Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2931	
GEF Agency project ID		3520	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Adaptation to Climate Change through Effective Water Governance in Ecuador	
Country/Countries		Ecuador	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Climate Change/ SCCF	
Executing agencies involved		Ecuador Ministry of Environment	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Selected NGOS will be trained on water management practices	
Private sector involvement		Private sector members of the National Climate Committee (CNC) were consulted, CNC was a political project counterpart	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		April 14th, 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 31st, 2008	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		Dec 31st, 2014	
Actual date of project completion		May 30th, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.35	.35
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		3	3
Co-financing	IA own	.02	.02
	Government	15.35*	.66
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	.81	NA
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		3.35	3.35
Total Co-financing		16.19	.68
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		19.54	4.03
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		May 2015	
Author of TE		Sandra Cesilini	
TER completion date		2/4/2016	
TER prepared by		Molly Watts	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Caroline Laroche	

*.108 is cash from Ministry of the Environment in Ecuador, all other is in kind/parallel co-financing from local government.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	HS	NR	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		L	NR	L
M&E Design		HS	NR	S
M&E Implementation		S	NR	S
Quality of Implementation		S	NR	MS
Quality of Execution		S	NR	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	NR	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's environmental objective is "to reduce Ecuador's vulnerability to climate change through effective water resources management." The project sought to mainstream climate change adaptation into water management practices in Ecuador through the integration of climate change risk of the water sector into key national and local development plans, the implementation of adaptation measures, and information management and knowledge brokering. (Project Document April 2008 p.1) Ecuador is particularly vulnerable to anticipated impacts of climate change on water resources, due to its location and topography. Existing water governance problems in Ecuador will be compounded by climate change, as increased mean temperature, recurrent droughts and floods, retreating glaciers and more intense and infrequent rainfall patterns will impact water.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objective is to "increase adaptive capacities to address climate change risks in water resources management at the national and local level." (Project Document April 2008 p.5)

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There were no changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities noted in the TE or project documents.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE rates relevance as "relevant". This TER, which uses a different scale, rates relevance as "satisfactory". The project is relevant to GEF focal area strategies for climate change, specifically objective 8 "to support pilot and demonstration projects for adaptation to climate change".(GEF 4 Climate Change Strategy, 2007) It is also consistent with eligibility criteria for the Special Climate Change Fund, and the project strategy is based on UNDP-GEF's Adaptation Policy Frameworks document. (Project Document p.23)

The project also fits with national objectives, as it builds on the momentum created by the lead up to Ecuador's Second National Communication to the UNFCCC (SNC). The SNC proposes to develop a National Adaption Strategy to Climate Change, the water resources sector of which would be informed by this project. (Project Document p.18)

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE rates achievement of the three project outcomes as satisfactory (1) and highly satisfactory (2). It also gives a rating of Moderately Satisfactory for Effectiveness of results. This TER rates project effectiveness as Satisfactory, as the majority of project outcomes were achieved and in some cases targets were surpassed.

The project's first planned outcome- that climate change risks & water management are mainstreamed into plans and programs- was rated as satisfactory by the TE. To achieve this outcome, the project planned to develop a practical guide to incorporating climate risks to the water sector into relevant plans and programs. This guide was developed by the project, along with various other documents and studies to support planning for climate risks to the water sector. Additionally, the project team participated in workshops related to the development of the Law on Water Resources and Water Development Applications, which includes provisions for environmental management and integrated management of water resources through local planning (Development and Zoning Plans- PDOT). The TE and final project implementation report also note that the project contributed to the National Strategy on Climate Change (2012-2025) and the National Plan on Climate change, currently the two most important national planning tools for climate change. (TE p.51)

The project's second planned outcome- that strategies & measures are implemented at a local level to ensure adaptation to CC in the water sector- was rated as highly satisfactory by the TE. As part of this outcome, the project planned 1) to introduce and implement measures, technologies and practices to improve the resilience of water resources management in pilot systems and 2) to develop management systems that reflect information on the impacts of climate change in the water sector. By project end, more than 4,000 families benefited from the community pilot projects funded through this project. More than 20 projects were financed. Compared to the goal that at least 10 communities implement adaptation measures by project end, 116 communities had benefited and implemented adaptation measures by project end. A second target, that upon project completion at least 50% of farmers involved in the project are implementing water saving measures, was surpassed as by the end of the project 90% of beneficiaries were implementing water conservation practices. The TE also notes that the

project strengthened the hydro meteorological network in the Babahoyo basin. Project experiences as part of this outcome have served as a reference point for the development of the monitoring system to be used by Ecuador's Secretariat for Climate Change.

The project's third planned outcome- Institutional & human capacity strengthened/dissemination of information & lessons learned- was rated as highly satisfactory by the TE. The three products the project planned to produce as part of this outcome were: 1) improvement of both institutional and technical capacities to support the mainstreaming of the risks of climate change and implementing adaptation measures in the water sector, 2) knowledge and lessons learned to support the implementation of adaptation measures compiled and distributed, and 3) Guidance documents for GEF and MAE on adaptation to climate change in the water sector. The final PIR notes under this outcome the information generated by the hydro-meteorological stations EHA 98005 and EMA 98006 installed in the basin of the Cristal river. A website for the project was produced, and the final PIR notes by project end there had been 1,124 visits to the project website page (PIR 2014). 16 publications related to climate change were also developed by the project focusing on training and scientific information. The project organized 12 training events, including workshops aimed at all stakeholders of the project. About 300 people were trained in climate change, water culture, health and climate, water resources management, use of SWAT, and Agroecology management.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory

The TE rates "Efficiency of Results as Moderately Satisfactory", which this TER downgrades slightly to Moderately Unsatisfactory, due to delays described in the project documents and a significant project extension. Efficiency at the time of the midterm evaluation was rated as low, due to many delays and impediments suffered. (MTE p.47) The project received a three year no cost extension in order to complete its objectives. However, the TE notes that "delays in the implementation in the first half of the project have not affected the achievement of expected results thanks to significant additional effort and the involvement of all stakeholders. In this way, the project overcame lost time at the start and achieved an excellent level of execution." (TE p.7)

In terms of financial management, the project was completed slightly under budget, with some funding from the first outcome used to cover slightly higher than expected project management costs resulting from the no cost extension. (TE p.46)

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: Likely

The TE notes that interview respondents felt the results of this project would last, but many included the caveat that the Ministry of Environment must continue to lead the establishment of future strategies, either through a specific program or by assigning funds. (TE p.60)

Financial Resources Sustainability: The TE describes sustainability of financial resources as somewhat likely, and the TER agrees with that rating. The TE notes that the local governments in project areas, and private companies such as ETAP, have made commitments to provide specific resources for maintenance of aspects of some project activities. (TE 61) Though this is a positive sign, the TE also

notes that different levels of government will need to assign a budget for the continuation of actions begun by the project, and that it is not yet clear if this will happen or not, although the inclusion of reservoir maintenance plans in the budget of local governments has been a step in the right direction. (TE p.61)

Sociopolitical Sustainability: The TE describes sociopolitical sustainability as likely, and this TER agrees with that rating. The TE commends the project's strategy of coordinating between public institutions and civil society, and "promoting the consolidation of a new socio-cultural paradigm of involvement of the broad set of citizens on the challenges of climate change and its effects." (TE p.61) The TE finds that communities have incorporated the conservation practices introduced, and that the creation of maintenance and operational guides have allowed for the sustainability of work implemented at the community level. The TE notes however that many communities still lack all the technical skills necessary, such as ability to build barricades, thus specialists are still needed for replication between communities. (TE p.61)

Institutional framework and governance Sustainability: The TE describes sustainability of institutional framework and governance as likely, and this TER agrees with that rating. During implementation of the project, the government of Ecuador implemented its own initiatives to ensure sustainability of the actions taken as part of the project. During project implementation, the position of Undersecretary of Climate Change was created as part of the Ministry of Environment of Ecuador. Under the management of the Undersecretary, the National Climate Change Adaptation Committee (DNACC) was consolidated, and now manages numerous programs and projects in the territory. Once again, the TE reiterates that moving forward the Ministry of Environment will need to play a leading role in future strategies, and also make funds available at the local level for decentralized management. (TE p.61)

Environmental Sustainability: The TE describes environmental sustainability as likely, and this TE agrees with that rating. The reforestation achieved in the Loja, Azuay and Portoviejo zones for protection of water resources is sustainable, as is the construction of water reservoirs and water efficiency systems, as these are likely to remain in use.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

There is not enough information to assess level of co-financing, as the project document discusses a large level of in kind/parallel co-financing which is not discussed in the TE. The project achieved higher than expected levels of co-financing from the Ministry of Environment, as the co-financing from the government of Ecuador was 6 times the expected level, at 655,000$ USD, which along with 20,000$ from UNDP totaled 675,000$ in co-financing (in cash). The TE does not discuss which aspects of the project the co-financing supported, but it can be taken as an important indicator of project sustainability that the Ministry of Environment invested more than it planned to originally.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was originally expected to last 5 years, from 2008-2012. A three year no-cost extension was granted through May 2015. (TE p.47) The TE notes that "delays in the implementation in the first half of the project have not affected the achievement of expected results thanks to significant additional effort and the involvement of all stakeholders. In this way, the project overcame lost time at the start and achieved an excellent level of execution." (TE p.7)

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

There are many indicators of a strong sense of country ownership in this project. One is the higher than expected level of country co-financing achieved by the project, mentioned above. Another is the involvement of public institutions, civil society, and both national and municipal governments in the implementation of the project. (TE p.61)

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: Satisfactory

The TE assigns a rating of "Highly Satisfactory" to M&E design at entry, and this TER assigns a rating of "Satisfactory" to M&E Design at entry, as all the components of a sound M&E system are in place.

The project results framework presented in the project document include SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound) indicators, baseline values, targets and verification sources. Responsibilities for M&E are defined, with the UNDP country office responsible for country-level monitoring, and the Ministry of environment responsible for monitoring at the project level. (Project document p.3) The project document also calls for a mid-term and final evaluation.

Although the indicators presented in the original results framework appear SMART, a finding of the mid-term evaluation was that some of the indicators proposed in the project document were outdated, with inoperative data sources, and outdated assumptions. (MTE p.16) The mid-term evaluation proposed revisions to these indicators, however based on the post mid-term PIRs they were not adopted. Considering the otherwise sound M&E Plan, a rating of satisfactory for M&E is justified.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: Satisfactory

The TE rated M&E execution as satisfactory. The TE notes that "The scheme of monitoring and evaluation was very satisfying. Project monitoring was carried out with a methodological framework and tools and criteria appropriate and rigorous monitoring and evaluation assessment, based on previous experiences of other GEF projects, incorporating the tools of the GEF and its most current developments." (TE p.44) The five PIRs available for the project report on indicator data in detail, as well as risk management, and progress toward gender equality. At the time of the mid-term evaluation only one PIR had been completed, in 2010 (MTE p.25) but after the mid-term review frequency of reporting appears to have increased, as one was provided every year until project closure in 2015. The TE notes that a challenge in M&E was the turnover in project coordinators, which required the re-establishment of M&E circuits of communication. (TE p.45) However, there is also evidence of adaptive management in the fact that project performance improved following the mid term evaluation.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE rated quality of project implementation by UNDP as Satisfactory, which this TER downgrades to Moderately Satisfactory due to the apparently poor performance in the first half of the project, noting the improvement following midterm review. The TE notes that the implementation approach was successful, especially in the second half of the project, when the approach was much improved by the mid-term review. (TE p.43) Interviews conducted as part of the TE found communication on the part of UNDP to be successful. As mentioned above, prior to the midterm evaluation only one PIR was produced by UNDP, but following the midterm evaluation they were produced annually.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE rates quality of execution by the Ministry of Environment as satisfactory, which this TE downgrades to Moderately Satisfactory due to some issues listed in the TE. The TE describes a bottleneck in the level of cooperation between the Ministry of Environment and communities. (42) The TE also mentions that high levels of turnover in the Ministry of Environment was detrimental to the project which was brought up in interviews. (TE p.44) However the TE also notes that the "procedures established by between the Ministry of Environment and UNDP with stakeholders following the midterm evaluation have allowed for proper project implementation and financial management, in

addition to satisfactory budget execution." (TE p.43) Administration of the project was handled from Quito, which worked ultimately due to the strong network of collaborators the project utilized. (TE p.44)

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project constructed reservoirs along the Babahoyo and Guayas river, and in the Azuay province built 10 small dams, 57 irrigation models, 53 organic farms and 20 water protection sources. (PIR 2014, p.55)

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project benefitted 22,224 inhabitants of 116 communities in Ecuador through its climate change adaptation initiatives, including water sources protection, native forest management, ecological latrines construction, and improved pastures. (PIR 2014 p. 56)

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The project had a strong focus on capacity building. In agro-ecological practices, "Of the 116 communities that benefitted from the implementation of climate change adaptation measures, 90% of beneficiaries apply water-saving and integral watershed management practices. These include a total of 22,224 people, of which 50% are women."(PIR 2014) The project installed hydro-meteorological stations

in the basin of the Cristal river, which produce information to feed models for maps of rainfall and temperature in the Guayas basin. The 2014 PIR notes that "The strengthening of capacities and the institutional work for the period of report have generated the formation of nearly 300 qualified persons as well as 1124 visits in the page of the project PACC (www.pacc-ecudor.org). There now exist 16 publications related to climate change, focusing on topics of training and scientific information." (PIR 2014 p.49)

b) Governance

The TE and final project implementation report also note that the project contributed to the National Strategy on Climate Change (2012-2025) and the National Plan on Climate change, currently the two most important national planning tools for climate change. (TE p.51)

During project implementation, the position of Undersecretary of Climate Change was created as part of the Ministry of Environment of Ecuador. Under the management of the Undersecretary, the National Climate Change Adaptation Committee (DNACC) was consolidated, and now manages numerous programs and projects in the territory. (TE p.61)

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts are noted in the terminal evaluation or other project documents.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

Local governments in project areas, and private companies such as ETAP, have made commitments to provide specific resources for maintenance of aspects of some project activities, (TE 61) however there is no evidence of adoption of GEF initiatives at scale.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

LESSONS LEARNED

GENERAL:

- Identifying community leaders or private individuals (men, women and youth) with leadership potential and incorporating them can create key allies in the process of project implementation, generating a dynamic social mobilization.
- Strengthening capacities of organizations that articulate interests in regard to the planning, management and participation in the dialogue with the government, can generate leaders trained in the language of projects and conservation principles. This is particularly important in projects involving vulnerable groups, such as indigenous peoples.
- The stakeholders of a project, regardless of their institutional affiliation, should have access to key information on project activities in a timely manner in order to establish changes if needed. This means that they should be constantly informed in order to make suggestions / changes / idea about each action. Duly informed and involved, strategic partners build confidence in the project's activities and transmit it to the highest levels of environmental authority, and the relevance of the topic, to the highest authorities. It is essential to maintain and strengthen the channels of communication, regardless of changes of authorities and even political-ideological orientations of decision makers.
- Governmental organizations involved in the process must be consolidated regardless of the intervention projects funded by the GEF, using tools of the legal framework and cooperation, given that changes in new institutions can generate major management problems to the extent that institutions do not have an institutional long-standing tradition that allows them to absorb these impacts and continue a strategic line of work.
- The active participation of indigenous leaders and community must be assured throughout the process of a project, from the design, the assembly of community meetings to discuss options for sustainable development, data gathering, listening in recommending courses of action and participation in policy decisions. This has a major impact on the sustainability of the project, to the extent that it responds directly to the needs of the communities where we work. The same applies to the participation of women, particularly the poorest, which are displayed in the literature on climate change as the most vulnerable.
- The role of autonomous governments (provincial and local and decentralized areas of the national government) is key to the achievement of results. Regional cooperation mechanisms established at local level are vital to ensure financial sustainability of any program. When such cooperation fails there is a loss of installed technical capacity at the local level.
- Projects should not focus only on areas with existing water management problems, but also areas where preventative measures can be taken.
- A broad sense of ownership of the project by the state is sufficient for the survival of the structure of a complex project to the extent that the key actors are in agreement on the structure prior to the conclusion of the project.
- The survival of a project where the private sector, civil society, and communities are involved, requires a strong commitment to this network of relationships on the part of relevant national and regional organizations and government counterparts.

- Incorporation of products in government organizations: When the tools developed by a program are accepted and internalized by national and regional authorities, a central part of the project's sustainability is ensured although its long-term use can be reviewed in the future.
- In projects where changes in policy direction produce gaps decision-making it is critical to have stability in project coordinators so that they can continue with the project operations even in times of lack of established policy line.
- The role of UNDP should be to support this process and in that sense mixed mode execution appears to be of great help. Mode full implementation by the government is particularly affected by changes in the political control and can lead to paralysis of the project. Direct administration by UNDP, improved efficiency in the use of resources and time devoted to resolving procurement issues.
- Designing field projects with the community and selecting them through public mechanisms generated adhesion and commitment on the part of all stakeholders, by supporting actions towards sustainability with equity.
- The role of companies like ETAP in direct political involvement of users through the signing of agreements for the preservation of territories should be replicated in other regions.
- Including consideration of gender, for example by the company ETAP, who ensured that agreements be signed by both women and men, should be considered as a model in all types of agreements.
- The endorsement by the PACC to the discussion of laws and regulations relating to climate change was highly relevant, however it exceeds the powers of a program to have goals such as the enactment of a law. In this regard, it should be reflected in the ML differently these contributions to changes in the environmental legal framework of the country as contributions / inputs.
- Incorporation of products in government organizations: When the tools developed by a program are accepted and internalized by national and regional authorities, a central part of the project's sustainability is ensured and its long-term use can be reviewed in the future.
- The scale of the project stresses the commitment of the national government. In projects involving areas of intervention over a vast territory, it has learned that it is necessary to be flexible, establishing replacement models in cases that have institutional political and climatic issues that prevent such targeting.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

1. Use all means to bring together producers and beneficiaries of the project with other programs for farmers, especially those which address climate change. Such as FORECCSA (food safety) and the Integrated Public Investment Project Management to Combat Desertification, Land Degradation and Climate Adaptation (GIDDACC) Change.

2. For visibility, generate a closing event that allows bringing together decision makers of international cooperation and external financing as well as various areas of government with projects carried out in the field in order to understand the scope of the project He had.

3. Formulate a media plan developed from the beginning of the project, including the recording of the various stages of access to a project, including field visits involving journalists, audiovisual elements to recommend expanding the awareness on climate change at all levels including schools and formal or informal groups working at local level. This plan must have the acceptance of the authorities of the Ministry of Environment and be integrated into the overall communication strategy of the national government and GADs on environmental issues.

4. Conduct a study on the effects of the project on the inclusion of gender in climate change projects.

5. Conduct a study on the effects on the urban and rural outmigration and the re-migration related to climate change, establishing potential impacts of the implementation of the project and contributing to a national adaptation strategy to consider the quality of vulnerability related to migration, the need for training and technical assistance required for returnees to rural areas, social conflicts of those returns. It is recommended in projects of this kind, include vulnerability indicators in the logical framework.

6. The key role of civil society organizations and producers in the field, as well as those providing technical assistance in areas of intervention, including tools should be enhanced to strengthen organizations emerging producers.

Recommendations to GEF and UNDP

7. It is appropriate to consider more realistic requirements of the projects financed. Proponents are challenged to pursue ambitious projects to be attractive targets. However, this puts at risk the achievement of results or extension involves successive installments.

8. Pay special attention to indicators developed within the framework of projects in order to allow proper monitoring and subsequent evaluation of the same, as far as possible, simplifying and adapting the scope of projects.

9. It is recommended that the focal points of GEF and UNDP in Ecuador immediately start operations necessary to give continuity to the actions implemented and ensure the sustainability of the achievements of this project, generating synergies with other projects dealing with climate change, including actions of the Ministry of Agriculture even when not directly related to climate change.

Recommendations to the Government

10. It is recommended that a working group focused on climate change that incorporates all Ministry of Environment projects with an impact on the subject is instituted.

11. It is desirable to continue the training of officials of the provincial GADs aspects of climate change, ensuring the incorporation of new staff in the event of institutional changes result in modifications.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains a detailed assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts, following the project's original logical framework.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent, although in some instances ratings are inflated.	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report contains a thorough discussion of project sustainability and exit strategy.	**S**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are comprehensive.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report contains total project cost, but does not discuss the in-kind co-financing reported in project documents.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The reports evaluation of project M&E systems is satisfactory.	**S**
Overall TE Rating		**S**

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER.