificación.

*Tabla 3: Marco de evaluación*

| CRITERIOS DE EVALUACIÓN | INDICADORES DE EVALUACIÓN | MEDIOS DE VERIFICATION |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Relevancia |  |  |
| ¿Cómo se relaciona el proyecto con los objetivos del área focal de GEF? | * Nivel de alineación con área focal de GEF (BD1) * Logro de GEB y contribución a TT | * Comparación de PRODOC e informes de progreso con documentos de política y estrategia de GEF * Entrevistas con la Oficial de Programa PNUD, Asesor Técnico Regional PNUD, Coordinador del Proyecto * EMT |
| ¿Cómo se relaciona el proyecto con las prioridades nacionales y locales de ambiente y desarrollo? | * Nivel de alineación con el Programa de País PNUD y Plan Nacional de Desarrollo * Nivel de alineación con programas ambientales nacionales y locales | * Comparación de PRODOC e informes de progreso con documentos de política y estrategia de Ecuador, GADs y PNUD * Entrevistas con MAE, GAD, Oficial de Programa PNUD, Coordinador del Project * EMT |
| ¿Qué tanto cambió el contexto (económico, social, político, institucional, ambiental) y cómo respondió el proyecto a esto? ¿Los productos principales del proyecto (eg, modelos e instrumentos de gestión de VS ) siguen relevantes a pesar del cambio de contexto? | * Medidas de manejo adaptativo reportadas en respuesta a cambios en contexto. * Grado de flexibilidad en enfoques, modelos e instrumentos recomendados en los principales productos del proyecto | * Informes de progreso/PIR * Revisión de productos * Entrevistas con Unidad de Gestión y autoridades gubernamentales * Revisión de literatura sobre el contexto |
| Efectividad |  |  |
| ¿Qué tan exitoso ha sido el proyecto en la generación de sus productos, tanto en cantidad, calidad y oportunidad? | * Número de productos, logrados dentro del tiempo establecido | * Informes de progreso/PIR * Productos tangibles (estudios, documentos, publicaciones, etc.) * Entrevistas con Unidad de Gestión, organizaciones socias en ejecución, beneficiarios del proyecto |
| ¿Se cumplieron los supuestos de calidad de las actividades y productos? (Los estudios y herramientas son de calidad; la capacitación resulta en el incremento de capacidades, la sensibilización y comunicación llega al público meta, las fuentes alternativas de proteína son disponibles y factibles; los procesos de normatividad y legislación son activos y flexibles) | * Calidad de los productos en cuando a calidad académica, factibilidad, efectividad (de capacitación), alcance (de comunicación) | * Productos tangibles (estudios, documentos, publicaciones, etc.) * Observaciones directas (en campo) * Entrevistas con Unidad de Gestión, organizaciones socias en ejecución, beneficiarios de proyecto |
| ¿Se cumplieron los supuestos de colaboración e interés de los actores locales a nivel de actividades y productos? (Los planes y programas son consensuados por actores; Las fuentes alternativas de proteína son aceptados, Hay colaboración de comunidades beneficiadas es constante y favorable; Interés y colaboración continua de GAD y otros actores locales; Las prácticas de producción son aceptadas y sostenidas; Hay voluntad de diferentes actores para reducir conflictos fauna-humano) | * Declaración de contribución e interés de actores locales en actividades y productos | * Informes de progreso/PIR * Observaciones directas (en campo) * Entrevistas con Unidad de Gestión, organizaciones socias en ejecución, beneficiarios de proyecto |
| ¿El proyecto ha contribuido a que las APs contribuyan eficazmente a la conservación de la vida silvestre amenazada? (Resultado 1) | * Indicadores 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4 y 1.5 del marco de resultados | * Medios de verificación para estos indicadores mencionados en marco de resultados * Informes de progreso/PIR * Entrevistas con beneficiarios del proyecto y personal de AP |
| ¿La administración de las AAPP focales del proyecto aplicó los productos, según los supuestos para el logro del resultado 1? (El marco de gestión, los planes y programas son aceptados y apoyados por las autoridades relevantes, el monitoreo es implementado e informa la gestión adaptativa; se mantiene coordinación entre AP y comunidades) | * Nivel de aplicación de productos por parte de la administración de las AP focales | * Observaciones directas (en campo) * Entrevistas con beneficiarios del proyecto y personal de AP * Informes de gestión de AP |
| ¿El proyecto ha contribuido a que la gestión de áreas no protegidas en 5 paisajes seleccionados contribuya eficazmente a la conservación de la vida silvestre amenazada? (Resultado 2) | * Indicadores 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 y 2.5 del marco de resultados | * Medios de verificación para estos indicadores mencionados en el marco de resultados * Informes de progreso/PIR * Entrevistas con beneficiarios del proyecto y personal de GAD |
| ¿La legislación y normativa es aplicada, incentivada y controlada, inclusive con los cambios en la administración? | * Ejemplos de recomendaciones del proyecto son efectivamente incluidos en políticas y planes * Número de nuevas políticas, programas o planes que incluyen la conservación de vida silvestre | * Documentación sobre políticas y planes de agencias gubernamentales * Informes de progreso/PIR * Entrevistas con equipo del proyecto y staff de agencias gubernamentales |
| ¿Existe suficiente base social para la gestión positiva de Vida Silvestre alrededor de las AAPP? | * Evidencia de participación social en actividades de conservación de vida silvestre (sensibilización, educación, monitoreo, etc.) | * Entrevistas con beneficiarios locales * Observaciones directas * Registro de participación en eventos |
| ¿En qué tanto el proyecto ha contribuido a que el SNAP del Ecuador aplique enfoques de paisaje para aumentar su efectividad para la conservación de la vida silvestre? (objetivo) | * Indicadores O2, O3, O4, O5 y O6 del marco de resultados | * Medios de verificación para estos indicadores mencionados en el marco de resultados * Entrevistas con personal de AP y agencias gubernamentales * Observaciones directas |
| ¿Las autoridades nacionales han cumplido su compromiso de dar continuidad a la gestión, financiamiento, replicación y personal técnico para la efectiva conservación de vida silvestre? | * Decisiones documentadas de continuidad de gestión y financiamiento | * Documentos oficiales * Entrevistas con autoridades nacionales |
| ¿La gobernabilidad local en los cinco paisajes es favorable para aumentar la efectividad de la conservación de especies de vida silvestre? | * Grado de profesionalismo, eficiencia y transparencia de la gobernabilidad en los cinco paisajes | * Entrevistas con GAD * Observaciones directas * Entrevistas con otros actores en paisajes |
| ¿Hay un ambiente favorable para la réplica en otros paisajes? (Existen condiciones favorables en otras AP/corredores? ¿Las herramientas, resultados y lecciones son puestas a disponibilidad de otros actores?) | * El nivel de interés, conocimiento e información básica en otros paisajes/corredores es similar a las 5 áreas focales de este proyecto al inicio de su ejecución | * Visita a y entrevistas con actores de otras zonas * Entrevistas a agencias nacionales |
| ¿Qué efecto tiene el proyecto sobre las perspectivas de género? | * Balance de género en gestión del proyecto, actividades del proyecto, beneficios del proyecto. * Existencia de estrategia/visión | * Reportes de actividades * Revisión de documentos de gestión del proyecto * Entrevistas con equipo de gestión |
| Eficiencia |  |  |
| ¿El proyecto fue implementado eficientemente, en línea con normas y estándares internacionales? ¿Representó un buen valor por su inversión? ( | * Cumplimiento con estándares de transparencia (fondos aplicados a actividades planeadas, buen balance implementación *vs.* administración), equidad, ética y profesionalismo (ausencia de quejas o eventos críticos) * Mediadas implementadas para ahorrar tiempo o recursos para intentar lograr un mayor desempeño con los recursos disponibles | * Documento del proyecto * Entrevista con agencias de ejecución * Informes de progreso * EMT |
| ¿El proyecto aplicó el manejo adaptativo adecuadamente? | * Ejemplos de medidas aplicadas para mejorar la implementación del proyecto basadas sobre el monitoreo y la evaluación | * Informes de progreso/PIR * EMT y respuesta de manejo * Entrevistas con unidad de ejecución y oficial de programa PNUD |
| ¿El proyecto se construyó adecuadamente sobre esfuerzos existentes? ¿Se buscó complementariedad, se evitó duplicación y se aplicaron lecciones de otras iniciativas e instituciones? | * Nivel de alineación con otras iniciativas | * Comparación de diseño y ejecución del proyecto con actividades de otras iniciativas * Entrevistas con actores de otras iniciativas * Referencia a otras iniciativas en informes de progreso/PIR |
| ¿Cómo fueron aplicados los estándares de manejo y reporte financiero (claridad, transparencia, auditorías etc.), para asegurar que los recursos financieros fueron suficientes y movilizados oportunamente para el manejo del proyecto? | * Calidad de estándares para el manejo financiero (manejo transparente, oportuno, correcto) | * Entrevistas con personal financiero de agencias de ejecución * Informes financieros e informe de auditoría |
| ¿Fue materializado el cofinanciamiento de acuerdo a lo planificado inicialmente? | * Nivel, fuente y momento de co-financiamiento, comparado con planificación original | * Informes financieros * Entrevistas con personal financiero de unidad de ejecución y oficial de programa PNUD |
| Sostenibilidad |  |  |
| Social-Político: ¿Existen factores sociales o políticos que pueden influir positiva- o negativamente en la consolidación de los resultados del proyecto y el progreso hacía su impacto? | * Factores claves (sociales, políticos) que afectan positiva- o negativamente los resultados (en relación a los supuestos y riesgos manifestados) | * Entrevistas con Unidad de Gestión y agencias del proyecto * Informes de progreso/PIR * Revisión de literatura sobre el contexto |
| Institucional y gobernanza: ¿Existe suficiente apropiación del proyecto por parte de los principales actores a nivel nacional y local para asegurar la continuidad de las acciones en campo y la consolidación de los resultados del proyecto? | * Actores nacionales participan activamente en la implementación y réplica de los resultados del proyecto * Actores locales están con la capacidad e interés de continuar acciones iniciadas con el proyecto | * Entrevistas con actores claves * Documentación de implementación de actividades del proyecto * Documentación de actividades de actores claves (en otras zonas/iniciativas) * Observaciones directas |
| Institucional y gobernanza: ¿Que tan sólidos son los logros institucionales como estructuras de gobierno y procesos, políticas, acuerdos y marcos legales necesarios para la consolidación de los resultados y el progreso hacia el impacto? | * Nivel de compromiso de actores clave en participar en las estructuras de gobernanza para la consolidación de resultados, demostrado por acuerdos formales, recomendaciones aceptadas, declaraciones escritas | * Entrevistas con actores claves * Documentación |
| Ambiental: ¿Existen factores ambientales, fuera del contexto directo del proyecto, que pueden afectar positiva- o negativamente los resultados del proyecto o vice-versa? | * Factores claves (ambientales) que afectan positiva- o negativamente los resultados (en relación a los supuestos y riesgos manifestados) | * Entrevistas con Unidad de Gestión y agencias del proyecto * Informes de progreso/PIR * Revisión de literatura sobre el contexto |
| Financiero: ¿Que tanto depende la consolidación de los resultados y el progreso hacia el impacto de la continuación del financiamiento? ¿Qué tan factible es la continuidad de las fuentes actuales de financiamiento o la generación de nuevo financiamiento? | * Nivel de seguridad de fondos necesarios a futuro para la consolidación de los resultados | * Análisis de fondos necesarios * Documentación de compromiso o interés de agencias claves para el financiamiento * Progreso de nuevos proyectos * Entrevista con actores claves |
| ¿Qué tan sólido y factible es el plan de cierre/sostenibilidad del proyecto? | * Plan existente, incluye aspectos financieros, recursos humanos, recursos materiales, gestión de conocimiento (manejo de productos del proyecto). | * Revisión de plan de cierre/sostenibilidad * Entrevistas con el equipo del proyecto y la Oficial de Programa PNUD |
| Impacto |  |  |
| Los resultados del proyecto pueden contribuir a un aumento de cobertura de vegetación efectivamente conservada | * Alta efectividad del manejo de la vegetación en áreas de conservación nuevas (socio bosque, ACUS, RAMSAR) | * Documentación de la efectividad de la gestión de las áreas en mención * Observación directa * Entrevistas con actores locales |
| Los resultados del proyecto pueden contribuir al mantenimiento o aumento de la abundancia de las especies prioritarias de vida silvestre en los paisajes | * Indicador O1 | * Medio de verificación del indicador * Informe de progreso/PIR * EMT * Entrevistas con el equipo del proyecto y los responsables de monitoreo |
| ¿Cuáles son los factores, internos y externos al proyecto, que determinan el progreso de los resultados finales al impacto? | * Número de factores | * Entrevistas con actores clave * Literatura de contexto * EMT |
| Gobierno y manejo del proyecto (Desempeño de Agencias de Ejecución e Implementación) |  |  |
| ¿Fue adecuado, efectivo y eficiente el manejo del proyecto aplicado por la Unidad de Ejecución de MAE y WCS, en cuanto a habilidades, liderazgo, coordinación y capacidad adaptativa? | * Nivel de satisfacción (entre agencias socias y Unidad de Gestión) del manejo general del proyecto | * Entrevistas con agencias socias y Unidad de Gestión. |
| Fue oportuna, adecuada y de calidad la supervisión y el apoyo técnico de la agencia de implementación? | * Percepción de apoyo de PNUD * Nivel de participación de PNUD en actividades, eventos y reuniones del proyecto | * Minutas de reuniones * Entrevistas con agencias socias y Unidad de Gestión |
| El proceso de toma de decisiones de parte del comité directivo fue eficiente, transparente y justo? Fueron seguidas las recomendaciones y decisiones por la unidad de ejecución? | * Percepción del funcionamiento del comité directivo | * Minutas de reuniones * Entrevistas con miembros del comité. * Informes de progreso/PIR |
| ¿Cómo fue el grado y efectividad de colaboración entre las diferentes agencias responsables durante el diseño y la ejecución del proyecto? | * Nivel de participación de socios en el diseño y la efectiva inclusión en los arreglos de implementación | * Informes de progreso/PIR * Entrevistas con socios clave |
| Monitoreo y Evaluación |  |  |
| De que consistía el sistema de M&E en el diseño (marco de resultados, indicadores, plan de medición y reporte, uso de evaluaciones) | Calidad de indicadores (SMART),  Factibilidad de plan | Documento de diseño  EMT  Entrevista RPO PUD |
| El sistema de M&E fue operativo y funcional durante la implementación del proyecto, en facilitar el rastreo oportuno de resultados y el progreso hacia los resultados y objetivo (medición de indicadores, reporte actual, uso para manejo adaptativo)? Se adaptó adecuadamente? | Cumplimiento de medición de indicadores en relación a requerimiento de datos  # ejemplos de manejo adaptativo basado en monitoreo y evaluación (incl. EMT) | Planes anuales  Informes de progreso  EMT  Entrevista RPO PUD |
| ¿Fueron adecuados y de buena calidad los PIR reports, informes de progreso y otros medios de comunicación sobre la implementación del proyecto? | Level of completeness of reports | Project progress reports/PIR |

8. Metodología

1. La metodología de evaluación consiste de la combinación de métodos y herramientas que recopilan la información cualitativa y cuantitativa necesaria para responder a las preguntas de evaluación de una forma objetiva y basada en evidencias.

* *Revisión de documentos.* El evaluador hará una revisión de una amplia gama de documentos durante varias fases de la evaluación, con diferentes objetivos. Al revisar esta documentación, el evaluador asociaría cada (sección de) documento relevante con preguntas de evaluación específicas (mediante una codificación de documentos) para luego poder procesar esta información con el conjunto de información para cada pregunta
  + Documentos fundamentales del proyecto. Durante la fase de incepción, el evaluador revisará los documentos base del proyecto para entender la lógica, el diseño y el nivel de avance del mismo, con base en ellos se podrá ajustar mejor el diseño de la evaluación. Estos documentos incluyen la propuesta (PRODOC) y los informes de avance técnicos.
  + Documentos de gestión del proyecto. Durante la fase de levantamiento de información, el evaluador revisará toda la documentación producida en la gestión del proyecto, incluyendo los planes de trabajo (plurianual y anuales), el presupuesto detallado y detalles, financieros, informes de auditoría, minutas de reuniones, tracking tool, etc. (La mayoría de estos documentos están mencionados en la lista de documentos en el anexo B de los TdR, y documentos adicionales se recopilarán con la Unidad de Gestión del Proyecto. La revisión de estos documentos dará información principalmente sobre las preguntas en el criterio de Eficiencia y Gobierno/Manejo del Proyecto.
  + Documentos producidos en el proyecto como producto de actividades. (publicaciones, informes, estudios, planes y estrategias) y por otros proyectos/organizaciones, relevantes para el proyecto. Esta información refleja el cumplimiento con el plan de trabajo del proyecto y evidencia (parte de) las actividades ejecutadas (criterios de eficiencia y efectividad). Comparar los productos del proyecto con otros de proyectos similares, el evaluador podrá obtener una idea de la calidad, el valor innovador y el valor agregado de los productos.
* *Análisis de los indicadores.* Para los criterios de efectividad e impacto, una parte clave del levantamiento de información es obtener una perspectiva general del valor actual de los indicadores incluidos en el marco de resultados del proyecto, y validar estos valores. Con base en los informes de avance técnico y conversaciones con la Unidad de Gestión del Proyecto, el evaluador recopila los valores actuales de los indicadores y los incluirá en una tabla. Estos valores serán validados durante los otros pasos de levantamiento de la evaluación (entrevistas, revisión de documentos y observaciones en el campo).
* *Entrevistas a diversos actores.* El evaluador efectuará una serie de entrevistas semi-estructuradas con un número representativo de actores. Esta información secundaria valida los datos recopilados de la documentación revisada y de los indicadores y los complementa con la crucial perspectiva de la gente que ejecuta, colabora y se beneficia del proyecto.   
  La mayoría de las entrevistas serán bilaterales (uno a uno), pero en ciertos casos, donde hay una cantidad de individuos numerosos por grupo focal, se organizarán reuniones de grupo. Para las entrevistas, se elaborará una plantilla de preguntas especificas. Estas preguntas están basadas en las preguntas de evaluación, pero por los fines de la entrevista no son exactamente las mismas. Son preguntas abiertas que permiten al evaluador y entrevistado tener una conversación más amplia y no restringirse estrictamente a un tema determinado. Esta forma semi-estructrurada ayuda a recopilar información más amplia, ya que el entrevistado siente mayor libertad para reflexionar sobre el proyecto. Para cada grupo de actores, se adapta la plantilla de entrevistas puesto que con cada grupo se espera profundizar en diferentes temas (por ejemplo, con agencias de implementación y ejecución se trata más de la gestión y gobernanza del proyecto, mientras con el personal de GAD se habla más de la acción en el campo y la colaboración con actores locales). Para las entrevistas de grupos (ej. grupos de guardaparques, funcionarios municipales, asociaciones productivas y campesinas) se elaborará una plantilla más corta con las preguntas principales y se dará más tiempo para el debate.  
  La información de cada entrevista se registrará por escrito y se grabará en audio (luego de haber pedido el permiso de los/las entrevistados). La información se asocia a cada pregunta de evaluación para su debido procesamiento en la elaboración de los hallazgos.  
  Se entrevistará como mínimo las personas incluidas en los TdR pero durante la fase de incepción, se complementará esta lista con otras personas relevantes, identificadas por las personas entrevistadas inicialmente. También es posible que durante la fase de levantamiento de la información y procesamiento de datos, se identifiquen personas adicionales para ser entrevistadas.  
  Es importante mencionar que durante este proceso de entrevistas, se mantiene una consulta continua con la Unidad de Gestión del proyecto y la agencia ejecutora, para validar la información y eventualmente confrontar estos actores claves con ciertas percepciones de otros actores (respectando principios de anonimato y confidencialidad).
* *Observaciones en el campo.* Varios indicadores de progreso y de éxito del proyecto se validarán mediante visitas a las áreas focales del proyecto, con observaciones directas y con conversaciones con los beneficiarios locales. En el campo se puede observar directamente el funcionamiento del sistema de monitoreo y control de vida silvestre, la implementación de planes de manejo comunitario e instrumentos de manejo de los GAD, las actividades productivas y percepciones de la reducción de conflictos vida silvestre-humanos. Se reportarán estas observaciones con descripciones y fotografías, y se registrarán experiencias y vivencias de las personas directamente involucradas a estos elementos del proyecto.
* *Procesamiento y validación de información.* Una vez terminado el levantamiento de la información, esta sería organizada de acuerdo a los criterios y preguntas de la evaluación, según la codificación obtenida durante su levantamiento. Se recopilará y resumirá esta información y se analizará su nivel de coincidencia o diferencia. En caso de que la información sobre ciertas preguntas demuestre una tendencia de coincidencia y complementariedad, se la puede utilizar directamente para sostener hallazgos. En caso de que la información sobre ciertas preguntas no coincide (por ejemplo, percepciones diferentes de distintos informantes o información contraria de diferentes documentos) se valida la información mediante un proceso de confrontación (presentar la información a diferentes actores claves, como la Unidad de Gestión) o se haría una triangulación (volver a hacer la misma pregunta a informantes adicionales). En caso de que después de estos procesos continúe la diferencia entre fuentes de información, se tomará nota de la inconsistencia en la información o percepción y se usará con esta anotación para eventualmente sostener hallazgos.

Parte de la información recopilada por las diferentes herramientas de evaluación es cuantitativa (ej. datos de indicadores, progreso en tiempo, información financiera) pero otra es cualitativa y subjetiva por naturaleza (entrevistas y percepciones). El evaluador procesará la información de tal manera que pueda ser cuantificada, por ejemplo contando el número de informantes que mencionan un particular logro o producto positivo o calculando el porcentaje de informantes que manifiestan una cierta opinión. El mencionado proceso de confrontación y triangulación reduce el valor subjetivo de la información de las entrevistas.

* *Elaboración de hallazgos, conclusiones y recomendaciones.* Con base en la información recopilada durante la fase de levantamiento de información y su procesamiento inicial, el evaluador identifica hallazgos preliminares. Cada hallazgo es una respuesta parcial de las preguntas de evaluación (asociadas a los cinco criterios de evaluación) y está basado estrictamente sobre la información encontrada durante el levantamiento de información. Estos hallazgos iniciales se presentarán al Comité Directivo de la evaluación, incl. PNUD, MAE y Unidad de Gestión, para su debate. Con base en la retroalimentación recibida, se decidirá eventualmente hacer unas entrevistas adicionales o una revisión de la documentación adicional para mayor validación de la información o para llenar vacíos en la información. Con esto, el evaluador definirá los hallazgos finales, que son objetivos y basados en evidencia. Luego, elaborará las conclusiones de evaluación, refiriéndose a los hallazgos e incluyendo su opinión profesional sustentada. Las conclusiones forman la argumentación de calificar los criterios según la escala presentada en Anexo D de los TdR.

Como elementos finales de la evaluación, y haciendo referencia a los hallazgos y conclusiones, el evaluador identifica una serie de lecciones y recomendaciones. Las lecciones aprendidas durante la ejecución del proyecto son prácticas buenas o no tan adecuadas en el diseño, la implementación, la gobernanza o en el contexto del proyecto que valen la pena ser consideradas en futuros proyectos similares. Las recomendaciones son dirigidas a las agencias de implementación y ejecución y se refieren a acciones inmediatas correctivas, actividades en el futuro o prácticas recomendables para aumentar la sostenibilidad de los resultados del proyecto, la probabilidad de lograr el impacto o la replica a otra escala geográfica o temporal.

1. Finalmente, el evaluador elaborará el informe borrador con todos los hallazgos sustentados, conclusiones, lecciones y recomendaciones de forma clara y concisa, en un informe borrador según el índice presentado en el Anexo F de los TdR. Luego el informe entrará en un proceso de revisión por parte del grupo de referencia, agencias de ejecución e implementación y subsecuente edición por parte del evaluador. El informe final (primero en español y luego inglés) incluirá todos los anexos, además de un documento en el que el evaluador explicará como fueron considerados los comentarios sobre la versión borrador del informe en la versión final.

## Annex 7. Template used for semi-structured interviews[[78]](#footnote-78)

Nombre:

Fecha:

Explicación de la metodología y consentimiento de participar y ser grabado:

|  |
| --- |
| INTRODUCCIÓN |
| ¿Qué es su posición? |
| ¿Desde cuándo tiene esta posición? |
| ¿Cómo está vinculado con el Proyecto Paisajes - Vida Silvestre? |
| ¿Cómo es la historia de su vinculación? (¿Qué pasó, quién le invitó, como inició?) |

| *PREGUNTAS DE EVALUACIÓN* | *PREGUNTAS DE ENTREVISTA* |
| --- | --- |
| Relevancia |  |
| ¿Cómo se relaciona el proyecto con las prioridades nacionales y locales de ambiente y desarrollo? | * ¿Estuvo involucrado con el diseño del proyecto? ¿Quién lideró? * ¿Cómo está alineada con sus prioridades ambientales? |
| ¿Qué tanto cambió el contexto (económico, social, político, institucional, ambiental) y cómo respondió el proyecto a esto? ¿Los productos principales del proyecto (eg, modelos e instrumentos de gestión de VS ) siguen relevantes a pesar del cambio de contexto? | * ¿Cómo fueron los efectos de cambios políticos sobre la ejecución? * ¿Sintió una crisis económica? ¿Que se ha hecho para adaptarse? |
| Efectividad |  |
| ¿Se cumplieron los supuestos de calidad de las actividades y productos? (Los estudios y herramientas son de calidad; la capacitación resulta en el incremento de capacidades, la sensibilización y comunicación llega al público meta, las fuentes alternativas de proteína son disponibles y factibles; los procesos de normatividad y legislación son activos y flexibles) | * Los productos del proyecto ¿son de buena calidad? * Las normas y reglas que propone el proyecto, ¿son aplicables? (entrevistados externos) ¿Ustedes ha escuchado del proyecto? ¿Qué sabe? |
| ¿Se cumplieron los supuestos de colaboración e interés de los actores locales a nivel de actividades y productos? (Los planes y programas son consensuados por actores; Las fuentes alternativas de proteína son aceptados, Hay colaboración de comunidades beneficiadas es constante y favorable; Interés y colaboración continua de GAD y otros actores locales; Las prácticas de producción son aceptadas y sostenidas; Hay voluntad de diferentes actores para reducir conflictos fauna-humano) | * ¿Cómo fueron elaborados los planes/instrumentos? * ¿Cómo aplica el GAD los planes y reglas? * ¿Cuánta gente de su comunidad participa? ¿Es mucho o poco? * ¿Son adecuados los proyectos productivos? ¿A la gente les gusta? * ¿Las actividades productivas seguirían? ¿Incluso si no habría dinero? * (en zonas de conflicto) ¿Que hacía antes cuando había ataque de animales? ¿Qué hace ahora? |
| ¿El proyecto ha contribuido a que las APs contribuyan eficazmente a la conservación de la vida silvestre amenazada? (Resultado 1) | * ¿Hay más animales en el Área? ¿Cómo se sabe? |
| ¿La administración de las AAPP focales del proyecto aplicó los productos, según los supuestos para el logro del resultado 1? (El marco de gestión, los planes y programas son aceptados y apoyados por las autoridades relevantes, el monitoreo es implementado e informa la gestión adaptativa; se mantiene coordinación entre AP y comunidades) | * ¿Qué instrumentos de manejo de VS aplica? ¿Cómo sabe si funcionan? (monitoreo) * ¿Cómo es el trabajo de su área con la comunidad/como es el trabajo de su comunidad con el AP? |
| ¿El proyecto ha contribuido a que la gestión de áreas no protegidas en 5 paisajes seleccionados contribuya eficazmente a la conservación de la vida silvestre amenazada? (Resultado 2) | * ¿Hay más animales en el Área? ¿Cómo se sabe? |
| ¿La legislación y normativa es aplicada, incentivada y controlada, inclusive con los cambios en la administración? | * ¿Cómo es aplicada las nuevas reglas e instrumentos? ¿Puede dar ejemplo de cómo hay referencia a VS? |
| ¿Existe suficiente base social para la gestión positiva de Vida Silvestre alrededor de las AAPP? | * La gente en su área (municipio, comunidad) ¿qué hace para conservar VS? |
| ¿En qué tanto el proyecto ha contribuido a que el SNAP del Ecuador aplique enfoques de paisaje para aumentar su efectividad para la conservación de la vida silvestre? (objetivo) | * ¿Cuáles elementos de visión de paisaje han incluido en la gestión del SNAP? ¿Cómo? |
| ¿Las autoridades nacionales han cumplido su compromiso de dar continuidad a la gestión, financiamiento, replicación y personal técnico para la efectiva conservación de vida silvestre? | * ¿Cuantos fondos han desembolsado los diferentes actores? ¿Para qué? * ¿Hay planes para el futuro? |
| ¿La gobernabilidad local en los cinco paisajes es favorable para aumentar la efectividad de la conservación de especies de vida silvestre? | * ¿Cómo trabaja GAD con diferentes sectores? * ¿Qué conflictos existen entre agencias y/o sectores? * ¿Cómo puede aplicar legislación? |
| ¿Hay un ambiente favorable para la réplica en otros paisajes? (Existen condiciones favorables en otras AP/corredores? ¿Las herramientas, resultados y lecciones son puestas a disponibilidad de otros actores?) | * ¿Hay contacto con otras comunidades/parroquias/ gobiernos provinciales? ¿En qué consiste? ¿Han recibido interés para replicar? |
| ¿Qué efecto tiene el proyecto sobre las perspectivas de género? | * ¿Quienes participan (a todo nivel)? * ¿Piensa que el proyecto ayuda a todo el mundo? ¿O es más para ciertos grupos? |
| Eficiencia |  |
| ¿El proyecto fue implementado eficientemente, en línea con normas y estándares internacionales? ¿Representó un buen valor por su inversión? ( | * ¿Le pareció mucha plata lo que tiene el proyecto? * ¿El proyecto aplicó los fondos a lo que debería aplicar? * ¿Hubiera sido bien aplicar más/menos fondos a alguna cosa? |
| ¿El proyecto aplicó el manejo adaptativo adecuadamente? | * ¿Qué hicieron diferente en la implementación respeto al proyecto original y por qué? |
| ¿El proyecto se construyó adecuadamente sobre esfuerzos existentes? ¿Se buscó complementariedad, se evitó duplicación y se aplicaron lecciones de otras iniciativas e instituciones? | * ¿Con cuál otros proyectos hablan? ¿Coordinan esfuerzos? |
| ¿Cómo fueron aplicados los estándares de manejo y reporte financiero (claridad, transparencia, auditorías etc.), para asegurar que los recursos financieros fueron suficientes y movilizados oportunamente para el manejo del proyecto? | * ¿Cómo es el manejo financiero? (quien hace, cuando, a quien reporten, quien firma, quien controla) |
| Sostenibilidad |  |
| Social-Político: ¿Existen factores sociales o políticos que pueden influir positiva- o negativamente en la consolidación de los resultados del proyecto y el progreso hacía su impacto? | * ¿Cuáles son riesgos políticos o sociales a corto o mediano plazo? * ¿Hay un ambiente político positivo? ¿Cómo se nota? |
| Institucional y gobernanza: ¿Existe suficiente apropiación del proyecto por parte de los principales actores a nivel nacional y local para asegurar la continuidad de las acciones en campo y la consolidación de los resultados del proyecto? | * ¿Cuáles son riesgos institucionales a corto o mediano plazo? * ¿Existe una apropiación verdadera de las agencias gubernamentales? ¿Cómo se nota? |
| Institucional y gobernanza: ¿Que tan sólidos son los logros institucionales como estructuras de gobierno y procesos, políticas, acuerdos y marcos legales necesarios para la consolidación de los resultados y el progreso hacia el impacto? | * ¿Las instituciones del proyecto están bien coordinados y colaborarían luego de no tener fondos? |
| Financiero: ¿Que tanto depende la consolidación de los resultados y el progreso hacia el impacto de la continuación del financiamiento? ¿Qué tan factible es la continuidad de las fuentes actuales de financiamiento o la generación de nuevo financiamiento? | * ¿Para qué necesitan plata en el futuro? * ¿Quién pagaría? * ¿Qué planes hay para seguir? |
| Impacto |  |
| Los resultados del proyecto pueden contribuir a un aumento de cobertura de vegetación efectivamente conservada | * ¿Hay indicaciones de nueva vegetación? ¿Mayor éxito de conservación en nuevos modelos de conservación? |
| Los resultados del proyecto pueden contribuir al mantenimiento o aumento de la abundancia de las especies prioritarias de vida silvestre en los paisajes | * ¿Cómo funciona el monitoreo? * ¿Que son los datos actuales/nuevos? |
| ¿Cuáles son los factores, internos y externos al proyecto, que determinan el progreso de los resultados finales al impacto? | * ¿Qué riesgos generales existen? |
| Gobierno y manejo del proyecto (Desempeño de Agencias de Ejecución e Implementación) |  |
| ¿Fue adecuado, efectivo y eficiente el manejo del proyecto aplicado por la Unidad de Ejecución de MAE y WCS, en cuanto a habilidades, liderazgo, coordinación y capacidad adaptativa? | * ¿Qué tal les ha parecido la dirección? * ¿Las actividades de capacitación? * ¿Que tanto han hablado el mismo lenguaje o se confundieron? |
| ¿Fue oportuna, adecuada y de calidad la supervisión y el apoyo técnico de la agencia de implementación? | * ¿Qué tal apoyo de PNUD? ¿Mucho/poco? |
| ¿El proceso de toma de decisiones de parte del comité directivo fue eficiente, transparente y justo? Fueron seguidas las recomendaciones y decisiones por la unidad de ejecución? | * ¿Qué tanto funcionaban las reuniones (frecuencia eficiencia, utilidad)? * ¿Las decisiones fueron tomadas democráticamente? ¿en consenso? * ¿Las decisiones fueron seguidas? |
| ¿Cómo fue el grado y efectividad de colaboración entre las diferentes agencias responsables durante el diseño y la ejecución del proyecto? | * ¿Cómo coordinaron las agencias en la implementación? |

|  |
| --- |
| FINALIZAR |
| ¿Qué le ha parecido lo mejor de este proyecto? |
| ¿Qué de este proyecto hubiera cambiado? |
| ¿Algún tema que no hemos tratado o que quiere enfatizar? |

## Annex 8. Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form[[79]](#footnote-79)

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: \_\_Robert Hofstede\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at *Quito* on *March 1, 2019*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. Fifth period of replenishment. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Outcome from CDP 2010-2014; it also aligns with current CDP 2019-2022: The acceleration of structural transformations for the sustainable development, particularly through innovative solutions with multiplying effects in all of the Sustainable Development Objectives, particularly through innovative solutions with multiplying effects in all of the Sustainable Development Objectives. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. The score of the monitoring and evaluating system, government and management, general results, effectiveness and efficiency was done over a scale of six (highly satisfactory; satisfactory; moderately satisfactory; moderately unsatisfactory; unsatisfactory; highly unsatisfactory). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. The score for the relevance criteria was done over a scale of two (relevant; irrelevant). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The score of the sustainability criteria was done over a scale of four (probable; moderately probable, moderately improbable; improbable). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Eight municipal level GAD included specific measures to reduce the pressures on wildlive, through ordinances: Mejía (regulation and control of urban wildlife), Nabón, Oña, Santa Isabel and Saraguro (declaration of ACUS Condor Andino), Cotacachi and Carchi (declaration ACUS) and Francisco de Orellana (fish management). Also, wildlife managmen was supported to GAD El Oro and Loja [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The evaluator is aware of different terminology to describe the negative interaction between humans and wildlife. In this report, the term “human-wildlife conflict” is used in agreement to the project document (Prodoc), the indicator 2.5 of the results framework and the Project Implementation Reports (PIR) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. See Prodoc, Spanish Version, pg. 101 “MAE has agreed to incorporate the field technicians in the different regional tables....., as part of a strategy to strengthen the institutional capacity on a long term basis”. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. https://www.oecd.org/development/evaluation/dcdndep/47069197.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. According to the list identified by the Conservation International (Mittermeier, R. A., Robles Gil, P. & Mittermeier, C. G. Megadiversity: Earth’s Biologically Wealthiest Nations. (1999) and considered by the United Nations Program for the Environment; http://www.biodiversitya-z.org/content/megadiverse-countries. Depending on the source, Iran was included afterwards. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Until 2018 named “Patrimony of Natural Areas of the State (PANE)” [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. http://sociobosque.ambiente.gob.ec/?q=node/44 [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7966/Impacts\_climate\_change\_wildlife.pdf?sequence=3&amp%3BisAllowed=

    https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/mar/31/ipcc-climate-report-wildlife-impact [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. In the general State budget (www.finanzas.gob.ec), the MAE budget was of 65M US$ in 2014, US$ 80M in 2015 and decreased to 28M US$ in 2016. In 2017 and 2019 it continues to decrease to 26M US$ and 24M US$, respectively. The higher budget in 2018 (58M US$) was a one-time increase for paying debts to beneficiaries of the Socio Bosque program, generated in previous years. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. At the start of every section of evaluation outcomes the findings are presented and after discussing the information (D = Design, PI = Project Implementation, GR = General Result, etc.) and a number. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. See figure 1 of the inception report; annex 6 to this report. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Real changes or anticipated, positive or negative, in the benefit of global environment as are verified for changes in the environmental stress level or status change; also considering sustainable development impacts, including changes in lifestyle. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Clark, H. and Taplin, D. (2012) Theory of Change Basics: A Primer on Theory of Change. New York: Acknowledge [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. From the 23 local interviewed actors, 7 were MAE functionaries. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. A recent analytical study showed that 72% of the 477 analyzed species, a minimum of 10 years is necessary for detecting population trends in wildlife. In 30% of the cases, more than 20 years are needed. The study concludes with monitoring results during short periods of time which have low power and are possibly tricky. White (2019) BioSCience 69(1) https://academic.oup.com/bioscience/article/69/1/40/5195956 [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers; United Nations System for Transfers between agencies. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. i.e. Jaguar: https://www.panthera.org/initiative/jaguar-corridor-initiative; Sharks and sea turtles: https://whc.unesco.org/en/activities/14/; Oso andino: http://assets.panda.org/downloads/oso\_estrategia\_conservacion\_abr\_2003.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Prodoc Spanish Version, p71-73 [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. SNAP project of Sustainable Finance [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
27. http://biodiversityfinance.net/index.php/about-biofin/biofin-approach [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
28. http://www.comunidadandina.org/cooperacion\_praa.aspx [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
29. Summarized from PRODOC, Spanish version, Table 9. Adapted and complemented by the evaluator. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
30. See organizational chart, Pg. 84 Prodoc, Spanish Version [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
31. The effort of component 3 to identify the threat to fereal dogs and cats in the protected areas contributing directly to the objective of Landscapes - Wildlife Project and forming an exception regarding the observation of this paragraph. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
32. The evaluator revised the applied audits of WCS and observed the 2014-2016, the auditor made an opinion with qualifications for a charge of the 6.5% over all of the expenses; in 2017 the issues were resolved and emitted a favorable opinion, without any news. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
33. In the Prodoc, all of the support funds for Socio Bosque compromised as co-financing for this project originated from the Conservation of Forests Program and the REDD=, of KfW. Finally, these just covered part of the funds in 2014 and 2015. The rest of the co-financing of Socio Bosque originated from fiscal funds. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
34. The contribution of GAD Imbabura was based in a communication directed to the Provincial Director of MAE Imbabura, explaining the direct Provincial Government expenses in environmental initiatives, from which the evaluator made an estimate of which would be considered as co-financing to the project (US$ 4483). Additionally, GAD Imbabura contributed in species (US$ 3776) and in cash (US$ 30170) to the sustainable production projects of Landscapes - Wildlife Project in the parishes which were included in the declaration of the counterpart of these GAD. Finally, the consultant verified that GAD Imbabura included US$ 56,000 in the budget for 2019 for replica activities of these projects in other parishes. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
35. The information included in the generation of products and results table extracted from the PIR and validated by the evaluator. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
36. Véase Prodoc, versión español, pg 101 “el MAE se ha comprometido a incorporar los técnicos de campo en los diferentes cuadros regionales...., como parte de una estrategia para fortalecer la capacidad institucional a largo plazo”. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
37. El presupuesto del MAE previsto para 2019 anticipa un decrecimiento de 33% para la gestión de áreas protegidas (https://gk.city/2019/01/11/problemas-ambientales-ecuador-2019) [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
38. Mentefactura. 2018. Modelo de Gestión para la Conservación in situ y ex situ de la vida silvestre en el Ecuador” [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
39. Prodoc Spanish Version, ¶62, pg. 24. [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
40. To score this level of understanding of the landscape focus, the evaluator scored the mentioning of key concepts: integrality of landscape elements, participative management, connectivity, cultural areas, natural unprotected areas, protected area system biodiversity, and ecosistemic systems. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
41. Ecuador is considered the smallest of the 17 countries considered to be mega diverse according to the Monitoring of the Conservation and Environment Program Center for the Environment of the United Nations. IT is the most densely populated (60 inhabitant/km2) among Latin-Americans. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
42. See for example, http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf\_files/articles/ASunderland1302.pdf; [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
43. http://www.planificacion.gob.ec/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2017/10/PNBV-26-OCT-FINAL\_0K.compressed1.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-43)
44. The information included in the generation of products and outcomes table is extracted from the PIR, and validated by the evaluator. [↑](#footnote-ref-44)
45. Now SEAP [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
46. “Evaluation of socioeconomic and environmental impact of 18 productive and agricultural sustainable alternatives of protein, implemented in the framework of the Project Landscapes- Wildlife - Wildlife” J.C. Rivera, December 2018. [↑](#footnote-ref-46)
47. Considerations regarding tools for the management of effectiveness in Leverington et al. (2010) Management effectiveness evaluation in protected areas – a global study. https://www.eci.ox.ac.uk/publications/downloads/coad11-protected-areas.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
48. The information included in the generation of products and outcomes table is extracted form the PIR, and validated by the evaluator. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
49. The activities in the community in Landscape 1 had to be shut down due to commotion in the public order. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
50. The information included in the generation of products and outcomes table is extracted form the PIR, and validated by the evaluator. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
51. These are four municipalities in the replica area. They are not the GAD included at the start of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)
52. # Ravanelle y Nyhus. 2017. Global patterns and trends in human–wildlife conflict compensation. Conservation Biology; https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.12948; Lamarque et al., 2009. Human-wildlife conflict in Africa; Causes, consequences and management strategies. FAO/WWF. http://www.fao.org/docrep/012/i1048e/i1048e00.htm

    [↑](#footnote-ref-52)
53. https://www.thegef.org/projects [↑](#footnote-ref-53)
54. See midterm evaluation report, pg. 90 [↑](#footnote-ref-54)
55. Evaluation of the socioeconomic environmental impact of eighteen agricultural sustainable and of alternative sources of protein initiatives implemented in the framework of the Project Landscapes - Wildlife -” J.C. Rivera, December 2018. [↑](#footnote-ref-55)
56. http://news.bbc.co.uk/hi/spanish/latin\_america/newsid\_7646000/7646918.stm [↑](#footnote-ref-56)
57. https://es.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iniciativa\_Yasun%C3%AD-ITT [↑](#footnote-ref-57)
58. https://www.unredd.net/index.php?option=com\_country&view=countries&id=46&Itemid=605 [↑](#footnote-ref-58)
59. https://www.elcomercio.com/pages/resultados-consulta-popular-referendo-2018.html [↑](#footnote-ref-59)
60. Regarding the last case of, December 2018 (Salcedo, Cotopaxi), in a quick internet search by the evaluator, found 23 articles of National written press. [↑](#footnote-ref-60)
61. Mentefactura (Mayo 2018): “Management Model for in situ y ex situ conservation of wildlife in Ecuador” [↑](#footnote-ref-61)
62. Metefactura (junio 2016): Elaboration of the Financial Strategy for the Implementation of the Wildlife Management framework”. [↑](#footnote-ref-62)
63. Mentefactura (December 2018): Development of a Financial Sustainability Strategy for the management of wildlife through” the Cycle of the Wildlife Fund in the operational framework from the Environmental Investment Fund (FIAS) and the Socio-Environmental Corporate Responsibility Mechanism for Wildlife. [↑](#footnote-ref-63)
64. Document “Monitoring Report at a Landscape Scale”, which as presented as an annex to the PIR2018 [↑](#footnote-ref-64)
65. The results from the second census of the condor were not available on the date. [↑](#footnote-ref-65)
66. The information included in the generation of products and outcomes table is extracted form the PIR, and validated by the evaluator. [↑](#footnote-ref-66)
67. Vargas et al. (November 2018). Action Plan for the conservation of the Andean Condor in Ecuador. MAE andThe Peregrine Fund. [↑](#footnote-ref-67)
68. See Prodoc, Spanish Version, pg. 101 “MAE has agreed to incorporate the field technicians in the different regional tables....., as part of a strategy to strengthen the institutional capacity on a long term basis”. [↑](#footnote-ref-68)
69. The annexes of the ToR were not included because these are elements of the PRODOC o or UNDP-GEF guidelines for evaluations [↑](#footnote-ref-69)
70. Additional values of co-financing and counterparts will be delivered during the evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-70)
71. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-71)
72. For this the CO will share the UNDAF, CCA, CPD, Strategic

    Plan and CPAP. [↑](#footnote-ref-72)
73. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2\_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-73)
74. This list is in addition to the documents referred in footnotes [↑](#footnote-ref-74)
75. Por ejemplo, si se tiene el "plan de manejo" (producto) y se supone que el plan es adoptado e implementado por la comunidad (supuesto) se genera que la comunidad aplica un mejor manejo de sus recursos (resultado). [↑](#footnote-ref-75)
76. A*ctual or anticipated, positive or negative changes in global environmental benefit, as verified by environmental stress and/or status change, and also taking into account sustainable development impacts, including changed livelihoods.* [↑](#footnote-ref-76)
77. Con base a estas observaciones, la evaluación hizo recomendaciones de cambio en varios indicadores, que en dos casos fueron aceptados por el Proyecto (O5 y 2.4) [↑](#footnote-ref-77)
78. Not all questions were applied to all interviewed persons, depending on their role in the project or level of familiarity the list was adapted [↑](#footnote-ref-78)
79. www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct [↑](#footnote-ref-79)