TERMINAL EVALUATION

Final Report

UNDP/GEF Project

"Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity into Production Sectors in the East Godavari River Estuarine Ecosystem, Andhra Pradesh'

GEF Project ID: 3936
UNDP/GEF ID: 4257
Agency's Project ID: 0076477
Evaluation Period: June-July 2019
Date of Evaluation Report: 18 July 2019
Country and Region: India, South Asia
GEF Operational Program: Biodiversity
GEF Agency: UNDP
Executing Partner: Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change
Department of Environment, Forest, Science and Technology, Govt. of Andhra Pradesh

International Consultant and Team leader: Amal Aldababseh adababseh@estidama-jo.com
National Consultant: C. Thomson Jacob tomson09@yahoo.co.in

July 2019

Acknowledgments

The Terminal Evaluation team would like to acknowledge the support of the UNDP India and the Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Climate Change and the Forestry Department during this evaluation. The consultant is particularly indebted to the Government officials, Programme team-UNDP India, and Project team in Kakinada / Andhra Pradesh, for their help in planning the focus of the review and organizing the mission.

The team would like to share the gratitude to all partners and stakeholders of the Project who gave of their time, and experience during the terminal evaluation and sharing their experiences and insights on this project. Without their valuable input, the work could not have been accomplished.

The team wishes to thank the local community representatives of the piloting sites and the local NGOs and CBOs and staff in the field, East Godavari District Government, AP Fisheries and Agriculture Department, Kakinada Municipal Corporation, M.S. Swaminathan Foundation, AP Pollution Control Board, and Village-level Institutions, who gave of their time during the field visit and proved to be very helpful, and informative, and all of whom were supportive of the project and its delivery.

ii. Table of Contents

List of Tables:

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Project Summary Table

Project Title: Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity into Production Sectors in the East Godavari River Estuarine Ecosystem, Andhra Pradesh management		
GEF Project ID:	**3936**	
UNDP Project ID (PIMS #):	**4257**	
ATLAS Business Unit, Award & Project ID:	**IND10, Award ID: 00060659, Project ID: 00076477**	
Country(ies):	**India**	
Region:	**South Asia**	
Focal Area:	**Biodiversity**	
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:	**Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity into production Sectors**	
Trust Fund (GEF)	**GEFTF**	
Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner	**Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change**	
Project Financing	at CEO endorsement (US$)	at TE July 2019 (US$)
[1] GEF financing:	**6,023,636**	**5,586,072**
[2] UNDP contribution:	**0**	**0**
[3] Government (in-kind):	**18,000,000**	**7,802,560**
[4] Other partners:	**0**	**3,861,890**
[5] Total co-financing [2+3+4]:	**18,000,000**	**11,664,450**
PROJECT TOTAL COST [1+5]	**24,023,636**	**17,250,522**
Project Document Signature Date	**8 June 2011**	
Closing date	**Proposed 30 Mar. 2016**	**Actual 31 Mar. 2019**

1.2 Project Description

The UNDP implemented and GEF supported Project "***Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity into Production Sectors in the East Godavari River Estuarine Ecosystem, Andhra Pradesh***" follows the national implementation modality (NIM). The Project executing agency is the Ministry of Environment, Forests, and Climate Change (MoEFCC).

The long-term **goal** to which the Project was designed to contribute is the *sustainable management of the globally significant coastal and marine biodiversity of India by mainstreaming biodiversity conservation considerations into production activities in the coastal and marine zones*. The Project was supposed to consider development imperatives, the need for sustaining livelihoods and addressing retrogressive factors including the anticipated impacts of climate change.

The Project's immediate **objective** is ***to mainstream coastal and marine biodiversity conservation into production sectors in the East Godavari River Estuarine Ecosystem.*** To achieve the Project's long-term goal and immediate objective, the Project has **three outcomes** and **Fifteen outputs**. The project's outcomes are:

- **Outcome 1:** *Sectoral planning in the East Godavari River Estuarine Ecosystem (EGREE) mainstreams biodiversity conservation considerations,*
- **Outcome 2:** *Enhanced capacity of sector institutions for implementing biodiversity-friendly sector plans including monitoring and enforcement of regulations, and*
- **Outcome 3:** *Community livelihoods and natural resource use are sustainable in the EGREE.*

The existing institutional arrangements in the EGREE at the time of the Project Design and development were quite inadequate in addressing key biodiversity-related issues from a landscape/ seascape perspective. The UNDP-GEF intervention aimed, therefore, to **mainstream biodiversity conservation into the production sectors of EGREE** through:

(i) Cross-sectoral planning in the EGREE that mainstreams biodiversity conservation considerations,

(ii) Enhanced capacity of sector institutions for implementing biodiversity-friendly sector plans,

(iii) Improved community livelihoods and sustainable natural resource use.

The project was designed based on key principles in order to balance conservation, livelihood and development needs in the EGREE, and to utilize potential synergies and minimize negative trade-offs: cross-sectoral approach and inter-disciplinary approach. These cross-sectoral and inter-disciplinary approaches were supposed to help in building a common diagnosis and shared vision; sharing information about past, on-going and planned development interventions; better coordinating and harmonizing existing interventions and investments; improving the design and alignment of future projects and programs; and identifying and addressing key barriers and bottlenecks to scaling up mainstreaming approaches.

1.3 Evaluation Rating Table

The Project's overall rating is **Highly Satisfactory** as the Project has achieved most of the intended results despite the delay encountered during its implementation. The detailed Project's rating is provided in Table 1.

Table 1: Rating Project Performance[1]

Criteria	Rating
Monitoring and Evaluation	
The overall quality of M&E	S
M&E design at project startup	S
M&E Plan Implementation	S
IA & EA Execution	
The overall quality of Implementation / Execution	S
Implementing Agency Execution	S
Executing Agency Execution	HS
Outcomes	
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	HS
Relevance: relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	R
Effectiveness	HS
Efficiency	S
Sustainability: **Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U).**	
The overall likelihood of risks to sustainability	L
Financial resources	L
Socio-economic	L
Institutional framework and governance	L
Environmental	L
Impact: **Significant (3), Minimal (2), Negligible (1)**	
Environmental Status Improvement	3
Environmental Stress Reduction	3
Progress towards stress/status change	3
Overall Project Results	**HS**

[1] *The rating for the main evaluation criteria is narratively highlighted in the report; other rating is not. Rating explanations: HS- Highly Satisfactory; S- Satisfactory; MS- Moderately Satisfactory; MU – Moderately Unsatisfactory; U – Unsatisfactory; HU – Highly Unsatisfactory; UA – Unable to Assess; N/A – Not Applicable Sustainability ratings: L – Likely; ML – Moderately Likely; MU – Moderately Unlikely; U – Unlikely. Impact ratings: Significant (S); Minimal (M); Negligible (N).*

1.4 Summary of Conclusions, Recommendations, and Lessons

Summary of Conclusions

Despite the unforeseeable political events that have effectually set-back project implementation, the Project managed to deliver considerable results by the end of its implementation. The Project implementing and executing agencies have provided satisfactory to high satisfactory support to project implementation. The project has demonstrated the capacity to create synergies and strategic partnerships with several key partners and stakeholders, which has succeeded in mobilizing a significant amount of additional funding, mainly from the productive sectors. The Project facilitated the implementation of a very successful and comprehensive capacity building programs and public awareness campaigns reached more than 32 thousand individuals. This is correctly reflected in the Project scorecards as it indicates that the Project has moved the capacity score up by **29** points since its inception **(60%).**

The constitution of the EGREE foundation establishes an important step towards the development of a formal institutional mechanism for mainstreaming biodiversity in the East Godavari River estuarine and coastal ecosystems. Yet, it was noticed that there were weak coordination and conflicting perception of biodiversity protection and management among government departments at the district level. This should be addressed to ensure EGREE Foundation sustainability and enhance work efficiency at the district level.

The Project has strongly invested in research and generation of knowledge on EGREE, particularly on the Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary (CWLS). Several masters students were involved in searching different topics in relation to mangrove protection in EGREE. The Project has successfully engaged main companies from the industrial and oil exploration sectors, which invested in promoting biodiversity conservation and enhancing awareness of their own staff concerning wildlife and biodiversity mainstreaming.

The Project is considered successful as it was able to mainstream biodiversity protection in production sectors. The Project also managed to deliver most of its planned results, however, with a substantial delay from the originally planned timeframe. Based on the review and assessment of the national context, the political situation during the Project's implementation, and taking into consideration the complex design of the Project, the project overall rating is ***Highly Satisfactory***.

The Project is very much acknowledged by the GoI, and very relevant to UNDP, GEF, and the Government's plans (at federal, state, and district levels). Yet, UNDP and GoI need to finalize an existing and sustainability strategy to ensure that the Project's deliverables and impacts are going to sustain after the closure of the Project. Nonetheless, with the confirmed interest and support provided by the UNDP and the GoI prospects for sustainability are certain, and overall sustainability is considered **likely**.

Recommendations

- ***Recommendation 1:*** The Project holds a workshop of stakeholders to adopt a comprehensive exit strategy to ensure the Project's results sustainability. The vision should provide a clear statement that conservation of the landscape and other natural values will be through a mixture of protection, alternative livelihoods, and sustainable use. (**UNDP/ MoEFCC/FD**).
- ***Recommendation 2:*** The Project's Knowledge Management System (KMS) and associated training programs to be officially launched at a national workshop. An urgent and clear plan of action needs to be developed to ensure this key knowledge management portal after 2019 to ensure Project's outcomes sustainability (**UNDP, MoEFCC/FD**).
- ***Recommendation 3***: In order to ensure the sustainability of the Project's outcomes (as it relates to the GEF Objective) it is necessary to institutionalize the Project's main results. The project should investigate embedding the EGREE Foundation at the Federal Governorate level through existing planning mechanisms and links to regional conservation plans. The possibility of extending the scope of work of the EGREE Foundation to cover the whole east coast of the country should also be investigated in order to utilize functional existed mechanisms. **(MoEFCC to implement, UNDP to assist).**

- ***Recommendation 4:*** In addition to the alternative livelihood programs implemented by the Project, it is important that the Government with the support of UNDP investigates the possibilities for community-based and private enterprise-based sustainable natural resource management systems. This should include:

  - income generation and employment creation through Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) (identification of ecosystem resources with economic values, processing, marketing, etc.), and

  - capacity building of community institutions, such as community-based organizations (CBOs), in governance, accountability, benefit distribution, etc.

- ***Recommendation 5:*** The Project managed to produce a set of valuable Project's documentation including public awareness products, factsheets, posters, kids' stories, technical notes, etc. It is recommended to develop a dissemination plan for those public awareness and outreach tools, to ensure that future initiatives would build on the Project activities and results and will incorporate the project's products in its work. (**UNDP, MoEFCC, FD)**.

- ***Recommendation 6:*** Capture lessons learned from this Project mainly on the role of the production sectors in biodiversity conservation and share at the national/ regional/ and global level (**UNDP CO**).

- ***Recommendation 7:*** The introduction of the Budget Head in 2016 has delayed project activities implementation tremendously. For new projects, UNDP CO and the Government of India to agree on a simplified procedure with a restricted timeframe to transfer funds from UNDP to executing agency **(UNDP, Government of India).**

Lessons Learned

Although the TE has made it clear that the time taken in implementing the project's activities is not in line with the UNDP/GEF project cycle timeframe, it is apparent that there is considerable progress on the ground and the project has successfully managed to achieve the majority of outputs despite the challenges faced the project due to the staff, government officials, and UNDP team-high commitments and interest to achieve the intended results. Hence, some of the lessons to be learned are:

- **Lessons Learned 1:** The dedicated commitment and efforts of the Project's team (MoEFCC, UNDP, FD, and PMU) are the main drivers of achieving the Project's major results despite difficulties and challenges the Project faced during implementation.

- **Lessons Learned 2:** The need for projects that are interacting with the ecosystem and natural resources use processes to follow an adaptive management approach that tracks the risks and assumptions as well as the indicators and to apply several different strategies. These elements should be clearly articulated in the project documentation (Project Document, LFM, etc.) and should be systematically and thoroughly examined during the project IW, annually, and at the MTR.

- **Lessons Learned 3:** More emphasis should be given to the project design stage and project inception phase. Incorporating all possible risks and assumptions when designing the project is critical to ensure the smooth implementation of the project's activities. For example, the Project site is a cyclone-prone area and this fact must be incorporated in project design.

- **Lessons learned 4:** Effective capacity development and comprehensive public awareness at the institutional, and individual levels are critical for achieving the project outcomes and to ensure their sustainability.

2. Acronyms and abbreviations

AKNU	Adikavi Nannaya University
APFA	Andhra Pradesh Forest Academy
AP PCB	Andhra Pradesh Pollution Control Board
APR	Annual Progress Report
AWP	Annual Work Plan
BMC	Biodiversity Management Committee
CDRs	Combined delivery reports
CIFT	Central Institute of Fisheries Technology
CO	Country Office
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CWLS	Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary
EA	Executing Agency
EDC	Eco-development committee
FD	Department of Forest
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEF CEO	Global Environment Facility Chief Executive Officer
GoI	The government of India
GRI	Global Reporting Initiative
IGCMP	India GEF Coastal and Marine Programme
IR	Inception Report
IW	Inception Workshop
JNTU (K)	Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Kakinada
KVK	Krishi Vigyan Kendra
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MoEFCC	Ministry of Environment, Forest, and Climate Change
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MPEDA	Marine Products Exports Development Authority
MSSRF	M.S. Swaminathan Research Foundation
MTR	Mid-term Review
NACSA	National Centre for Sustainable Aquaculture
NASCA	National Academy of Science and creative Art
NBA	National Biodiversity Authority
NEERI	National Environmental Engineering Research Institute
NETFISH	Network for Fish Quality Management and Sustainable Fishing Network for Fish Quality Management and Sustainable Fishing
NIH	National Institute of Hydrology

NIM	National Implementation Modality
NPD	National Project Director
PAC	Project Appraisal Committee
PBRs	People's Biodiversity Register
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PMU	Project Management Unit
Pro.Doc.	Project Document
RTA	Regional Technical Advisor
SBBs	State Biodiversity Boards
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SGP	Small Grants Programme
SHGs	Self Help Group
SIFT	State Institute of Fisheries Technology
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TED	Turtle Excluder Device
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistant Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDP CO	United Nations Development Programme- Country Office
UNDP-GEF	United Nations Development Programme- Global Environment Facility
VSSs	Vana Samrakhsana Samitis
WCCB	Wildlife Crime Control Bureau

1. Introduction

Terminal Evaluation (TE) is an integral component of the UNDP-supported GEF-financed project cycle management. This report for the TE of the UNDP/GEF Project "*Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity into Production Sectors in the East Godavari River Estuarine Ecosystem, Andhra Pradesh*" (hereafter called "Project") summarizes the full evaluation and the main findings of the TE in accordance with the UNDP/GEF terminal evaluation guide[2]. TEs should be carried out during the last 3 months of the Project implementation, however, this TE is scheduled after the operational closure of the Project and before financial closure, by the 30th of September 2019.

1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

As per the UNDP/GEF policies and procedures, this full -size UNDP/GEF project is required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. The purpose of the evaluation is to use the criteria of *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability,* and *impact*, to assess the project's status in achieving its intended results and impacts and the achievements of the project overall objective. This TE is intended to provide evidence-based credible, useful, and reliable information as it produces a set of recommendations and lessons learned to help guide future design and implementation of the UNDP/GEF Project. TEs also contribute to the overall assessment of results in achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefits. This TE must achieve the five standard purposes[3] of the UNDP/GEF project evaluation.

1.2 Scope and Methodology

Terminal evaluations are planned monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities of any UNDP/GEF projects according to the UNDP/GEF TE Guidance. The UNDP India Office initiated this terminal evaluation exercise during the last 3 months of the Project financial completion. It follows a participatory and consultative approach and focuses on ensuring close and continuous engagement with all government counterparts, state government, and local villages benefited from the Project, UNDP Country Office, Project team (Project Management Unit/ PMU), and key Project beneficiaries and stakeholders.

The TE team in cooperation with UNDP and the Project management Unit (PMU) conducted site visits to the Project's locations and interviewed key stakeholders, partners, and beneficiaries. The site visits were organized to ensure that key stakeholders and the project's beneficiaries were involved in the TE and to get their opinion and review of the Project's achievements, impacts, sustainability, efficiency, and relevance. The TE was carried out in accordance with the evaluation Terms of Reference **(TOR, Annex 1).**

The TE considered analyzing four major components; project implementation, Log-Frame Matrix Analysis (LFA) and strategy, adaptive management framework, and project performance. The evaluation focused on reviewing, analyzing and understanding project preparation and implementation phases, starting from the project's development stage (PIF formulation) to the current time. Special focus was placed upon the project's LFA to examine the rationale behind the project's design and consider how that contributed to achieving the objective and overall Government of India, UNDP, and GEF goals.

The project's strategy was also assessed, along with the project's main components, outcomes, outputs, indicators, and targets. A compressive review was conducted for the project's adaptive management framework. The evaluation included analyzing the project's risks, issues, and

---

2 http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf

3 *Project-Level Evaluation: Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects:* http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf: *promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose the extent of project accomplishments; synthesize lessons that can help to improve the selection, design, and implementation of future GEF financed UNDP activities; provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the UNDP portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues; contribute to the overall assessment of results in achieving GEF strategic objectives aimed at global environmental benefit; and gauge the extent of project convergence with other UN and UNDP priorities, including harmonization with other UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) outcomes and outputs.*

assumptions, assessing their validity, and the way in which the project has responded and managed risks and issues. Furthermore, the TE focused on evaluating the project's performance and the project's impacts over its lifetime. Consequently, the TE assessed the effectiveness of implementing various activities in achieving the Project's outcomes, and thus the effectiveness of the Project's outcomes on achieving the Project's objective.

The methodology consisted of several methods with an analysis of both qualitative and quantitative data. It followed a participatory approach and included three main stages:

- The *initiation/inception stage* of the TE involved desk review of Project-related documents that the TE considered useful for an evidence-based evaluation assessment (list of documents reviewed, (**Annex 2**)). After reviewing Project's related documents and developing a good understanding of the Project and its main achievements, an Inception Report (IR) was prepared and submitted to UNDP for approval on 1st of June 2019; it included:
  - a general overview of the Project and its main components;
  - the objective of the TE,
  - the proposed methodology of the TE,
  - the proposed agenda for the mission to India which was further developed during the mission **(Annex 3),**
  - a proposed list of people to meet with during the mission. This list was prepared based on the Project Document and the list of Project's stakeholders and beneficiaries **(Annex 4),**
  - An evaluation matrix to be used during the mission to India to guide the interviews with the project's stakeholders **(Annex 5)**.

- *Evaluation Mission to India:* an evaluation mission to India took place from 9-18 June 2019. The mission had three main activities:
  - **Consultations with the project's stakeholders via semi-structured interviews.** Interviewing key Project's stakeholders and beneficiaries to get updates on the project's activities. Findings were crosschecked during different interviews and with available evidence (Project documentation). The TE used a set of pre-prepared questions to initiate and facilitate the discussion with the stakeholders and ensure that all aspects of the TE are covered **(Annex 6)**;
  - **Observations based on the mission's interviews and meetings**. Visiting the Project's site in Kakinada and associated villages, meeting with the PMU, ePragati (national consultant), and local government, and stakeholders (minutes of the Project's site visits are summarized in **Annex 7**), and
  - **gathering details about Project's achievements**, reports, specific financial data and documents, and technical deliverables and cross-checking findings.

- *Preparing the Terminal Evaluation Report stage:* following the field mission to India, information and data collected were systematically and carefully examined in accordance with the UNDP Project Evaluation Methodology. Information and stakeholders' opinions with associated sources/ references and assumptions given, were used to develop the project's evaluation ratings and draft the TE report that was submitted to UNDP for review and feedback. It is UNDP India CO responsibility to circulate the report to key Project's partners for review. UNDP CO is also responsible to compile all comments on the TE draft report and share with the TE team. The response to these comments, whether comments were accepted and integrated into the TE report or not, is provided in the **"Audit Trail"** document (annexed to the TE final report). Audit trail document is considered by the UNDP GEF TE Guidebook as an integral part of the TE final report submission.

1.3 Structure of the Evaluation Report

According to the "*Project-Level Evaluation, Guidance for conducting Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-Supported and GEF-Financed Project*", the TE report is structured around four main chapters, an executive summary with a table showing the evaluation rating, in addition to several annexes, as follows:

- *Executive Summary:* Provides a comprehensive review of the project's progress along with the project evaluation rating, a set of recommendation and lessons learned.
- *Chapter 1:* provides a general project introduction, the project's objectives and goals, evaluation scope, and the TE methodology.
- *Chapter 2:* provides a detailed Project description including the problems sought to address, the Project objective and development context, the baseline indicators, expected results and Project's stakeholders.
- *Chapter 3:* describes the main finding of the TE in relation to Project design, implementation, results, and sustainability.
- *Chapter 4:* provides the TE conclusions, recommendations and lessons to be learned.

The maximum number of the TE report pages is 40 excluding the annexes. Annexes include TE's ToR, agenda of the international consultant mission to India, list of stakeholders interviewed, summary of site visits, list of documents reviewed, evaluation question matrix, the questionnaire used and summary of results, and evaluation consultant agreement form.

2. Project Description and Development Context

2.1 Project start and duration

The Project implementing agency is the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the executing agencies are the Ministry of Environment, Forests, and Climate Change (MoEFCC), Government of India, and Science and Technology Department, Government of Andhra Pradesh (AP), in cooperation with East Godavari District Government, AP Fisheries and Agriculture Department, Kakinada Municipal Corporation, M.S. Swaminathan Foundation, AP Pollution Control Board, and Village-level Institutions.

The Project Identification Form (PIF) was approved by the GEF on 24 January 2009 and the request for the CEO Endorsement was submitted to the GEF Secretariat on 21 March 2011. Government of India has signed the project document on 11th April 2011 and the UNDP signed it on 8th June 2011. The first National Project Steering Committee (NPSC) meeting of the GEF project was held on 05 July 2011 at New Delhi.

The Inception Workshop (IW) was held on 17 March 2012 in Kakinada. The main objective of Project's IW is to explain the objectives, outputs, and outcomes of the project along with expected results to all the stakeholders, operating in and around the project landscape. Further, local stakeholders were sensitized on conserving the coastal and marine biodiversity including mangrove forests that spread across the coast of Kakinada, including the Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary.

The stakeholder departments who participated in the workshop are: Andhra Pradesh Forests and Wildlife; Environment; Fisheries; Agriculture and Animal Husbandry; Industrial Science and Technology; Social Welfare; Rural Development; Tourism; Irrigation; Ports; Education; Salt Commission; Public/Private sector companies; Research organizations; Universities; Non-Government Organizations and Local Communities.

The Project should have been closed by 30 March 2016, but several factors caused a delay in its completion. Due to this unexpected delay in project implementation, two official extensions were granted by the UNDP based on a request received from the MoEFCC. The first request to extend the Project was submitted to UNDP GEF after the MTR, based on the MTR recommendation, and the second extension was requested in 2018. Two extensions were approved by the UNDP. The first extension allowed the Project to accelerate activities implementation, while the second extension allowed the Project to finalize the remaining activities as per the MTR recommendation. The second extension was granted on 6th November 2018. The newly approved project closure date was March 2019.

The causative factors for the delay are as follows:

- Political turmoil and institutional re-arrangement associated with the separation of Andhra Pradesh in two states. The demand for the formation of a separate state of Telengana by bifurcating the state of Andhra Pradesh.
- 2014 elections and election code - The elections during the period 2013 – 2014 were of immense significance for the region, in bringing the democratic process to function and stability at all levels in the governance process, however, these were encapsulated in a shroud of uncertainty.
- Change in the fund flow pattern delayed the project implementation (took 7 months for the transfer of funds) and currently 1.6 crore (approximately) is pending.
- The project was affected by 6 cyclones over the last 5 years. The intensity of the cyclonic activity was high in the EGREE project region.
- Initial setup of the project's management structures and governing bodies, including Project Steering Committees and, more importantly, the recruitment and establishment of the Project Implementation Unit was delayed by over nine months.
- Some of the sector plans, specifically, salt pans, fertilizers and ports, and shipping were not finalized due to delay in experts' recruitment. The TORs were complex, and it was difficult to find available national experts to conduct the work.

2.2 Problems that the project sought to address

The last few decades have witnessed rapid economic changes and the emergence of large scale production activities in EGREE. Currently, the main production sectors operating in the landscape/ seascape are fisheries, aquaculture, salt pans, manufacturing activities such as oil and gas exploration, fertilizers, edible oil, rice products, tourism, and ports. In addition, there is a dependency on the mangroves and marine resources by local villagers. These activities are impacting the overall ecological integrity of the EGREE, particularly the mangrove ecosystems in Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary (CWLS) and adjoining areas, with associated impacts on the livelihoods of local people. The existing institutional arrangements in the EGREE are quite inadequate in addressing the biodiversity-related issues from a landscape/ seascape perspective.

It is estimated that 30% to 40% of the degradation of mangrove forests has taken place in the last decade due to agriculture, aquaculture, tree-felling activities, and oil and pesticide pollution. Habitat destruction is the most serious threat to the long-term conservation of EGREE's globally significant coastal and marine resources. Large scale conversion of mangrove areas for non-forestry purposes such as edible oil refineries, ceramic factories, and fertilizer factories and a number of small-scale industries have led to considerable damage to the coastal and marine ecosystem. The rapid growth in shrimp farming has resulted in the conversion of agricultural fields and mangrove vegetation into aquaculture (shrimp) farms. These shrimp farms are located in revenue and private lands abutting the mangrove forests. About 14% of the aquaculture farms have been constructed on mangrove lands. Aquaculture farms are responsible for approximately 80% of mangrove conversion to other land uses in the 1990s. Aquaculture farms result in the increase of salinity of groundwater, among other adverse environmental impacts. Erstwhile mangrove wetlands converted to salt pans lead to increased salinity of groundwater and other nearby water sources. Ports and shipping activity contribute to habitat degradation. Direct impacts include habitat conversion for their construction along with associated industrial estates, which affects the health of the Godavari estuarine ecosystem.

The CWLS was declared and gazetted as a sanctuary in 1978 with a total area of 235.70 square kilometers under the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972, and it falls within the EGREE region. It was declared to regenerate mangroves and rehabilitate endangered species such as the Saltwater Crocodile, Olive Ridley Turtle, and the Indian Otter. The sanctuary provides rich habitats for marine living resources such as crabs and fish. It is the nesting ground of various migratory birds. The water in the forest supports a variety of animals such as the Mudskipper, the Jackal, monkeys and the Fishing Cat. There are various conservation strategies in place for protecting these forests such as bringing mangroves under the network of protected areas; demarcation of mangroves and a mangrove sanctuary, including its core areas, to avoid encroachments; taking up various protection measures through intensified watch and ward; taking up large-scale afforestation of banks by digging channels; growing seedlings in nurseries and planting them on the sloping edges of water channels; forming and strengthening the existing EDCs and Vana Samrakhsana Samitis (VSSs) for conservation of the mangroves through a participatory approach by providing welfare measures to the villagers living around the sanctuary to reduce their dependency on the mangroves, at the same time enhancing the livelihood of the coastal communities. Furthermore, the EGREE foundation along with the Swaminathan Foundation has restored the mangrove ecosystem by planted Mangroves in Coringa and Hope island covering 97.13 hectares

For conserving the mangrove species, mangrove nursery is raised in the intertidal area adjoining the Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary which has a Matlapalem canal. The bushes in these areas were cleared and the land was leveled. Irrigation canal for a length of 450 m and 19 sunken and the nursery beds were prepared with dimensions of 10 - 12 m length, 1 m wide and 0.2 m deep.

To enhance local communities living conditions while conserving the ecosystem, the Eco-tourism activities in CWLS were established with the collaboration of the AP Forest Department and the EGREE. The Eco-tourism activities in the region were initiated with the dual objective of (i) reducing pressure on the mangroves by creating alternative livelihoods for the economically backward local communities dependent on mangroves for their livelihoods, and in the process, (ii) supplementing their income levels. The mangrove cover at CWLS spreads

across an area of around 323 square kilometers. One of the main attractions at CWLS is the elevated boardwalk through the mangrove forest. It covers approximately 3.5 Km.

The boating experience offers an opportunity to enjoy nature and sight species of fauna including the Painted Stork, Spot-billed Pelican, Great Egret, Golden Jackal, Indian Smooth-coated Otter and even endangered species like the Fishing cats. The nature guides trained under the project were employed and they provide information on the various flora and faunal diversity of the sanctuary. The livelihood of the local communities has increased due to eco-tourism initiatives and the income for the year, 2017 has raised to INR 46,90,440.

Over-exploitation of resources is another major concern causing an ecological imbalance in the mangrove ecosystem. Subsistence and low-intensity fisheries face decreasing fish catch and increasing cost of operation. This often forces the local fisherfolk to adopt unsound and unsustainable fishing practices such as non-adherence to the seasonal ban on fishing and resorting to destructive fishing practices (such as the use of improper mesh size, etc). The commercial fishing sector that operates mechanized crafts has an even greater adverse impact on the fisheries resource base, and the increasingly significant decline in the fisheries resource base is disproportionately affecting local communities. Over-harvesting of juveniles is affecting the production cycle. Approximately 3,600 tonnes of mollusks are removed annually from Kakinada Bay and Coringa mudflats for lime production. Species of bivalves (Placuna placenta, Anadaragranosa, Macoma sp. Meretrix sp) and gastropods (Cerithediacingulata, Telescopium telescopicum) are regularly collected. The collection of seeds of tiger shrimp (Penaeus monodon) for the aquaculture industry is another major activity in the EGREE, which adversely impact coastal and marine resources.

The Project is working closely with State Biodiversity Boards (SBBs) and 4 Biodiversity Management Committees (BMCs) and playing a facilitator role in preparing People's Biodiversity Register (PBR). The project played an active role in molding the Coringa BMC in securing Biodiversity Award. EGREE also facilitated by extending services of the SBB field staff in collecting data for the preparation of PBRs within the jurisdiction of EGREE. EGREE is a member of the AP SBB represented by the CEO and the State Project Coordinator is a member of the Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS) committee of APSBB providing necessary guidance and seeking necessary cooperation from APSBB in project-related matters. The Andhra Pradesh PSBB conducts all the training and awareness meetings of East Godavari district in collaboration with the EGREE Project. EGREE has also facilitated organizing field visits of other BMCs to the EGREE region and organized media workshop on Biological Diversity Act by involving the National Biodiversity Authority (NBA) and MSSRF.

For conserving the biodiversity of CWLS, necessary awareness has been created among the fishing community on conserving the schedule species such as Shaw fish, Whale, Dolphin, Pondicherry shark, Sea horse, pipefish, Giant Grouper, Sea Turtle and Windowpane Oyster. Protective measures were taken for conserving species listed under the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972. Species-specific conservation measures are taken for the fishing cat, otter, turtle, waterbirds, etc. Under the project, an incentive amount of Rs. 18,000 was provided to the fishers who have released the Whale shark by cutting open their nets.

For reducing the over-exploitation of fishery resources, a square mesh cod end is provided for reducing the bycatch. Also, the effective implementation of the 61-day fish ban in the EGREE region is followed and this has resulted in a 20% increase in fishermen income. For conserving the turtle, Turtle Excluder Device (TED) is used by the fishermen and it was reported that there is an increase in the nesting vs hatching ratio of turtle and nearly 7,83,453 hatchings have been released into the sea during 2011-2018.

2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project

The EGREE region has witnessed rapid economic changes and the emergence of large-scale production activities such as fisheries, aquaculture, salt pans and manufacturing activities such as oil and gas, fertilizers, cement, tourism, and ports. In addition, the local communities are dependent on the mangroves and marine resources for their sustenance. These activities affect the overall ecological integrity, particularly the mangrove ecosystems and lead to loss of biodiversity. The existing planning and policy framework and institutional arrangements in the EGREE region do not adequately address biodiversity conservation issues from a landscape/ seascape perspective.

The Government of Andhra Pradesh (Departments of Fisheries, Forests, and Environment, Agriculture, Industries, Tourism, Rural Development, and so on) undertakes various activities in the project area aimed at improving the management of coastal and marine resources. However, these activities do not mainstream biodiversity considerations in the production sector. Mainstreaming biodiversity is the process of embedding biodiversity considerations into cross-sectoral plans such as sustainable development, poverty reduction, climate change adaptation/mitigation, trade and international cooperation, and in sector-specific plans. The concept of mainstreaming is advocated in Article 6 (b) of the CBD and is integrated into Section 36 of the Biological Diversity Act, 2002 of India. Article 19 (a) of the CBD stipulates that each party shall integrate as far as possible and as appropriate the conservation and sustainable use of biological resources into relevant or cross-sectoral plans, programs, and policies. The GEF project has successfully mainstreamed the biodiversity consideration into the productive sectors; it has also enhanced the capacity of the stakeholders and provided an alternative livelihood for the fishing community.

The Project long-term **goal**, as stated in the ProDoc, is the "*sustainable management of the globally significant coastal and marine biodiversity of India by mainstreaming biodiversity conservation considerations into production activities in the coastal and marine zones, while also taking into account development imperatives, need for sustaining livelihoods and also addressing retrogressive factors including the anticipated impacts of climate change.*"

The immediate **objective** of the Project is "*to mainstream coastal and marine biodiversity conservation into production sectors in the East Godavari River Estuarine Ecosystem."*

2.4 Baseline Indicators Established

Under the baseline scenario, the trajectory of production activities in the land/seascape surrounding the CWLS and associated degradation trends are likely to continue as there are persistent barriers in addressing the direct and indirect drivers of degradation. The existing planning and policy framework, as well as institutional arrangements in the EGREE, are inadequate for addressing biodiversity conservation issues from a landscape/ seascape perspective. In terms of making community resource use and livelihoods more sustainable, there is a lack of community-based resource governance systems and a lack of alternatives. The government of Andhra Pradesh is undertaking various activities in the project are aimed at improving the management of coastal and marine resources. The baseline is made up of diverse interventions being undertaken by the different sectors to further sector development objectives. The baseline forms the essential institutional structure into which mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation objectives needs to be pursued.

2.5 Main Stakeholders

During the Project implementation, the Project succeeded in involving stakeholders in planning, implementing and monitoring of the Project's activities. This project has involved multi-stakeholder communities such as government agencies, local institutions, communities, research organizations, NGOs, etc. to articulate their perceptions and to participate in decision-making.

Below is a summary of the main stakeholders at the national, state and local level and their role in project implementation:

1. ***Ministry of Environment Forests and Climate Change (MoEFCC):***

The MoEFCC provided administrative support and ensured regular monitoring and evaluation of the project implementation. It provided the required co-financing and also coordinated with other Ministries and Departments at the central and state government levels to ensure that the Project's activities are effectively implemented.

2. ***Department of Forests and Environment, Andhra Pradesh***

The Department of Forest and Environment provided the overall coordination of the project and ensured the regular monitoring and evaluation of Project implementation and facilitated the required changes in the institution and policy framework. It also coordinated with other departments at the state government level and ensured that the committed co-financing is made available for the project and also facilitated in releasing the project funds.

3. ***State Pollution Control Board:***

The Pollution Control Board regularly monitors the water quality in the creeks and estuaries and implements Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.

4. Line departments

The line departments included Fisheries and Aquaculture Department, Oil and Gas, Tourism, Port & Shipping, industries (Fertilizer) and Salt pans. These line departments were involved in the preparation of biodiversity-friendly sector-specific plans and took initiative in institution building activities such as capacity, training, awareness, etc. It facilitated livelihood and community extension activities by involving Government and non-governmental organizations.

5. Government Agencies

The Government agencies involved in this Project are Andhra Pradesh Industrial Infrastructure Corporation Ltd, Salt Commissionerate, District Rural Development Agency, Commissioner of Ports, Non-Conventional Energy Development Corporation of Andhra Pradesh Ltd, etc. These Government agencies facilitated the implementation of the sector plans and took a proactive role in capacity building, training, and awareness creation among the local/ village level institutions such as Community Based Organizations and Self-Help Groups, etc.

6. Local Government and departments

The local Government departments include Municipal Corporation, Gram Sabhas, Panchayati Raj Institutions, Biodiversity Management Committees, etc. These local-level institutions partnered in the implementation of community-based activities and administering landscape Regulation and control all the economic activities. It also implements the Coastal Zone Regulation Notification and develops sectoral plans for minimizing pollution load in estuarine/ bay ecosystem regions.

7. Community/user group based Organizations:

The community-based organizations include Self Help Groups, Mahila Samkhyas, Dairy Cooperatives, Joint Forest Management Committees (Eco-Development Committees), etc. These communities participated in the planning of budget, preparation of micro plans, capacity building and awareness initiatives of the project. Take leadership in the management of the resources ensuring sustainability and partner with other institutions and organizations in implementing the components of the project.

8. Research Organizations, Universities, NGOs, National Centre for Sustainable Aquaculture, etc

The educational institutions like Universities, research organization were involved in undertaking knowledge materials, databases, information systems, etc. These institutions have brought adequate capacity-building materials and conducted various awareness programs on sustainable livelihood activities, alternate resource uses and involved in the preparation of sector plans. These educational institutions mobilized communities and community-based organizations towards sustainable livelihood practices.

9. Industrial/ production (Small, Medium and Large) Enterprises

The industries and the production enterprises were involved in the preparation of biodiversity-friendly sectoral plans and took initiatives in incorporating environmental/ biodiversity conservation activities in their Corporate Social Responsibility (CRS) programs. Also, these enterprises were involved in pollution mitigation, turtle and whale shark conservation programs and organized various capacity building and awareness programs, training, exposure visit, competitions for the staff.

10. Media, both visual, audio and print

The media was involved in disseminating conservation-related activities to the relevant sections of the society and brought awareness about the project.

The list of stakeholders involved in the project implementation with a description of key partnerships established is fully discussed under section 3.1.4, Page 26.

2.6 Expected Results

The Project was designed to address the critical need to mainstream biodiversity conservation efforts in East Godavari in the production sectors. The ProDoc. discussed and described the three outcomes and the fifteen outputs to achieve the intended results.

The Project has brought many positive results in increasing the biodiversity of the EGREE region through an ecosystem-based approach. Following are some of the positive outcomes: a cross-sectoral platform to facilitate the implementation of biodiversity conservation is in place; more than 97 hectares of mangroves restored; biodiversity richness increased; mangrove genetic resources are conserved and propagated; nesting habitat of Olive Ridley and the bird population has increased. In addition, the project has brought about a behavioral change among the fishing community in reducing bycatch and protecting 9 marine scheduled species.

The mainstreaming approach has enhanced the resource base and generated local as well as global benefits. Most importantly, this project has encouraged community-based natural resource management by involving production sectors, eco-development committees, VSS, BMCs, SHG members and other local institutions. The local communities were trained in acquiring skills and capacity for generating alternative employment and this has subsequently reduced the over-exploitation of the natural resources and lead to the conservation of biodiversity.

Biodiversity Interpretation Centre was established at Coringa and a total number of 520 species encompassing fishes, snakes, amphibians, reptiles, and different marine specimens and 200 shells have also been identified, classified, marked and displayed at the Centre for creating awareness to the students and public. A marine museum was established under the EGREE project to provide awareness to the students and the public. The in-house library hosts approximately 1,500 information-oriented books and EGREE publications in different subject areas. The biodiversity laboratory also showcases 34 species of crabs and 15 species of snakes. Knowledge Management System was established and it is expected to help in accessing environmental data and information. This portal would be of much use for policymakers, environmental professionals, researchers, academia, etc.

EGREE is also networking with institutions such as Andhra Pradesh State Fishermen Cooperative Societies Federation Limited, Andhra Pradesh Forest Department, Andhra Pradesh Pollution Control Board, Andhra Pradesh State Biodiversity Board, MSSRF, Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Industries, and National Environmental Engineering Research Institute. Conducted special programs during International Whaleshark Day, Coastal Cleanup Day, Biological Diversity Day, Snakebite Awareness Day, Fisheries Day, Women's Day, Otters Day, Earth Day, Environment Day, wetland day, Wildlife Week Celebrations, etc. for creating awareness among the public about the importance of biodiversity conservation.

The EGREE foundation supports community-based organizations such as EDC, VSS, SHGs, etc and some of the activities supported are: Training on sustainable livelihood; Gender empowerment (formation and establishment of multi-cooperative society); Livelihood diversification; Socio-economic development; Exposure visit; and Village development. An apparel training center was established at Coringa, where a group of women come every day and do stitching work. The skill development programs helped these women earn around INR 2,000 to 3,000 and contributing 10 to 20% for their family revenue. Also, the project has brought unity, self-respect, and confidence among women group members and they have developed togetherness and help other SHGs in getting business contacts.

Effluents from major industries in and around Kakinada are discharged into the EGREE and Kakinada Bay. Spillage of offshore oil exploration and oil production and shipping result in pollution and bioaccumulation of heavy metals and synthetic compounds. The impact of oil spills, dredging, oil drilling, and the large scale fertilizer companies on coastal and marine natural resources affect the biodiversity of this region. Chemical run-off from aquaculture farms considerably contributes to the pollution of the estuarine and creek habitat. The rapidly growing urban agglomerations in the EGREE, particularly Kakinada, pose the issue of generation of a large quantity of waste and sewage that ultimately find their way into the Godavari Estuary in the business-as-usual scenario and exacerbate the degradation of the mangrove ecosystem. Maritime traffic is also known to have direct impacts on marine biodiversity. Indirect impacts

arise from increased sedimentation due to periodic dredging of navigational channels and other port-related activities, which impact marine and another biodiversity in this region.

AP State Pollution Control Board is a member of the Governing Body of the EGREE Foundation represented by its Chairperson. Periodical monitoring of pollution levels is the mandate of APSPCB. The mandate of the AP PCB is to monitor and control pollution. Some of the pollution control measures taken by EGREE is listed below:

EGREE conducted stakeholders meeting on pollution-related issues with the support and involvement of APSPCB. EGREE proposed to APSPCB for providing user-friendly pollution level indicator tool kits to community members to periodically test and convey the same to APSPCB for better and community participated monitoring of pollution levels which is under consideration by the APSPCB. APSPCB to Build Communities Capacities in Water and Air Quality monitoring in the EGREE region includes Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary to enhance Biodiversity. NEERI has proposed to Conduct Studies for establishing STPs in different locations by engaging 7 sectors. A study on the impact of Ports and Shipping in the EGREE region although Ballast water discharge was Prepared. Sectoral plans for oil and gas, tourism, aquaculture, fisheries, port and shipping, fertilizers and salt pans are prepared. The EGREE foundation worked with these sectors for integrating biodiversity concerns into their action plans. Micro plans for 41 villages in the EGREE region were completed and implemented for strengthening Self Help Groups (SHGs)/community-based organizations in natural resource use and sustainable livelihoods.

3. Findings

3.1 Project Design/ Formulation

The project was considered highly important and relevant to India at the time of design and development in 2010/2011. It remains very relevant to the GoI's global environmental obligations not only in relation to the UNCBD but also National Environmental Action Programme; National Environment Policy; the National Biodiversity Action Plan; the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); the UNDAF (mainly outcome 4), UNDP Country Programme and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) in India (mainly Outcome 4.3, output 4.3.2), and to the GEF global benefits and objectives. The Pro.Doc. thoroughly analyzed the biodiversity-related context, associated problems and barriers to handle, specified the needed outcomes, outputs, activities, indicators, targets, work-plans, and the needed budget per output.

Although the Project was developed before the SDGs, yet, it directly contributes to several SDGs. For example, **SDG Goal 14, conserve and sustainably use the oceans, seas and marine resources,** mainly these indicators**;** 14.1, 14.2, 14.4, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7 A, 14.7 B, and 14.7C.

India has a coastline endowed with a wide range of ecosystems such as mangroves, coral reefs, seagrasses, salt marshes, sand dunes, estuaries, lagoons, and natural habitats. The abundant coastal and offshore marine ecosystems include about 6,740 square kilometers of mangroves, including part of the Sundarbans, the Bhitarkanika, the Pichavaram, and the Coringa, which are among the largest mangroves in the world. These habitats and ecosystems store and cycle nutrients, filter pollutants, protect shorelines from erosion and storms, play a vital role in regulating hydrological functions and modulating climate as they are a major carbon sink and oxygen source, and, in addition, sustain livelihoods of coastal communities.

The coastal region that is the focus of the Project, namely the EGREE, is located on the eastern side of the Indian peninsula, in the State of Andhra Pradesh. A prominent feature of this coastline is its mangrove areas that extend over nearly 582 km^2 and are clustered in the estuarine areas of the Godavari River and Krishna River. The Godavari mangrove ecosystems alone constitute 321 km^2, making it the second-largest area of mangroves along the east coast of India. The area is rich in floral and faunal diversity and generates significant ecological and economic benefits such as shoreline protection, sustaining livelihoods and carbon sink services. There are 35 species of mangroves. There are important nesting sites for migratory turtle species, notably the endangered Olive Ridley turtle, the critically endangered Leatherback turtle, and Green turtle. The area is also an Important Bird Area (IBA) with a recorded population of 119 bird species, of which 50 are migratory. In recognition of its national and global biodiversity significance, a part of the EGREE area is gazetted as Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary (CWLS).

In addition to the biodiversity significance of the area, it is also of enormous economic significance. The last few decades have witnessed rapid economic changes and the emergence of large-scale production activities in EGREE. At the time of the Project design, the main production sectors operating in the landscape/ seascape are *fisheries, aquaculture, salt pans, manufacturing activities such as oil and gas exploration, fertilizers, edible oil, rice products, tourism, and ports*. In addition, there is a dependency on the mangroves and marine resources by local villagers. These activities are impacting the overall ecological integrity of the EGREE particularly the mangrove ecosystems in CWLS and adjoining areas, with associated impacts on the livelihoods of local people.

According to the UNDP/GEF Terminal Evaluation Guide, the TE team assesses and analyzes whether: the Project objective and components were clear, well-written, practical and feasible within the proposed timeframe and with the allocated budget; the ability and capacities of the Project's executing agency to implement the project's components in line with the proposed design; what lessons learned from other relevant projects were incorporated into the project design; needed partnerships to implement the project were properly incorporated in the project design; financial resources (including the cash and in-kind co-financing) were adequate or not;

the Project's assumptions and risks identified during the project preparation with the proposed mitigation measures, and the Project's outcomes and the proposed indicators were **SMART**[4]

The ProDoc stated how this Project will define the best way to get production sectors to factor in biodiversity conservation into their operations. The ProDoc also stated that "*it is going to require a significant change in thinking and practice*". Therefore, the Project was considered timely and urgently needed. The project was designed to help stakeholders and implementing partners in "*giving the appropriate "push" by enshrining this thinking in the legal framework, but it is equally about drawing the sectors into the discussion, bringing individual actors to the table, changing mindsets, providing training and tools, and providing technical and financial "hand-holding" to demonstrate the new paradigm, in turn, absorbing some of the perceived risks in changing current practices*".

The ProDoc correctly demonstrated that restoring and maintaining the ecological integrity of Andhra Pradesh's coastal and marine ecosystems is a desired long-term objective, and in order to achieve that, it "*will require a significant change in the governance approach that is currently being pursued with regard to production activities in the wider land/seascape surrounding ecologically sensitive areas*". In order to realize this change in governance and to mainstream environmental management considerations into major production activities that are impacting the Godavari mangroves in the area of concerns, with a special focus on the Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary, the Project design effectively addressed three sets of barriers: systematic and knowledge-related barriers, institutional capacity barriers, and community-level barriers.

Furthermore, biodiversity-friendly sector plans including monitoring and enforcement of regulations are prepared mainly focusing on imparting capacity building and training to sector agencies, so that each sector is able to effectively implement sector-specific biodiversity-compatible plans under the umbrella of the biodiversity-friendly, landscape-level Strategic Plan.

In order to facilitate replication of the project strategy to other coastal and marine environments a compendium of best practices on mainstreaming biodiversity for key production sectors prepared. Also proposed to develop revised management plan for the CWLS and technical and financial support provided for eco-restoration of mangrove areas, control of poaching activity, capacity development of enforcement personnel and local community members, participatory resource management, provision of better equipment, strengthening wildlife research, education and nature awareness; strengthening of infrastructure; wildlife veterinary care; staff welfare activities; eco-development and community-oriented activities; fostering ecotourism, etc. Effective monitoring, reporting, and evaluation system will be in place to assess the impacts of biodiversity mainstreaming activities.

The need for human and institutional capacity development, public awareness, and enhancing institutional coordination is realistically justified in the ProDoc. Based on most of the environmental initiatives analyzed during the Project development stage, the capacity of local communities, beneficiaries and stakeholders needed to be enhanced. Sustainable livelihood alternatives were also needed to release the pressure on natural resources. The Project correctly responded to these two main issues. In the project area, there are several community institutions e.g., SHGs, EDCs, Co-operatives, and Mangrove Protection Committees and Biodiversity Management Committees. In the 44 villages near the CWLS, there are 709 SHGs; 20 EDC; 16 Fishermen's Association; 33 Women's Organization; 5 NGOs; 17 Youth Clubs; and 5 Dairy Cooperatives are present and the members of these institutions depend on the estuarine ecosystem for their subsistence and there is a perceived decline in resources. The dependents received the needed capacity building for sustainable resource-based livelihood approaches/ alternate livelihoods, in this regard, several training modules were delivered such as sustainable farming, fishing, use of Turtle Exclusion Devises, sustainable aquaculture, horticulture, handicrafts, soft skills, value-added fish production, and marketing, etc.

Nevertheless, the Project design suffered from a major flaw which is related to the number of Project outputs and the interdependencies among these outputs. The project's log-frame is composed of 15 outputs logically connected to the three outcomes. The sequence of results involves many interdependencies among outputs, as they constitute necessary conditions for the delivery of others. This added more complications to the complex Project design.

[4] **SMART:** ***Specific***, ***Measurable***, ***Achievable***, ***Relevant***, and ***Time- bound***.

3.1.1 Logical-Framework Analysis (LFA)/ (Project logic/ Strategy, Indicators)

Projects' LFA are key monitoring and evaluation tool used as a base for the planning of detailed activities defined during the project development phase. It is very crucial for the project team to review the LFA during the IW, update if necessary, and agree on the new LFA. For this project, according to the Project's IR, the LFA has been reviewed, but no changes were made. The outputs and lists of indicators, targets, risks, and assumptions remain the same.

The LFA followed principally the GEF format and included targets with dates to be achieved at the outcomes and outputs levels. However, it was noticed that the timeframe proposed to achieve some of the targets is not realistic and did not take the national capacity and context into consideration. This resulted in some weaknesses in the LFA mainly in relation to the evaluation of the timeliness of the project's achievements. Table 2 provides an overview of the TE assessment of the Project's LFA and how "SMART" the achievements are compared to the defined end-of-project targets.

The ProDoc established a well-adjusted strategy to address challenges to make the balance between economic development, and population growth from one side and the weak or limited implementation of environmental regulatory frameworks on the other side. The strategy, as a well-presented plan, mostly addressed the degradation of mangroves areas, an important biodiversity-ecosystem, and provided support to critical economic and sustainable livelihood activities like fisheries. The Project strategy correctly identified capacity barriers (systematic, institutional, and knowledge), and risks and issues that might hinder the project implementation and hence consistently set the basis for a plan of action. Furthermore, the strategy survived through to the very-long project implementation period and effectively remained the strategy for the Project. The targets achievement per the end of the Project as formulated during project development-are generally realistic.

The Project indicator framework is very large, with 6 objective indicators, and 19 outcome indicators. The indicator framework also includes a capacity development scorecard specifically designed for the project composed of 16 indicators. It is obvious that the indicators have some issues of overlapping and relevance as summarized in the below table. The indicator framework should have been reviewed, streamlined and made more efficient by modifying it during the Project IW.

Table 2: Overview of the Terminal Evaluation of the Project's Log-frame indicators

Criteria	TE comments
Specific	Indicators are specific and target-oriented in general. A few expectations exist like one indicator under Outcome 1, "*Application of new EIA guidelines – that includes CC change consideration – to new manufacturing units entering the licensing process in the EGREE*". This compliance with EIA guidelines is already compulsory. Hence, the TE does not see this target as a direct consequence of the Project's work.
Measurable	The indicators are linked to measurable targets. However, some indicators are dependent on the measurement of the area affected by each one of the production sectors. For example, the indicator "*use of correct fishing gear by commercial fishing operations*". This target depends on the monitoring of these actions by different institutions and not only the Project.
Achievable	Many of the indicators are achievable; however, one indicator was not within Project control and hence it was difficult for the Project to achieve: "*Application of new EIA guidelines to new manufacturing units entering the licensing process in the EGREE*".
Relevant	Three of the listed indicators were irrelevant to the Project's outputs and components or were merely reflect achievement of a specific output like "Strategies developed for ensuring that existing sector policies mainstream biodiversity conservation", "Number of representatives from the key sectors (government and private) trained in mainstreaming approaches", and

	"Compendium of best practices on mainstreaming biodiversity for key production sector". One indicator under outcome 2 on "*Effluents from manufacturing units*" was also irrelevant as industrial pollution abatement regulated independently of the Project.
Time-bound	Some of the indicators are not well-linked to specific dates or the timeframe of implementation and enforcement are independent of the Project. Like "*Landscape/seascape area in the EGREE where production activities mainstream biodiversity conservation*". The time limit was not identified. And for this indicator "*Application of new EIA guidelines to new manufacturing units entering the licensing process in the EGREE*". It is independent entirely from the Project.

3.1.2 Assumptions and Risks

The Project's LFA included a set of risks and assumptions per outcome and output. The ProDoc discussed some of them under the key Indicators, Assumption, and Risk Section.

The main issue concerning the Project design is the main Project strategy, which is based on the assumption that economic development and population growth, together with uncoordinated and partially weak implementation of the current regulatory framework is causing degradation of mangroves areas and consequently threatening important biodiversity values, which in turn support vital economic activities such as fisheries.

The review of the Project's assumptions showed that some of these assumptions are not realistic. For example, one of the Project's indicators assumed that productive sectors are going to be heavily involved in the Project's implementation and that led to defining reduction of emissions from industrial effluents as the main indicator. However, it was noticed during the mission that most major enterprises, particularly from fertilizer production sector, count with environmental systems and certifications, and include strict safety measures to prevent accidental spills, effluent treatment, etc. Furthermore, large enterprises are very motivated to strictly comply with the current regulatory framework to avoid closure orders and legal challenges, as well as to comply with export or international safety standards.

The Project identified **Eleven Risks** during the formulation stage[5] and included risks rating and mitigation strategy. Eight risks were rated as medium level (M) risks while the remaining three were considered low-level (L) risks. The risks can be classified as political, operational, technical, environmental, and financial. However, during the Project implementation, the PMU did not identify any other risks even though the Project faced a major delay due to political, operational, financial and technical risks.

Risks weren't monitored by the PMU and the UNDP CO (no risk analysis/ management in APRs/QPRs, no update in ATLAS). The risks log could not be accessed by the TE team. Hence, the TE team believes the management of the Project's risks needs a lot of improvement, as they need to be carefully identified and monitored with concrete mitigation measures, and quarterly updated with a robust follow-up plan on mitigation measures. It was noticeable that many of the potential risks were not identified in the Pro.Doc. during the project formulation stage. Like the delays disrupting the sequence of activities of the project strategy, such delays could potentially jeopardize the logical links between the outputs and the outcomes.

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

The Pro.Doc. managed to explicitly incorporate lessons learned from other relevant projects. The Project design benefited from previous project development and implementation mainly those focused on strengthening institutional structures at different levels to bring in behavioral changes for managing natural resources in a holistic and sustainable manner. The ProDoc clearly mentioned three Projects:

[5] UNDP GEF Project Document, Section 2.4 Key Indicators, Risks, and Assumptions. Pages 36-38.

- ***GEF-UNDP-Gulf of Mannar Biosphere Reserve project***. wherein an integrated, multi-sectoral approach was adopted that demonstrated the critical linkage between improved coastal and marine biological resources and the livelihood security of local people. As a result of the Project's efforts that largely focus on inter-sectoral coordination for improving biodiversity and livelihood security, the coral cover in the Gulf of Mannar region has increased by about 7 percent since 2006. One of the important lessons emerging from this project has been the need to establish a body with adequate powers to govern and manage the Biosphere Reserve, and the need to direct the actions of all line departments/ agencies in the Biosphere Reserve as a fully integrated program.
- ***Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM)*** – has developed models of viable and ecologically sustainable community-owned ecosystem-based enterprises with high replication potential in the national and sub-national context. Lessons from the CBNRM project were applicable to this Project's efforts to make livelihoods more sustainable, from a conservation and well-being point of view, for the local communities reliant on the natural resources of the EGREE.
- ***GEF-World Bank aided project – India Eco-development Project (1996-2004)*** – has shown that involving local communities by providing alternative livelihoods is key to the conservation of biological diversity and the lessons from this project have resulted in upstream policy engagements and the amendment of the national wildlife legislation (e.g. the strategy of establishing Conservation Trusts/ Foundations for priority conservation areas in the country).

The Project built on the lessons learned and experiences gained from these projects and thus avoided some risks and issues that might have hindered the Project implementation.

3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation

The Pro.Doc. reflected the findings of numerous and extensive consultation that took place at different levels during the Project development/ formulation phase. Annex 6 of the Pro.Doc. presented main stakeholders, consultations findings, and provided a consultation plan. Consultations with stakeholders were carried out in three phases; first phase which focused on local communities and associated institutions (May 7th- 26th 2010); second phase which focused on CBOs, and departments agencies (10 June – 8th July 2010), and the last phase focused on filling any missing information gap from the first two phases (25th – 30th July 2010).[6]

Also, the ProDoc documented the series of consultations that were carried out with private production sectors like Reliance Petrochemicals, Nagarjuna Fertilizers, Godavari Fertilizers (*Coramandal International limited*), Fisheries, Aquaculture, tourism, ports, and salt pans. The consultations focused on identifying what these sectors can do as part of their CSR as their spending on biodiversity conservation and environmental protection were very little.

The ProDoc provided details on stakeholder participation in Project implementation. At the demonstration sites, the Project focused on stakeholder's involvement in planning, implementing and monitoring of the project activities. The Project was able to "*build capacity at this level by enabling multi-stakeholder communities to articulate their perceptions and to participate in decision-making*"[7]. Furthermore, the ProDocidentified around 44 villages to benefit from improvements in resource management and the sustainable maintenance of natural resources, both regarding their living environment as well as their health and welfare.

To the TE team and based on the field visits to a few villages and some beneficiaries, the Project managed to reach to a wide range of stakeholders to involve them in various capacity building activities, sustainable livelihood training, workshops, and public awareness events. The Project organized a very comprehensive district-wise capacity building program in Kakinada. The total number of training programs, public awareness events, and knowledge sharing events reached **984** events. Around **32,681** locals have participated in these training programs, around **56.4%** were females. A complete list of these events organized and supported by the Project is presented in **Annex 8**.

[6] Project Document. Annex 6.

[7] Project Document. Section C.4. Stakeholder Involvement. Page 41

The TE team also noticed the strong partnerships between EGREE and different Departments at the Andhra Pradesh State. Government ownership of the Project's activities was obvious. Government officials showed strong interest to continue the work that has started under the Project to ensure the sustainability of the Project's results and impacts.

In conclusion, the Project has managed to involve many stakeholders in Project implementation and hence the stakeholders' participation has been planned sufficiently.

3.1.5 Replication approach

The Project was catalytic in mobilizing actions by key production sectors in the Godavari area and other stakeholders to overcome existing barriers and introduce new strategies and technologies that helped in improving the conditions of the natural resources and increased the stability, integrity, and productivity of the coastal and marine ecosystems. More importantly, building on the opportunities for community-based or stakeholder-based resource management, the Project managed to promote a participatory natural resource planning and management strategy, involved large scale stakeholders such as production sectors, strengthening of village-level institutions, and development of the capacity to enable stakeholders to undertake micro-level planning and management of natural resources. The Project enhanced the capacity of functionaries of different sectors, NGOs and CBOs to promote participatory resource management. One senior official noted that the Project is unique as it focuses on one key ecosystem within specific geographic areas, so it managed to successfully achieve its goal. This could be an example to follow in other geographical areas or for other ecosystems.

The Project's long-term results; the developed capacity, the enhanced public awareness, the established infrastructure and facility like the Livelihood Center, the Conservation Center, Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary walk board, the Birds Paradis in Coromandel International and the developed *Knowledge Management System* (KMS) would ensure the sustainability of global environmental benefits and outcomes' replicability of the key principles. There are various aspects of project design that facilitate replication:

- Firstly, the Project strengthened the enabling environment for biodiversity mainstreaming into production sectors by proposing strategies on amendments and methodological guidelines to complement existing policies so that they are more explicit on mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation considerations. There are currently 4 sectoral plans finalized and 3 drafted.
- Secondly, the project undertook various research studies and cooperated with key universities to address key knowledge gaps that impede the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation considerations in the activities of production sectors. These studies should also be easily accessible through the knowledge management system that is being established by ePrageti.
- Thirdly, the project's training programs that were conducted in associated with existing training institutions operating in the State would help make these training models and programs accessible resource to other coastal and marine areas where there is interest in replicating the Project approach. For many training programs, manuals and handbooks were prepared.
- The cooperation with the key Universities at the State level on establishing Mangrove nursery and the plan to establish Mangrove Genetic Data Bank would enhance learning-by-doing and facilitate planting different species of Mangrove in other States.

The Project developed comprehensive sets of documentation including learning series, illustration books, stories for kids, a mobile exhibition, mugs, posters, leaflets, flyers and T-shirts with key messages about; CWS, the key species in the area to protect, the Mangrove, etc. These items can be used to raise awareness, manage knowledge, and facilitate replicability.

3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage

UNDP is the GEF Implementing Agency for this project, with the UNDP Country Office responsible for transparent practices, appropriate conduct, and professional auditing. The Project was implemented in line with established GoI and UNDP procedures. According to the Government of India and the UN Sustainable Development Framework (2018-2022), UNDP is the designated UN agency to lead outcome 5 under Priority V, in cooperation with other UN

agencies: ***Priority V***. *Climate Change, Clean Energy and Disaster Resilience*. ***Outcome 5:*** *By 2022, environmental and natural resource management (NRM) is strengthened and communities have increased access to clean energy and are more resilient to climate change and disaster risks*.

UNDP comparative advantages lie in its global experience and local presence in integrating policy development, developing capacities, and providing technical support. UNDP support in designing, accessing the GEF funding, and implementing activities are consistent with the UNDP, GEF and the Government plans. Government officials at central and district levels appraised UNDP for its role in developing and implementing the Project. A senior official stated that "*we learned a lot from the project, and we appreciate UNDP efforts in supporting the Government of India in implementing this project, without UNDP support at different levels, it could have been difficult to successfully implement the Project due to its multi-sectoral nature."*

Furthermore, UNDP CO in India is leading the implementation of several projects related to Climate change, Resilience and Energy, hence, UNDP has the capacity at the national level to provide the Government with political, technical and operational support.

3.1.7 Linkages between the Project and other interventions within the sector

The Project was successful in building key strategic partnerships, cooperating with important institutions, and building linkages with other projects. It collaborated with and built on the success of different national projects funded by other donors and development partners, with other UNDP, UNDP/GEF, and GEF funded projects. Among those projects:

- *Integrated Coastal Zone Management Project (World Bank, GoI, 2010–2017, US$ 286 million*). The project supports capacity building for effective coastal zone management at the national level.
- Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Production Sectors in Sindhudurg Coast in Maharashtra Project (UNDP, MoEFCC, 2011–2016, US$ 3,438,294) was funded through the GEF. The Project collaborated well with this project to enhance the capacity of sector institutions for implementing biodiversity-friendly conservation measures and exchanged knowledge in relation to sustainable community livelihoods and natural resource management best practices.
- Enhancing climate resilience of India's coastal communities: a newly approved Green Climate Fund Project. Total GCF funds are 43.4 M USD. The project will focus on protecting and restoring the natural ecosystems of India's coastal zone to strengthen the climate resilience of coastal communities. The GCF project benefited from this Project's successes. According to the GCF Project document, "*this proposal builds on the successes of existing initiatives along India's coast that promote climate change adaptation and/or ecosystem protection and restoration (particularly the UNDP Sindhudurg and EGREE projects) and draws strongly from the lessons learned through such initiatives*."[8]

Overall, the Project was active in cooperating with key ongoing and new initiatives. This cooperation has positively affected the Project's implementation and enhanced its visibility.

3.1.8 Management arrangement

The MoEFCC was designated as the Executing Agency (EA) and the main beneficiary following a NIM implementation modality. It assumed the overall responsibility for the achievement of the Project results. However, the Department of Forests, Government of Andhra Pradesh was designated as the 'Responsible Party' for implementing the project at the State level. UNDP is the Senior Supplier and the GEF Implementing Agency (IA) responsible for transparent practices and appropriate conduct. Further, UNDP is also carrying the Project Assurance role[9]. Due to the administrative structure of India, the Project had two Project Directors, two Steering Committees and two Management Units; one at the National level and one at the State level.

[8] GCF Proposal. Section G.1. Risks Assessment Summary. Page 9.

[9] According to GEF, the Project Assurance role is meant to support the Project Board (PB) by carrying out independent and objective project monitoring and oversight functions

The Project faced serious issues led to delaying[10] the implementation of major activities, these issues could be summarized as follows:

- The unanticipated events and political turmoil related to the separation of Telangana, compounded by the multi-level electoral processes in 2014 and 2019. The separation of Andrah Pradesh in two states (bifurcating the State of Andhra Pradesh) in 2011. The event turned out to be tumultuous as people from different districts opposed bifurcation with a series of processions, strikes and shouting down activities (water supply, electricity, business) for several months for around a year. As a result, many of the Government officials have changed due to the major reorganization of government officials. According to MTR, the project was affected significantly by the 2014 election "*a total period of 114 days during the period there were restrictions on state and civil function*."[11] The 2019 State and National election affected the Project implementation as well. During the election period, restrictions are in effect like sanctioning of projects cannot be made; public schemes and disbursal of committed activities are not allowed.
- The complex setup of the project implementing and management structures and the delay in hiring the project team (around 9 months).
- One problem was related to the mobilization of national experts. The project faced some challenging in recruiting sector experts and thus the work on the sector's plans was delayed. Up until the TE time, 3 sector plans were not final (fertilizers, salt pans, and ports and shipping).
- Natural disasters. The 2014 Cyclonic activity has disturbed the project implementation. The AP State is well known for being vulnerable to tropical storms and cyclones. As stated in the MTR, 6 major cyclones (many of them rated as very severe cyclonic storms) hit the Project's area and hence affected the Project implementation.
- Frequent changes in EGREE's CEO. The Office of the CEO is usually headed by a director of a state department. This position is very critical for the Project and now for the sustainability of the Project's impacts and results. However, directors have a varied array of roles and responsibilities spread over a vast geographical area. This has greatly affected the Project as some CEO had only spent a few months and then left.
- New funds flow decision, 2016: is one of the most substantial financial management challenges was encountered in year six of the project. In September 2016 the GoI took the decision that funds from all externally supported projects be channeled from that time on through a Government budget head. Thus, for this project, instead of UNDP CO in Delhi releasing funds directly to EGREE Foundation, the fund would go from UNDP to the Government, namely MoEFCC, then to the State Government, then to the District and from it to EGREE Foundation. This caused significant delays in 2017, 2018 and 2019 in implementing certain project activities. The Project had some funds from 2016 to operate until mid-2017 when the project started to face challenges as funds ran out. Though the Problem was significant and had caused a major delay in implementing the remaining Project's activities, the problem was not completely resolved, and the project has still not received funds as of the time of the TE.

Due to these issues, the proposed Project management arrangement was modified. However, these changes were not fully discussed or documented in the NPSC meetings. Below is a brief description of the adopted Project management arrangement:

A ***National Project Director*** **(NPD)** was nominated to coordinate project execution on behalf of GoI and ensure its proper implementation. The NPD was responsible for overall project management including adherence to the AWP, achievements of planned results and ensuring coordination with various Ministries and agencies. The TE team noticed that the current NPD is actively engaged in project implementation at the national level.

The Project Document stated the need to establish a ***National Project Steering Committee (NPSC)***. This Committee is responsible for making appropriate management decisions to ensure that the project is implemented in line with the agreed-upon project design and consistent with national and state-level development policies and plans. The NPSC was a combined one with the UNDP/GEF sister project *"Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Production Sectors in the Sindhudurg Coast, Maharashtra".* Its

[10] The delay was for reasons beyond the capacity of the Project's team.
[11] Project MTR Report. Page 41.

membership includes all concerned departments at the National level. The NPSC was supposed to meet at least twice a year and provide the needed oversight to the project. To date, 8 NPSC meetings were organized to discuss and review the Project's technical deliverables.

A ***State Project Steering Committee (SPSC)*** was established on 2 August 2011 in Andhra Pradesh with representation from all key state Departments/ Agencies to direct and oversee project implementation and management at the state level. SPSC was chaired by the Special Chief Secretary Environment, Forest Department, Andhra Pradesh. The SPSC included 18 members representing relevant State Departments, Agencies, representatives of MOEFCC and UNDP and other stakeholders including the private sector/industries nominated by the State Government.

The ***National Project Management Unit (NPMU)*** is located at MoEFCC. The NPMU was managed by a full-time Project Manager (PM) and Project Assistant (PA). The NPMU coordinated exchange of information among the two projects developed under the India GEF Coastal and Marine Programme (IGCMP) and open channels of communication with other similar programs/ projects in India for ensuring synergy and initiating upstream policy engagements.

A UNDP Programme Officer was appointed as the ***Project Assurance***. UNDP's primary responsibility under this partnership was to render the Project Assurance function by providing independent feedback (through periodic monitoring, assessment, and evaluation) on how appropriate project milestones are managed and completed.

The Government of Andhra Pradesh designated the Chief Wildlife Warden as the ***State Project Director (SPD)***. The SPD was responsible for the overall implementation of the project at the State level, including adherence to the AWP and achievement of planned results as outlined in the Project Document, and for the use of project funds through effective management and established project review and oversight mechanisms. The SPD ensured coordination with UNDP, MoEFCC, various Departments and Agencies; and provided the needed administrative and financial support.

A ***State Project Management Unit (SPMU)***. The SPMU comprised of a State Project Coordinator (SPC) and a Financial Assistant (FA). Under the direct supervision of SPD, they worked closely with the SPSC and the Landscape Level Project Management Unit (LLPMU) to ensure that the project activities are proceeding as per the schedule and facilitate the effective state-level implementation of the project.

Landscape Level Project Management Unit (LLPMU): The implementation of the Project at the landscape level was carried out through LLPMU, which was hosted within the envisaged cross-sectoral institutional platform, the EGREE Foundation. The Foundation was a registered body represented by all key stakeholders in the area (including private sector/ industries) and have a ***Governing Body (GB)*** and Executive Committee (EC). While the GB provided overall guidance for the smooth implementation of the Project, EC was responsible for carrying out the day to day implementation of the Project. The Project merged the SPSC with the LLPMU to facilitate the project's work.

A group of subject specialists hired by the Project through EGREE Foundation in order to "*provide all technical leadership and support for the project implementation, monitoring & evaluation, and adaptive management*"[12]. The Project team decided to hire the needed specialists for long-duration rather than hiring many experts for short durations to save time as the procurement and recruitment processes take time and to ensure that these experts take the needed time to understand the Project. As a result, 21 national experts were hired by the Project instead of the 54 proposed in the ProDoc **(Table 3).** However, 20 Project's staff were hired in full-time and part-time bases to provide the needed technical and administrative support **(Table 4).**

[12] UNDP GEF Project Document, Page 56.

Table 3: The list of experts who were involved in the Project implementation

Technical Assistance Consultants Position	Proposed at Project Design	Actual Implementation
Legal Expert	1	1
Conservation Biologist	11	2
Socio-economic and Livelihood Specialist	11	2
Communication and Outreach Specialist	11	1
Lead Specialist on Preparation of the Strategic Plan	1	2
Research Gap Analysis Specialist	1	1
Resource Economist for PES study	1	1
Biodiversity Specialist for PES Study	1	
Climate modeling specialist for a climate impact study	1	
Biodiversity specialist for Climate Impact study	1	
Coastal Geomorphology and Hydrology Specialist for Climate Impact Study	1	
Specialists for other studies identified as research gaps analysis	1	-
Database Manager for knowledge management center	1	Institutional Contract
Database Assistant for knowledge management center	1	
Specialist for long term institutional and financial study	1	-
Law Specialist for developing strategies for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into sector policies	1	-
Sector specialists for the preparation of BD sector plans.	1	8
Training specialists	1	-
National Expert on the preparation of compendium on best practices	1	1
M&E Specialist	1	-
Development of Capacity Development Scorecard for various Sectors	1	-
MTR National Consultant	1	1
Biodiversity, Livelihoods & Resource Economics Specialist	1	-
TE National Consultant	1	1
International Expert on the preparation of compendium on best practices	1	
MTR International Consultant	1	1
TE International Consultant	1	1
ePrageti	0	1

Table 4. Project team

Position in the Project	**Nature of assignment**
State Project Director, PCCF &CWLW	Part-time (financed by the Government)
CEO & CCF	Part-time (financed by the Government)
Addl. CEO & DFO	Part-time (financed by the Government)
Addl. CEO &DFO	Part-time (financed by the Government)
State Project Coordinator	Full-time
Technical Officer	Full-time
Finance & Administrative Assistant	Full-time
Socio-economic Officer - National UNV	Part-time
Communication and Outreach Specialist	Full-time
Conservation Biologist	Full-time
Research Assistant-Livelihoods	Full-time
Field Assistant-Conservation Biology (2 positions)	Full-time
Field Assistant-Conservation Biology	Full-time
Field Assistant- Livelihoods	Full-time
Data Entry Operator	Full-time

Finance Assistant	Full-time
Project Officer	Full-time
Partnership Development Officer	Full-time
National UNV	Full-time
National UNV	Full-time

3.2 Project Implementation

In line with UNDP/GEF TE guidelines, the following six areas of project implementation have been assessed (1) adaptive management; (2) partnership arrangements; (3) feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management; (4) project finance; (5) monitoring and evaluation; (6) design at entry and implementation, and UNDP and EA roles. A scale of six-level was used to rate the achievements of project implementation and adaptive management in terms of the criteria above[13]. Ratings are summarized in the TE Ratings & Achievements table 1, Page 6. However, a narrative description of the complete evaluation and rating of the results is provided in the following paragraphs:

3.2.1 Adaptive Management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)

The Project correctly applied adaptative management due to the complex political and operational situation the Project had to operate within mainly; (1) the bifurcation of AP State, (2) a major delay in the inception phase due to major delay in assigning the project team, (3) natural disasters and associated damage affected the area mainly cyclones, and (4) changing funds head. The Project team in collaboration with concerned government officials at National and State levels as well as with UNDP were able to operate and implement the Project despite the difficulties they faced on the ground.

The TE observed key adaptative management measures taken by the Project, so far, most of these measures were not documented or discussed in the Project's steering committee meetings:

- The hiring of long-term national experts instead of short-term consultants to undertake critical technical work. This was done to avoid wasting a lot of time pertaining to the long procedures followed to hire consultants. This decision perfectly supported the Project as many of the national experts worked for almost the entire period of the Project implementation. They were fully aware of the Project's components and have good knowledge of the Project's stakeholders and beneficiaries.
- The Project simplified the management structure by merging of national project steering committees of two mainstreaming coastal and marine projects commissioned in the East and West Coast of India.
- The Project facilitated the Project implementation by merging of State Project Management Unit of Godavari Project with its Landscape Level Project Management Unit at Kakinada that helped smooth decision making and quick implementation of the Project's activities.
- One of the key adaptive management measures was the involvement of UNVs. For example, it was observed during sites visit that the socio-economic and livelihood officer (a national UNV) was very close to the local community, very knowledgeable of the local context, and knew the Project's beneficiaries and stakeholders very well. Furthermore, the inclusion of skilled and knowledgeable UNVs in Project implementation did not represent a burden on the Project financial resources. The UNVs staff was able to provide financial, technical and administrative support to the Project.

In conclusion, the Project implemented some adaptive management measures that enabled it to make good progress despite the key issues faced by the Project.

[13] UNDP/GEF TE Guideline: Highly satisfactory (HS) - the project has no shortcomings; Satisfactory (S)- minor shortcomings; Moderately satisfactory (MS)- moderate shortcomings; Moderately unsatisfactory (MU) - significant shortcomings; Unsatisfactory (U)- major shortcomings; and Highly unsatisfactory (HU) - severe shortcomings

3.2.2 Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

The Project was very successful in arranging partnerships with the main stakeholders for the implementation of the Project's activities. The ProDoc proposed to set up a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) as the project "*requires strong technical leadership and high levels of coordination due to its multi-sectoral nature".* It was proposed that the TAG "comprises of subject matter specialists who will provide their expertise for achieving project objectives."
The Project developed several crucial partnerships with the relevant national and state-level organizations, universities, and individuals. State partners started to recognize the EGREE foundation as a qualified foundation to provide technical advice. EGREE Foundation was contracted by different organizations to undertake certain technical tasks. Several agreements/MOU were prepared to serve this purpose, however, the TE could not get access to the signed MOU. The Project through its work with the Production Sectors managed to establish good cooperation with companies, projects, and NGOs. Below is a summary of the MOU reviewed during the TE mission:

Name of the partner	Date of agreement	Purpose of the partnership	Results
GMR Energy Limited	2nd July 2016	Preparation of report on biological parameters including flora and fauna. Inventory of biodiversity and creation of a database Mitigation measures to negate the likely impacts by anthropogenic effects Establishing biodiversity baseline community structure and species composition Report on the current status of wildlife Report on the current status of pressures on protected areas Projected impacts of projects on wildlife, habitat management and access/ use of the resource by various stakeholders Identification, prediction, and quantification of possible impact due to the proposed development on the nearest ecological sensitive areas Support data and report to comply necessary information required for National Board for Wildlife (NBWL) clearance	The assignment was duly completed, and final reports were submitted to GMR Energy Limited on 22nd June 2017. GMR Energy has paid Rs. 10,00,000 to EGREE as a consultancy fee. This study strengthens the case for EGREE Foundation for QCI-NABET accreditation.
Andhra Pradesh Gas Distribution Corporation (APGDC)	15th September 2016	Preparation of site-specific plan for wildlife conservation issues Preparation of report on biological parameters including the study of flora and fauna, water region, drainage pattern, wildlife usage and interface conflict plan Inventory of biodiversity and creation of database; consultation meetings for problem identification with local villagers and other stakeholders. Necessary mitigation measures to negate the likely impacts by anthropogenic effects Establishing biodiversity baseline community structure and species composition Report on the current status of wildlife Report on the current status of pressure on Protected Areas Projected impacts of projects on wildlife, habitat management and access/ use of the resource by various stakeholders Identification, prediction, and quantification of possible impact due to proposed development associated on the nearest ecological sensitive areas	The assignment was duly completed, and final reports were submitted to APGDC. EGREE Foundation has received INR 20,00,000 as a consultancy fee.

		Support data and report to comply necessary information required under part-1 and part-2 of submission for National Board for Wildlife (NBWL) clearance	
Andhra Pradesh State Forest Academy (APSFA),	Not mentioned	APSFA shall facilitate the training to be undertaken by EGREE Foundation. APSFA shall pay institutional charges to EGREE Foundation for each training course conducted by EGREE Foundation. APSFA shall assign a Focal Point person to work with EGREE Foundation to develop a work plan and facilitate activities listed therein.	
Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Kakinada, AP, India	Not Signed	Internship Using their Infrastructure facilities/office space (500 sq. feet) Knowledge building Awareness generation	
Adikavi Nannaya University, Rajahmundry	Not signed	Research Collaboration Exchange of students and scholars Project work	
DISHA Cooperative Society[14]	Not signed	Provide linkages between Disha Cooperative society and Coromandel in getting stitching orders. Technical support for the Women SHGs.	
Coromandel International Limited[15]	Not signed	Regular monitoring of the Birds Species inventory and reporting Provide training on bird identification, snake handling, first-aid, etc.	

3.2.3 Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

The M&E plan in the ProDoc followed the UNDP/GEF Project's M&E template. It included the LFA, Project' IW and IR, Project's QPRs and APRs, and the MTR and TE. However, The Project did not use feedback from M&E to appropriately and adequately address new challenges and risks and thereby ensure the achievement of established targets.

The UNDP Project Assurance role has been applied acceptably in assisting the PMU in preparing annual work plans, prepare for the steering committee, and follow up on the procurement and recruitment of national and international consultants. UNDP also provided the needed support for the development of the budget revisions and follow up with the Government on the transfer of funds from the Central Government to the State Government. Nonetheless, the TE observed key weaknesses in the Project monitoring cycle as a key Project's M&E activities were missing such as updating risks and issues in QPRs, APRs and Risks and Issues logs in ATLAS. Also, quarterly and annual progress reports could have been further

[14] a women self-help group and Coromandel International.

[15] **Coromandel International Limited**, India's second largest phosphatic fertilizer player, is in the business of fertilizer, specialty nutrients, crop protection and rural retail. The company manufactures a wide range of fertilizers, making a leader in its addressable markets. Coromandel was voted as one of the top ten greenest companies in India by TERI, reflecting its commitments to the environment and society. They have also awarded biodiversity awards from the State Biodiversity Boar and the National Biodiversity Authority during the Biodiversity Day celebrations. Coromandel and EGREE foundation mutually associated for the identification, protection and development of bird habitat at Coromandel, Kakinada. Some of the biodiversity conservation efforts taken by the company is given below:

- Provide habitat for nearly 271 species of birds during the year 2019, which includes resident and migratory birds.
- 350 acres of land was converted into bird sanctuary and green belt developmental activities.
- Rehabilitated nearly 150 birds during the Hud-Hud cyclone
- Creating public awareness for school students and staff members about the importance of biodiversity.
- Nearly 4.5 crores (approx. 6,42,857 in USD) were spend under the CSR activities for protecting the avian fauna in the Coromandel region. Annually Rs. 500000 is spend for conservation related activities.
- Exclusively 4 staff are dedicated for maintaining and patrolling related activities and a 6 members bird conservation committee has been formed.
- noise free zone and no horn zone is created inside the factor premises.
- Brand image of the company is increased among the industries.

strengthened by providing more substantial details about the project, its progress against the outputs, risks, and issues, financial resources used and the planned budget.

The project shared a national steering committee with its sister project on the Sindhudurg coast. The steering committee met once annually and counted with representation from the government of Andhra Pradesh. Additionally, a state steering committee (SPSC) supervised and directed project implementation on behalf of the government of Andhra Pradesh. The SSC was active and provided good support to the PMU. The state steering committee is chaired by the Special Chief Secretary for Wildlife and Forest of the Environment, Forest, Science, and Technology Department of the Government of Andhra Pradesh and has 18 members, including senior officials from the Ports Authority, State Pollution Control Board, Department of Agriculture, and Department of Fisheries, as well as representatives from civil society organizations and industry.

To date, TEN SPSC meetings took place (one meeting per year). The TE was able to review the minutes of meetings for 3 NPSC meetings and 2 SPSC meetings. The Project organized a mid-term review in June 2015 that concluded with a list of 20 recommendations. UNDP CO developed the needed management response (MR) to the MTR. The MR included a set of actions to be undertaken, by whom, and by when.

The GoI was satisfied with the level of support provided by the UNDP CO. The UNDP CO was also satisfied with the level of support provided by the UNDP/GEF Office responsible for this Project. In conclusion, the TE considers that the UNDP project assurance role has been correctly applied to this project.

3.2.4 Project Finance

As per the UNDP/GEF TE guidelines, the TE assessed the actual expenditure and the originally planned budget as well as the leveraged co-financing. At the time of the TE mission, June 2019, out of the 6 million USD GEF cash support, **US$ 5,586,072** about **(88.2%)** of the Project total budget, has been dispersed. However, around ***US$ 600,701.15*** about ***(12%)*** are committed, as presented in **Table 5**. This amount will be used to pay for the technical work as follows; the development of the KMS, project documentation development and dissemination, and the Project's TE. Around **US$ 23,629** was missing from the total budget balance. The UNDP CO indicated that this amount resulted from the loss/gain due to currency exchange.

The spending per outcome is not in-line with the GEF approved budget. While component 3 consumed the largest budget, yet, the spending was only ***83.4%*** of the total approved budget. The spending under component 1 has exceeded the approved budget as it reached ***175.78%*** of the originally planned budget. Although the spending seems logical due to the long-term project implementation period, prices and even salaries changed several times and hence, the spending varied from the originally planned budget. The same applies to the project management budget. The overspending reached ***132%***. The project team and UNDP indicated that the overspending was discussed with the UNDP/GEF team and a note to file was prepared on-time to explain the overspending which was related to the double extension for the project and the need to extend project staff such that project management costs.

The Project budget included ***US$ 18 million*** from the GoI as a cash contribution. However, after discussing the amount and nature of co-financing with the UNDP and the Government, they clarified that it was a typo as the Government agreed to provide an in-kind contribution to the Project. As of June 2019, the confirmed Project co-financing from the Government and the private sector has amounted to an estimated ***US$ 11,664,450,*** around ***64.8%*** of the total in-kind contribution. However, TE believes that the project co-financing was not correctly estimated as it could be higher than the registered amount. Details are provided in **Table 6**.

The TE team requested the project's audit reports. These reports were not available for the TE team to review and hence, the TE team can't comments on the reports' contents.

Table 5: Project Budget and Expenditures (US$)

Project Component	Budget Approved (US$)	Disbursed as of June 2019											Committed budget (2019)	Total (US$) (Spent and committed)	Difference between planned and actual (US$)
		2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	Total spent	% of budget spent			
Component 1	605,900	34,082	175,055	326,076	99,011	137,446	49,391	163,817	6,431	73,767.6	1,065,076.6	**175.78%**	0	1,065,077	**459,176.6**
Component 2	2,937,900	4,223	154,443	293,488	392,746	361,741	398,154	531,821	105,627	0	2,242,243	**76.32%**	219,184	2,461,427	**-476,473.0**
Component 3	2,053,236	0	353,625	273,042	125,153	297,650	191612	370,228	90,467	10,845.4	1,712,622.4	**83.41%**	242,000	1,954,622	**-98,613.6**
Project Management	426,600	26,628	88,413	82,588	134,506	122,083	214440	-167243	48,223	16,491.87	566,130	**132.7%**	0	566,130	**139,530**
TOTAL GEF	6,023,636	72,838	769,467	1,028,173	746,683	945,675	850,083	898,623	250748	101,104.9	5,586,071.9	**88.17%**	461,184	6,047,256	**23,619.9**

Table 6: Co-financing of Project Partner (US$)

Source of co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of co-financing	Amount confirmed at the CEO endorsement (US$)	The actual amount contributed at the stage of TE (US$)	Actual % of Expected Amount
GoI	The Government of Andhra Pradesh (Departments of Fisheries, Forests, and Environment, Agriculture, Industries, Tourism, Rural Development)	In-kind	18,000,000	7,802,560	**64.8%**
Private Sector/ Production Sectors	Industry, oil and shipping	In-kind	0	3,861,890	

3.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)

M&E Design at Entry: the standard UNDP/GEF budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan was included in both the UNDP ProDoc and the CEO Endorsement Request. The M&E Plan included quarterly, yearly and at the end of the project activities. A total of **US$ 84,400**, about **1.4%** of the total GEF grant was allocated for the M&E activities. The actual cost of the M&E during implementation could not be estimated by the TE due to the lack of financial information provided.

The M&E Plan included in the ProDoc contained detailed description of all UNDP/GEF M&E standard activities including The Project's LFA, indicators and targets, reports required to be prepared by the project like the quarterly progress report (QPR), annual progress report (APR), project implementation report (PIR), the inception workshop and report, the mid-term review and the terminal evaluation reports. However, the ProDoc included several committees like the NPSC, the SPSC, and LLMU. The so many committees proposed in the ProDoc made it complex and difficult to make decisions on the ground. The Project merged the SPSC with the LLMU and the NPSC with a sister project committee to simplify the decision-making processes. Some baseline values for indicators were never validated and established. This has also affected the implementation of the project's M&E.

Based on the above, the M&E design at project startup is rated as:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
	S				

Implementation of M&E

Based on the TE review of the Project M&E during the actual implementation of the Project, the M&E activities followed the M&E plan and that

- UNDP and UNDP/GEF role both have been correctly applied to this project, based on the following notes:
  - UNDP CO has followed the standard M&E activities based on the UNDP/GEF standard procedures. The CO conducted several monitoring site visits, attended and facilitated the commission of the Project's steering committees (NPSC, SPSC, LLSC).
  - UNDP CO provided the needed operational, technical and financial support. The UNDP CO has been active in preparing the project work plans, budget revision, convening the project committees and attending the meetings, and following up on Project's recruitment and procurement.
  - UNDP CO committed significant resources in terms of staff time and travel by the responsible officers and associates to the Project.
  - The UNDP actively participates in the project's steering committees at the national and state level, including the participation of senior UNDP officials. UNDP provided assistance and technical guidance to the project through the regional technical advisor in charge of the biodiversity focal area GEF-funded projects (UNDP/GEF RTA).
  - Communication between the Project's team, the Project's governing bodies, and the UNDP is continuous and open and conducted mostly through the SPC.
  - Finally, Project reports are reviewed by the UNDP and include the agency's rating of implementation and risks affecting project implementation.
- The Project's IW was organized on 17th March 2012 at Kakinada and an inception report (IR) has been prepared, printed out, and shared with concerned partners. However, the IR was lacking the results of the discussion, the recommendation made during the workshops, and the details of what has been discussed and agreed upon. Critical adaptive management measures were not discussed or introduced during the IW. It did not capture the discussion, the decisions, and provided an updated copy of the Project Document, and hence, the Inception Phase (Workshop and Report) represent a weakness in the project cycle.
- The National Project Steering Committee (NPSC): This committee was merged with the NPSC committee for the other sister-project which facilitated the two projects' work. According to the Project Document, the Project is subject to at least two NPSC meetings per year. To date, eight NPSC meetings were convened and a well-documentation of the minutes of the meetings (28th June 2011, 24th January 2012, 6th July 2012, 21st June 2013, 23rd January 2014, 16th June 2015, 31st August 2017, 9th October 2018).

- Four Governing Board meeting of the EGREE foundation was organized; October 2014, June 2016, August 2016, and November 2016. It was noticed that the Project did not organize any Governing board meeting after 2016 as the Project was scheduled to be operationally closed by then.
- UNDP Regional Unit in Bangkok, the UNDP/GEF Technical Advisor and assistant responsible for this Project, and UNDP India's provisions of financial resources have also been in accordance with project norms and in the timeframe.
- The UNDP India has helped the Project at the technical and operational levels. It carried out the needed assurance role and helped the Project in procuring critical services, hiring key consultants at national and international levels. The TE recognizes that the UNDP has practiced its role in compliance with the UNDP established procedures.
- Project Implementation Reports (PIR). PIRs are used as a critical analysis of the project's status and are submitted to the NPSC for review, discussion, and endorsement. The Project prepared 7 PIRs which have also missed risks and issues.
- Quarterly Progress Reports (QPRs); the QPRs were prepared mainly to report on progress. The TE noticed that these reports missed key information required for UNDP result-based management like the risks and issues logs, a detailed work plan for the next quarter and its planned resources.
- Project Terminal Report (PTR). This report should be prepared during the last three months of the project implementation and to be discussed during the terminal review meeting. Ideally, this report should be prepared by the Project team who has overseen all project's operational issues since its inception. The TE noticed that the PTR is not prepared yet.
- Terminal review meeting. A terminal reviewing meeting should be organized by the project team, with the participation of its members before the project closure. During the TE, the team did not observe any plan for organizing the terminal review meeting.

It was noticed that the M&E framework could have been reinforced by putting more emphasis on the Project's reporting tools (QPRs and PIRs). As the majority of the Project's core team (who were involved in the project implementation during the period of 2011-2016) have left the Project, major Project's M&E activities were not discussed. However, based on the review of the Project's QPRs, and PIRs, it was sensed that the Project team was trying hard to focus on the Project's implementation rather than on M&E, due to the complex political situation in 2011, 2014 and 2019, and the natural disasters (cyclones) hit the area almost every year.

Based on the above, the implementation of the M&E plan is rated as:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
	S				

3.2.6 UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation/execution, coordination, and operational issues

UNDP implementation (GEF IA):

UNDP as the Project Assurance provided support to the Project's NPSC and carried out objective and independent project oversight and monitoring functions. The key features of the UNDP implementation are as follows:

- The UNDP followed up on the Project's activities and carried out the needed monitoring activities.
- The UNDP reviewed project budgets and work plans and provided advice.
- The UNDP provided the provision of financial resources in accordance with UNDP/GEF guidelines.
- The UNDP supported the project, as requested, in recruiting national and international consultants.
- The UNDP facilitated, based on the project request, the project's procurement.
- The UNDP provided necessary and timely advice and guidance for AWPs' development.
- The UNDP through its high-level staff provided the needed political support.
- The UNDP facilitated the project's work by providing advice and ensure that the UNDP/GEF office is involved. For example, the UNDP Programme Officer followed up on the two times no-cost extensions. The requests were submitted by the EA to the IA, UNDP requested the extensions' approvals from the UNDP/GEF.

The UNDP support to the Project's team is regarded by the GoI as highly satisfactory and timely.

Rating for UNDP implementation is:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
	S				

MoEFCC and FD Execution

The Project followed the NIM modality; with the support of a group of national consultants. The Project team was based on the Forestry Department premises which have strengthened the relationship between the project team and the Government's entities as well as with the local communities. The GoAP has provided the project with the substantial in-kind co-financing and has contributed significantly to support the Project's activities. Senior officers of the Forestry and Fisheries departments are very supportive of the Project and are following up closely on its work. The co-financing provided by the GoAP demonstrates a significant commitment by the GoI.

The MoEFCC has also involved many staff members in the Project's activities and follows up on Project's financial resources; transfer and utilization. The *KMS* is going to be hosted and maintained by the Forestry Department. The FD is committed to take up this role and follow up continuously on the *KMS*. The Project supported the establishment of key facilities like livelihood center, the Biodiversity center, Mangroves nursery garden, and genetic resources bank, Coringa Wildlife sanctuary boardwalk, etc. The FD has provided support to the establishment of all facilities, provided technical and financial support, and follow up on its use and maintenance. Senior management showed a high interest in utilizing these facilities and providing financial support to ensure its use and maintenance.

Rating for execution by the MoEFCC and FD is:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
HS					

3.3 Project Results

3.3.1 Overall Results (attainment of objectives)

The TE evaluated the achievements of results in terms of attainment of the overall objective as well as identified project's outcomes and outputs, according to the UNDP/GEF evaluation guidelines. For this, the performance by the outcome is analyzed by looking at three main aspects as identified by the UNDP/GEF evaluation guide: general progress towards the established baseline level of the indicators; actual values of indicators by the end of the Project vs. designed ones; and evidence of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of the results as well as how this evidence was documented.[16]

Based on observations, findings of the field visits, data collection and analyses, meetings with key stakeholders including the beneficiaries, and review of the Project's technical reports and progress reports (quarterly and annually), a detailed assessment at the outcome level is presented below (Table 7). Most project's targets were achieved, however, as explained in pages 24-25, some of the targets were irrelevant to the project's scope and/or not time-bound (not SMART), hence, the lack of achievement of some targets was not considered as a shortcoming. Furthermore, although the Project did not manage to achieve capacity development targets, it has made noticeable progress throughout its lifetime as the original target was over-ambitious. **Annex 9** presents the capacity development and shows the scores at the time of Project formulation (2011), and TE (2019). The updated GEF tracking tool was reviewed and validated during the TE, attached in **Annex 10.**

Overall results of the Project are rated as:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
HS					

[16] UNDP/GEF Terminal Evaluation Guide

Table 7: Matrix for rating the Achievement of Outcomes

The key is used for indicator assessment (Color Coding):

Green = completed, the indicator shows successful achievement
Yellow = On target to be achieved by the end of the project
Red = Not on target to be achieved by project closure

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline	Targets by the end of the Project	Progress at the TE time, June 2019	TE Comments	Rating
The long-term goal to which the project will contribute is the sustainable management of the globally significant coastal and marine biodiversity of India by mainstreaming biodiversity conservation considerations into production activities in the coastal and marine zones, while also taking into account development imperatives, need for sustaining livelihoods and also addressing retrogressive factors including the anticipated impacts of climate change.						
Immediate Objective: To mainstream coastal and marine biodiversity conservation into production sectors in the East Godavari River Estuarine Ecosystem (EGREE)	Landscape/seascape area in the EGREE where production activities mainstream biodiversity conservation	0 ha	About 80,000 ha (46,450 ha as an area of direct influence and 33,550 ha as an area of indirect influence)	The Project has covered Landscape & seascape area of 46,000 ha under direct influence (includes Corangi RF 4,272ha, Corangi Extension RF 18,808 ha, Bhairavapalem RF 1,015ha, Rathikaluva RF 1,762ha, Balusuthippa RF 1,300ha, Matlathippa RF 389ha, Masanithippa RF 546ha, Kothapalem RF 66ha, and Kandikuppa RF 3,984 ha). An additional area of 33,500 ha was covered under the indirect influence (the geographical area of 41 project villages which includes the jurisdictional area of the Panchayats having BMCs).	Completed, the indicator shows successful achievement	HS
	Percentage of allocation of CSR expenditures of production sectors aligned with landscape-level Strategic Plan for the EGREE	Limited link with biodiversity conservation objectives	At least 50% of the CSR budget of production sectors aligned with biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihoods objectives at the landscape level	Sectoral plans have been prepared for oil and gas, tourism, aquaculture, and fisheries sectors. Best practices recommended by the Fisheries, Tourism, and Aquaculture sectoral plans are under implementation. Key recommendations of the Fisheries and Aquaculture sectors have been incorporated in the AP State Fisheries Action Plan. The recommendations of		S

				the Tourism Sector Plan have been incorporated in the Smart City Proposal of Kakinada, which has been selected as a Smart City. Several MoUs and Partnership agreements were drafted by the project and the production sectors for mainstreaming coastal and marine biodiversity conservation into production sectors. Informal agreements for sponsoring research studies on smooth-coated otter, turtle conservation and mangrove regeneration and Livelihood enhancement activities namely making hand gloves, conference bags, etc., have been made with ONGC, GAIL, Coromandel Industries to a tune of 75 lakhs. However, the Percentage of the CSR budget of production sectors aligned with biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihoods objectives at the landscape level was not estimated and it was difficult for the TE team to estimate due to lack of financial data.		
	Improvement in Total **Capacity Development Scorecard** (Annex 7 of the ProDoc)	23% (11 points out of 48 points)	94%	- Achieved 35% by Midterm Review by 2015. - **Achieved 83.3% by TE July 2019 (40 points out of 48 points)** A separate chapter on Marine Conservation has been included in the proposed Wildlife Action Plan of India (2017 to 2031) with the successful intervention of the project. This is the first for India. Micro-plans for 41 villages in the EGREE Region completed and implemented for strengthening SHGs/Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) in natural		S

				resource use and sustainable livelihoods. Training conducted regularly for forest department, coast guards, fisheries department, customs department, and other production sectors on conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity. Corporate sustainability reporting and biodiversity workshops organized, and strong support obtained from industries operating in the region for integrating biodiversity concerns into their practices. Training in hospitality management conducted regularly for local communities. Training provided to local people working as Nature Guides in the Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary on biodiversity conservation. Livelihood activities, skill development training such as shell handicrafts, coir making, tailoring, embroidery, pickle making, etc. undertaken especially focusing on local women. SMART" (Skills for Manufacturing of Apparel through Research and Training) Centre set up to strengthen livelihoods of local women, with support from the Ministry of Textiles, Government of India. Community-Based Eco-Tourism centers were established with the support of the Tourism and Forest Departments of Andhra Pradesh. Eco-Tourism support to Coringa Tourism Point helped in 16 folds		

				increase in the revenue of Sanctuary, which is again plowed back to the management of sanctuary and support community. The longest mangrove wooden boardwalk in India for 4 Kms is a major attraction to the Sanctuary. Effectively implemented the 61-day fish ban in EGREE Region which resulted in a 20% increase in the income to the fisherman.		
	The population size of the following critical species remains stable or increases: Scyphiphora hydrophyllacea (IUCN threatened) Olive Ridley turtle (IUCN vulnerable status) Fishing cat (IUCN status is endangered)	*Scyphiphora hydrophyllacea:* 70 numbers Olive Ridley Turtle: 300 annually Fishing cat: 112 as per 2001 census	Population size stable/ increasing as follows: Scyphiphora hydrophyllacea (increase) Olive Ridley turtle (stability) Fishing cat (at least stable or increase)	The population size of Scyphiphora hydrophyllacea is ensured to be stable. The nesting habitats of the Olive Ridley Turtle have been protected. Every year there is a considerable increase in mass nesting of ***Olive Ridley Turtles***. In the Year 2018, 1,582 Turtles visited coastal areas within the EGREE Region. The baseline identified three nesting sites namely Hope Island, Sacramento island, Ellayya peta, however, the project has identified and established four more nesting sites namely Gatchakayalapora, S. Yanam, Antharvedhi, Vasalathippa during the period from 2012 - 2018. This intervention facilitated the protection, conservation, and management of a total of 670 nests of which, 501 were protected under in-situ and 169 under ex-situ conditions. The above efforts have resulted in the release of a total of 783,453 hatchlings during the period 2011-2018). At the beginning of the project		HS

				(during 2011), a total of 60,735 hatchlings were released. The sustainability of these turtle conservation efforts has been ensured by training and increasing the capacity of 58 members of Kothapalem, Molletimoga, Pora and Balusuthippa VSSs, as base camp watchers. Three new species of bird and one snake have been recorded in the EGREE region by the project. Fishing Cat: EGREE region recorded 95 to 100 numbers of the fishing cat in the sanctuary area as per the camera trap study. This is the highest concentration of fishing cat aggregation in India. Around 50-60 in the non-sanctuary area as per ocular observations of members of VSSs. Otters – An estimated population of 198 Otters in the sanctuary area and 30-40 Otters in the non-sanctuary area as per ocular observations of members of VSSs. Awareness generation on the important role of both *Fishing Cat* and *Otter* has played a major role in the conservation of these two species and an increase in its population size in the EGREE region. In-house library and biodiversity laboratory established in the EGREE Foundation for supporting research and conducting water quality assessments in the region. Government of Andhra Pradesh has also proposed EGREE Foundation as ENVIS center under the coastal and marine theme		

	The population size of birds (including migratory) remains stable or increases	Baseline to be collected in Year 1	Population size remains at least stable or increases.	According to the Asian Waterbird Census (AWC) conducted every year in partnership with WWF-Hyderabad Office, BNHS, Andhra Pradesh Forest Department - Wildlife Management, Bird Watchers Society of Andhra Pradesh and Visakhapatnam Bird Watchers Society, there is a considerable increase in population size of birds including migratory birds. The waterbird population has been estimated in the entire landscape/ seascape/coastline is found as **43,718** birds comprising of 272 species.		HS
	% of open (degraded) mangrove areas in the project area reduced to the minimum	40 %	10 %	The Project in collaboration with Wildlife and Territorial divisions of Rajahmahendravaram and Kakinada established **97.13ha** of mangrove plantation and coastal shelterbelts during 2012 – 2017. At the beginning of the project in 2012, the open area of 17.5ha was planted with mangroves. There has been an increase of mangrove cover and this has reduced open (degraded) mangrove areas to the minimum.		HS
Outcome 1: Sectoral planning in the EGREE mainstreams biodiversity conservation considerations	Establishment of cross-sectoral institutional mechanism with representation from conservation, livelihood and production sectors	0	1	EGREE Foundation was established under the Andhra Pradesh Society Registration Act, 2001. This foundation provides a platform to facilitate the implementation of biodiversity conservation initiatives through the production sectors operating in the EGREE region.	Completed, the indicator shows successful achievement	HS

	Improvement in Systemic Level Indicators of Capacity Development			The capacity of the policymakers, fishing community and the industrial sector is increased after the implementation of the project. A knowledge management portal (e-pragati) is developed. The policymaker can use this portal for obtaining environmental information for decision making. The fishing community is engaged in learning alternative livelihood skills and protecting the scheduled species and the industrial sector is also involved in conserving mangroves, coastal and marine biodiversity.		S
	Amount of resources available for funding the Foundation and the compliance of approved sectoral plans	NA	Financial sustainability strategy prepared; At least 50% of costs for the foundation covered by regular government and other resources At least 50% of compliance of approved sectoral plans funded	For sustaining the project, a corpus fund was generated through CSR activities, consultancy, and educational programs. It is proposed that 50% of the cost for the EGREE foundation to be covered by regular Government and other resources for sustenance of the foundation. NABET accreditation was received for undertaking projects for the foundation's sustainability. Also, the existing resources were realigned under the CSR programs of large corporate institutions operating in the EGREE region.		S
	Strategies developed for ensuring that existing sector policies mainstream biodiversity conservation	Policies requiring amendments identified in Year 1	Strategies developed for 100% of identified policies			
	Application of new EIA guidelines (that include CC change considerations) to new manufacturing units entering the licensing process in the EGREE	0	By project end, any new manufacturing units entering the licensing process in the EGREE are subject to the new guidelines that also incorporate climate	The new manufacturing units entering the licensing process in the EGREE are subject to the new guidelines.		S

			change considerations			
	Incentives for production sector companies to promote biodiversity-friendly practices by giving them opportunities for marketing/ advertising their efforts	0	By year 2 at least 2-3 companies take up this incentive; By year 5, at least 10 companies take up this incentive	The Coromandal International (Fertilizer company) has partnered with the EGREE foundation and converted 350 acres of land into a bird sanctuary. Under the CSR budget, the company has spent around INR 4.5 crores for protecting the Avian fauna in the Coromandal region. Annually INR 500000 is spent on conservation-related activities. Similarly, other industries are also taking the effort in biodiversity-friendly practices such as mangrove conservation and conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity resources.		S
Outcome 2: Enhanced capacity of sector institutions for implementing a biodiversity-friendly sector plan including monitoring and enforcement of regulations	Sector-specific biodiversity compatible plans	0	Sectoral plan for Fisheries, Aquaculture, Salt pans, Manufacturing units, Ports and Shipping, and Tourism	Biodiversity friendly Sectoral plan for Fisheries, Aquaculture, Salt pans, Manufacturing units, Ports and Shipping, and Tourism have been prepared. These plans have been circulated among the seven sectors with recommendations that they are incorporated into their respective action plans.	Completed, the indicator shows successful achievement	S
	Improvement in Institutional and Individual Level Indicators of Capacity Development Scorecard (Annex 7)			Adequate capacity building programs were organized for increasing individual and institutional capabilities. Nearly 29, 345 community members were benefited through various Capacity building programs. The local level institutions such as SHGs, EDCs and VSS and NGOs, fishermen cooperatives, fisherwomen cooperatives, youth clubs, cattle rearers were benefited.		HS

	Number of representatives from the key sectors (government and private) trained in mainstreaming approaches	0	Production Sector: 1000 Conservation Sector: 300 Livelihood sectors: 10,000	Production Sector: Approx 1000 Conservation Sector: Approx 800 Livelihood sector: Approx 30,000		HS
	Compendium of best practices on Mainstreaming biodiversity for the key production sector	0	1	The work has been carried out and a compendium of best practices on mainstreaming biodiversity for key production sectors has been prepared.		HS
	Use of correct fishing gear by commercial fishing operations (indicator, baselines and targets will have to be revisited once the Sector Plans are prepared by mid-term)	Limited use (baseline to be measured in 1st 3 months of the project)	By project end, at least 50% of commercial fishing operations are using correct fishing gear	Turtle Excluder Device (TED) and square nets were provided for reducing the by-catch. Awareness was created among local communities on bycatch issues and the usage of square net and TED for conserving the fishery resources.		S
	Decline in pesticide concentration in the effluents of aquafarms in the target landscape (indicator, baselines, and targets will have to be re-visited once the Sector Plans are prepared by mid-term)	Baseline concentrations to be measured in 1st 3 months of the project	50% decline over baseline Se concentrations	Pesticides were used by the small-scale aquaculture farmers. There is no data available to substantiate the reduction of pesticides.		MS
	Effluents from manufacturing units (indicator, baselines, and targets will have to be revisited once the Sector Plans are prepared by mid-term)	Baseline to be defined in consultation with the Pollution Control Board at time of approval of Sector Plans	The decline of 50% over baseline	The fertilizer industry has developed strategies for minimizing the pollution load in the adjacent brackishwater areas and this will help to reduce the concentration of chemical contamination. Some of the best practices adopted are: 1. Adoption of clean/green technology 2. Zero liquid effluent fall outside the factory limit		S

				3. Ammonia plants are based on natural gas 4. Elimination of movement of liquid ammonia tanker 5. Total recycle of liquid waste 6. Recovery of fluorine in the phosphoric acid plant 7. Installation of the scrubber to control excess SO_2 emission		
	Management Effectiveness Evaluation (MEE) Scorecard	Baseline to be measured in 1st 3 months of project	MEE score improves by 20% by year 3 of the project and 30 % by year 5	Progress has been made, however; the MEE was not used.		MS
Outcome 3: Community livelihoods and natural resource use are sustainable in the **EGREE**	Number of SHGs/ CBOs strengthened	0	In 44 abutting villages 709 SHGs; 20 EDCs; 16 Fishermen's Association; 33 Women's Organization; 5 NGOs; 17 Youth Clubs and 5 Dairy Cooperatives are strengthened	SHG: 1,137 EDCs: 20 VSSs: 09 Fishermen cooperatives: 20 Fisherwomen cooperatives: 18 NGOs: 02 Youth clubs: 05 Cattle rearers: 950		S
	Number of skill development activities carried out for SHGs/ CBOs/ and other local institutions for alternative and/ or sustainable ecosystem-based livelihoods that reduce pressures on biodiversity	0	Target to be defined after the design of the micro-plans	*(the target was not identified)* Fishing communities (SHGs/CBOs) were trained with alternative Livelihood skills such as handicrafts, coir making, tailoring, embroidery, pickle making focusing on local women. SMART (Skills for Manufacturing of Apparel through Research and Training) Centre was established to strengthen the livelihoods of local women, with the support of the Ministry of Textiles, Government of India. The training was conducted for local youth as Nature guides. These activities have reduced the pressure on biodiversity.		S

	Number of people shifting to alternative livelihood options that reduce pressure on biodiversity	Baseline to be collected in Year 1	Target to be defined after design of the micro-plans	Micro-plan for the targeted villages in the EGREE Region completed and implemented for strengthening SHGs/Community-based organizations in natural resource use and sustainable livelihoods. Nearly 984 livelihood improvement programs (training, awareness, meetings, exposure visit, etc.) were organized and 32,681 individuals were benefited, which includes 18,422 women (56%) and 14,259 men (43.6%).		S
	Incidents of felling of mangrove trees, non-adherence to the seasonal ban on fishing, destructive fishing practices by local communities within the the project area in contravention of community natural resource use plan	Baseline to be measured in 1st 3 months of project	Declines by 50% by the year 5, compared with baseline levels	More than 97 hectares of mangroves restored; biodiversity richness increased; mangrove genetic resources are conserved and propagated. Moreover, the project has brought about behavioral change among the fishing community in reducing bycatch and protecting 9 marine scheduled species. The mangrove vegetation in the EGREE region has considerably increased due to the plantation of mangroves in the degraded stretches. The plantation has increased the biodiversity/ fishery resources of the EGREE region. This mangrove ecosystem generates significant ecological and economic benefits for sustaining livelihoods and providing carbon sink services. This mangrove ecosystem plays a vital role in protecting shoreline, provides habitat for turtles, fin and shellfishes, bird population. The local communities are dependent on the mangroves and marine resources for their sustenance. Providing incentives for conserving schedule species has brought awareness among the fishing		S

				community about the importance of conserving the coastal and marine biodiversity, these activities also reduce the loss of biodiversity in the EGREE region.		

- EGREE Foundation has been established under the Andhra Pradesh Society Registration Act 2001. This Foundation is a cross-sectoral platform to facilitate the implementation of biodiversity conservation initiatives through the production sectors operating in the EGREE.

3.3.2 Relevance (*)

The Project is relevant for the GoI. It even became more relevant in 2014 after the "political bifurcation of State of Andhra Pradesh into Telangana State and State of Andhra Pradesh approximately 1000 KMs of linear coastline in strip shape lies is with State of Andhra Pradesh, which is as good as calling it as the maritime Provincial State of India."[17]. Key Government officials and stakeholders interviewed during the mission indicated the importance of the newly approved GCF Project to continue the work that has started. It is to the TE consultant's opinion, the Project has managed to mainstream the marine biodiversity into production sectors in East India, especially in the East Godavari region. The public awareness component was very successful in engaging beneficiaries, students, SMEs, and local communities.

The Project has been highly relevant to UNDP activities in India. It represents a contribution to the fulfillment of India's former UNDAF, outcome 4: *By 2012, the most vulnerable, including women and girls, and government at all levels have enhanced abilities to prepare, respond, and adapt/recover from sudden and slow onset of disasters and environmental changes*, and to UNDP Strategic Plan for Environment and Sustainable Development, mainly *Outcome 4.1: Mainstreaming environment and energy*. The Project was also designed to contribute to the following CPAP outcomes and outputs: *Outcome 4.3: Progress towards meeting national commitments under multilateral environmental agreements*; and *Output 4.3.2: National efforts supported towards conservation and management of natural resources* (Indicator: Number of new joint initiatives undertaken for integrated biodiversity conservation).

Although the project was developed around 10 years ago, the Project is very relevant to the current United Nations Sustainable Development Framework (UNSDF) 2018-20122. It contributes to UNSDF Outcome 5: "*By 2022, environmental and natural resource management (NRM) is strengthened and communities have increased access to clean energy and are more resilient to climate change and disaster risks*".

The Project is highly relevant to the GEF 4 focal area on Strategy and strategic programming and covered all the strategic objectives such as sustainable protected area systems, mainstreaming biodiversity, safeguarding biodiversity and access and benefit-sharing. It also addresses a subset of direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss and focuses on the highest leverage opportunities for the GEF to contribute to sustainable biodiversity conservation. This project has substantially contributed to developing institutional capacity and knowledge on biodiversity conservation issues and established an action plan to integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives into the actions of the production sectors.

Based on the abovementioned the Relevance is rated as Relevant (R).

Relevant (R)	Not Relevant (NR)
R	

3.3.3 Effectiveness and efficiency (*)

Effectiveness

The Project was greatly impacted by major political and natural issues. These issues affected the speed of implementation. Thus far, the Project was able to design and utilize effectively several adaptive management measures to continue the work under the difficult conditions in order to achieve its main goal. The Project objective and main outputs have been achieved; the majority of the established targets have been met. Though, most targets almost were achieved with substantial delays. Up until the time of the TE, some critical activities were finalized after the TE mission such as:

- The Knowledge Management portal developed by the E-pragati Authority, Department of Information Technology Electronics and communication is completed and there is a strong commitment from the AP Government side to launch the website for the benefit of the policymakers, researchers and other stakeholders.

[17] MTR Report

- KMS provides knowledge base on expert referrals, community discussions, regulatory information and details regarding published articles and journals. It is useful for policymakers in evaluating site suitability while providing approvals for industrial projects. KMS assists regulatory authorities and policymakers in planning and for drawing environmentally sound policies. The Environmental KMS (EIAssist.org) is a one-stop source help in undertaking pre-feasibility study, preparation of ToR, DPRs, and EIA reports.
- The Project has produced a valuable set of documentation that was finalized, printed out and disseminated to key stakeholders and beneficiaries.[18]

Providing training to concerned staff and following up on the Portal by the Government are essential steps to be concluded as soon as possible to ensure the long-term sustainability of the Project's results. However, due to the strong commitment from the government, the deep engagement of all concerned departments and the government's staff high motivation to follow up on the project results after project closure, there is a minimal concern that these will not be achieved soon.

Considering the above-mentioned facts, Effectiveness was rated **Highly Satisfactory**.

Based on the above mentioned the Effectiveness is rated:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
HS					

Efficiency

Project efficiency is considered **Satisfactory (S)** for the following reasons:

- Considering the critical challenges, the project has faced, the compliance and flexibility of the project EA, UNDP, and project team have been enough to alter the project's status in order to achieve the project's objectives.
- The cost-effectiveness of the project is considered **Satisfactory (S).** *T*he inclusion of long-term staff instead of short-term consultants in project implementation in addition to the involvement of UNVs enhanced the project's efficiency and facilitated work at a minimal cost. It helped the Project in achieving many results with limited allocations.
- The M&E of the project was undertaking according to UNDP and GEF procedures and it is rated as **Satisfactory (S),** yet, some aspects could have been enhanced like reporting. It was noticed that the quarterly reports do not include the needed analysis, an update of the risks and issues, and hence M&E was deemed **Moderately Satisfactory (MS).**
- Risks and issues identification and management is rated as **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MUS).** The Project was affected by major risks and issues more than one time during its implementation. These were not captured in the quarterly or annual progress reports and most critical risks were not always identified nor were appropriate risk ratings and management responses identified and/or formulated.
- Project capacity to build needed partnerships during the project's implementation phase is rated as **Highly Satisfactory (HS).**
- The involvement of men and women equally into project activities as well as mainstreaming gender in the project's activities are rated as **Highly Satisfactory (HS).**

[18] *Produced materials include: Empowering women: EGREE way; Building capacities; Promoting partnerships; Restoration of Mangroves; Biodiversity Mainstreaming–A paradigm shift; Brochure on case study; EGREE coffee table book; Illustration book for children; Voices of the sea Stories from India's coastal communities; Biodiversity Management Plan for Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary, Andhra Pradesh; Biodiversity Friendly Tourism Sector Plan; Biodiversity Friendly Fisheries sector Plan; Biodiversity Friendly Aquaculture Plan; Biodiversity Friendly Oil and Natural Gas Sector Plan; Biodiversity Friendly Port and shipping Sector Plan; Biodiversity Friendly Fertilizers and salt pans Sector Plan; Voice of the sea stories from India's Coastal communities, 2018; Fin fish Atlas of EGREE; Mollusk species in EGREE; Indian Smooth-coated Otter (Lutrogaleper spicillata) – The Wetland Ambassador conservation in EGREE region; Whale Shark (Rhincodon typus conservation in EGREE Region) - Save the Gentle Gian; Sea turtle conservation in EGREE region; A Birdwatchers Paradise, Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary Coringa, Kakinada; Brochure on - Eco-tourism in CWS and Coringa Biodiversity Centre;* ***7 species brochure prepared on*** *– Fishing cat; Golden Jackal; Whale Shark; Great Knot; Olive Ridley turtle; Indian Smooth – Coated ottar; and Windowpane Oyster.* ***Videos prepared***
Turning a Factory into a Bird Sanctuary- https://youtu.be/Q0FDLaQUQ18; Transforming Lives Through Ecotourism - https://youtu.be/Z0Hd4PaJ2Bo; Saving the World's Largest Fish - https://youtu.be/IhKnMyFMHmE; On the Trail of the Fishing Cat - https://youtu.be/4Z9Fgn41rl0; A Hotspot for Nature Lovers- https://youtu.be/aBvoX2fsbGk

- Project capacity and efforts to mobilize the agreed-upon co-financing is rated as **Moderately Satisfactory (MS).**

Based on the above mentioned the Efficiency is rated:

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Satisfactory (S)	Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Unsatisfactory (U)	Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)
	S				

3.3.4 Country Ownership

The ProDoc stated that "*India ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity on 18 February 1994. India is a recipient of UNDP technical assistance and notified its participation in the GEF on 12 May 1994. It is thus eligible according to Article 9 (b) of the GEF instrument to receive GEF funding*."[19] The Project is also consistent with "*relevant National Policies and Strategies for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity."* And with the *"MoEF's National Environmental Action Programme (1993)".* The Project is also in line with India's priorities for coastal and marine ecosystem management as articulated in the National Environment Policy (2006) and The National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBAP, 2008).

Country ownership was evident during the Project formulation stage as mentioned in the ProDoc; furthermore, it was reiterated during Project implementation and that is evident in the strong interest and participation of senior government officials in Project implementation, NPSC, SPSC and Project review meetings. The Project was linked to other national initiatives on biodiversity mainstreaming in production sectors and has supported the GoI in preparing the GCF concept and project document that got approved by the GCF and will start the implementation later 2019.

3.3.5 Mainstreaming

The Project was able to positively mainstream GoI and several UNDP priorities. Specifically:

- ✓ The Project objective is in line with the new UNDP Country Programme 2018-20122.
- ✓ The Project contributed directly to the achievement of certain UNSDF's outcomes and outputs
- ✓ The ProDoc included a fair analysis of gender issues and specified certain activities to target women and women's organizations. The Project managed to mainstream gender in most of its activities. UNDP and GoI Project-related team included both women and men. The Project's international and national consultants included both women and men as around 20% of the consultants were women. Around 56.4% of the Project beneficiaries were women.
- ✓ The Project targeted both women and men in their capacity building and public awareness components. The Project was successful in including 18,422 women. Some training program was designed for women only. Lists of all project's activities indicating the total number of women and men are included in **Annex 8**.
- ✓ The Project actively promotes disaggregated data by gender. This led to strengthening gender analysis and mainstreaming in biodiversity conservation and sustainable livelihood practices as presented in **Annex 8.**

3.3.6 Sustainability (*)

The draft project's exit strategy does not specify clearly all actions to be taken in order to ensure sustainability. It focuses on how to sustain EGREE foundations, and what are the available options. Yet, the Project's exit strategy needs to be finalized, more concrete actions linked to a responsible party, budget, and timeframe needs need to be included.

UNDP/GEF TE guidelines identify Sustainability is as the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends. Consequently, the assessment of sustainability considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes. Below is the detailed assessment of the four main risks categories:

Financial risks

[19] UNDP GEF Project Document. Subsection 2.2.1: Country Eligibility. Page 24.

For financial sustainability and in order to ensure that biodiversity mainstreaming approaches identified under the project can be financially sustained post-project, a financial sustainability strategy was proposed to be prepared along with the landscape-level Strategic Plan. However, this did not happen. Nevertheless, the project looked at other options to ensure financial sustainability such as re-alignment of existing resources earmarked under CSR programs of large corporate institutions operating in the area, and/ or mobilizing new resources to mainstream biodiversity conservation concerns. The Project also prepared and implemented a livelihoods diversification strategy based on economic feasibility assessments that aimed at ensuring that alternative livelihoods are sustained over the long-term

Based on the above discussion, the financial risks are limited, and sustainability is rated as:

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
L			

Socio-economic risks

According to the ProDoc, "*to ensure that social exclusion is minimized, and social equity maximized,"* Project activities targeted the livelihoods/ subsistence sector was founded on extensive stakeholder participation. Existing networks of VLIs (SHGs, EDCs, VSS) were utilized. The Project ensured representation of women's SHGs. The Project targeted institutions operating at the community level to enable them to actively participate in developing and implementing activities to ensure continuity and replicability once the project is completed. The socio-economic risks associated with the project are considered negligible.

Based on the above-mentioned Socio-economic Risk, risks are negligible and thus the sustainability is rated as

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
L			

Institutional framework and governance risks

The Project managed to institutionalize its major deliverables. EGREE Foundation was established under the Andhra Pradesh Societies Registration Act, 2001. This Foundation is a cross-sectoral platform to facilitate the implementation of biodiversity conservation initiatives through the production sectors operating in the EGREE region. Micro plans for 41 villages in the EGREE region were completed and implemented for strengthening Self Help Groups (SHGs)/community-based organizations in natural resource use and sustainable livelihoods. Biodiversity Interpretation Centre was established at Coringa showcases and a total number of 520 species have been identified, classified, marked and displayed at the Centre for creating awareness to the students and public. The in-house library hosts approximately 1,500 information-oriented books and EGREE publications in different subject areas. The biodiversity laboratory also showcases 34 species of crabs and 15 species of snakes.

Knowledge Management System (KMS) established to provide useful environmental information and it is expected to help a great deal at a different stage of the EIA preparation and it will be useful for environmental professionals, researchers, academia. The environmental information is being converted to the environmental knowledge base for the benefit of the policymakers. Training programs were conducted for local youth to equip them as Nature Guides and they were hired in the Coringa Wildlife sanctuary. Community-based ecotourism centers were established with the support of the Tourism and Forest Departments of Andhra Pradesh. The livelihood of the local communities has improved due to the eco-tourism initiatives. SMART (Skill for Manufacturing of Apparel through Research and Training) Centre was established to strengthen the livelihood of local women, with the support of Ministry of Textiles, Government of India and nearly 225 individuals were benefited.

The Institutional framework and governance risks are low, and sustainability is:

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
L			

Environmental risks to sustainability

For *ecological sustainability*, the Project proposed six key measures:

(i) putting in place a cross-sectoral institutional mechanism (Godavari Foundation) to promote cross-sectoral dialogue and joint actions by the different sectors that operate in the EGREE.

This was achieved by the Project. EGREE Foundation (the name was changed from the Godavari to EGREE) was established in 2014. EGREE Foundation operates as a registered society under the Indian Societies Registration Act, 1860 and is managed by representatives from the Governments of Andhra Pradesh. EGREE Foundation works directly with Indian institutions and organizations to enhance and promote environmental development, with a principal focus on building and sustaining institutional capacity and related management capability in environmental management in general and coastal management.

(ii) developing a landscape-level Strategic Plan that will look at current land use in the project area and will then provide a plan for how land uses/ production practices by the different sectors can be made more compatible with the conservation needs of the EGREE,

The landscape-level Strategic Plan was developed.

(iii) *developing the capacities and tools of sector institutions to implement the Strategic Plan*,

4sector-related strategic plans were developed, and 3 plans were drafted.

(iv) *developing user-group based micro plans for sustainable natural resource use along with capacity building and other technical assistance to VLIs to implement these plans*.

Micro plans for sustainable natural resource use were developed and comprehensive training programs were designed and implemented.

(v) *revising the Management Plan of CWLS and devise strategies for addressing new-generation threats*.

The CWLS management plan was revised and a new one was developed to address new generation threats. Furthermore, the Project managed to prepare a file to be submitted to the Ramsar Convention in order to list CWLS as a Ramsar site.

(vi) *capacitating the park staff in improving the management effectiveness of the Sanctuary*.

The comprehensive training program was implemented including specific training modules on Sanctuary effective management.

The Project was designed to preserve a key ecosystem and protect valuable species. No activities implemented by the Project posed any environmental threats to the sustainability of the Project's outcomes.

The Environmental risks are negligible, and the sustainability is:

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
L			

Overall rating: All the associated risks are negligible and thus, the overall rating for Sustainability is:

Likely (L)	Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderately Unlikely (MS)	Unlikely (U)
L			

3.3.7 Impact

The Project has achieved major milestones and key outputs in relation to mainstreaming biodiversity in key production sectors in Kakinada- India.

Below is a summary of key deliverables, that would have a long-term impact:

Strengthening the Institutional Structure

(i) EGREE Foundation was established under the Andhra Pradesh Societies Registration Act, 2001. This Foundation is a cross-sectoral platform to facilitate the implementation of biodiversity conservation initiatives through the production sectors operating in the EGREE region.
(ii) Micro plans for 41 villages in the EGREE region were completed and implemented for strengthening Self Help Groups (SHGs)/community-based organizations in natural resource use and sustainable livelihoods.
(iii) Sectoral plans for oil and gas, tourism, aquaculture, fisheries, port and shipping, fertilizers and salt pans are prepared. The EGREE foundation will work with all these sectors for integrating biodiversity concerns into their action plans.
(iv) Biodiversity Interpretation Centre was established at Coringa showcases and a total number of 520 species encompassing fishes, snakes, amphibians, reptiles, and different marine specimens and 200 shells have also been identified, classified, marked and displayed at the Centre for creating awareness to the students and public.
(v) The in-house library hosts approximately 1,500 information-oriented books and EGREE publications on different subject areas including Conservation Law, Animal Behavioral Studies, Mangroves and Wetlands and on different production sectors like Fisheries, Aquaculture, Tourism, Oil and Natural Gas, Ports and Shipping, Fertilizers and Salt Pans. National and international journals are also available in this library. The biodiversity laboratory also showcases 34 species of crabs and 15 species of snakes.
(vi) Knowledge Management System (KMS) established - The KMS provides useful environmental information and it is expected to help a great deal at a different stage of the EIA preparation and it will be useful for environmental professionals, researchers, academia. The environmental information is being converted to the environmental knowledge base for the benefit of the policymakers.
(vii) EGREE is also networking with institutions such as APFA, KVK, CIFT, SIFT, MPEDA, NASCA, NIH, JNTU (K), AKNU, WCCB, GRI. APPCB, NETFISH, MSSRF and NEERI and nearly 1,246 local level institutions have been strengthened.

Biodiversity conservation initiatives

(i) Biodiversity inventory was carried out in the EGREE region (five species of birds, one snake and 8 species of mollusks were recorded). The EGREE region has recorded 73-92 number of fishing cats and the fishing cat was declared as an Iconic species of CWLS.
(ii) Nesting habitat of Olive Ridley turtle has increased from 1 to 7. Data reveals that there is an increase in the nesting vs hatching ratio and nearly 7,83,453 hatchings have been released into the sea during 2011-2018.
(iii) Conservation measures have been taken for increasing the fishing cat, otter, turtle, water birds, and whale shark population. The incentive is provided for conserving and the releasing of Whale Share (accidentally caught) into the sea.
(iv) For reducing the bycatch, square net and Turtle Excluder Device (TED) are used by the fishermen.
(v) Effective implementation of the 61-day fish ban in the EGREE region is implemented and this has resulted in a 20% increase of fishermen income.
(vi) Training is provided on wildlife crime and trade with special emphasis on scheduled coastal and marine species falls under the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972. The awareness on the scheduled species is given to the forest, fisheries department officials, coast guard, customs department and other production sectors.
(vii) Training for mending different sizes of nets, tie knots, ropes, construction of net using needles, and preparation of TED were taught and nearly 63 individuals were benefited.
(viii) Conducted special programs during International Whaleshark Day, Coastal Cleanup Day, Biological Diversity Day, Snakebite Awareness Day, Fisheries Day, Women's Day, Otters Day, Earth Day, Environment Day, wetland day, Wildlife Week Celebrations, etc. for creating awareness among the public about the importance of biodiversity conservation.

Livelihood improvement

(i) To enhance and sustain natural resources, training sessions were organized for village communities, who are dependent on natural resources for their livelihoods, in the EGREE

region. The training was focused on developing skills, stopping illegal fishing practices, increasing the income of local communities, etc.

(ii) Training programs were conducted for local youth to equip them as Nature Guides and they were hired in the Coringa Wildlife sanctuary. Community-based ecotourism centers were established with the support of the Tourism and Forest Departments of Andhra Pradesh. The livelihood of the local communities has improved due to the eco-tourism initiatives (Increase in the revenue of CWLS from Rs. 780 in 2011 to Rs. 46,90,440 in 2017).

(iii) SMART (Skill for Manufacturing of Apparel through Research and Training) Centre was established to strengthen the livelihood of local women, with the support of Ministry of Textiles, Government of India and nearly 225 individuals were benefited.

(iv) EGREE provided training for post-harvesting technologies and preparing fish value-added products. As a value addition, 53 individuals were trained on dry fish processing using the smoke bin.

(v) Fishing communities have received a better market price for hygienic handling of fish catch and a mega fish processing unit was established in the EGREE region.

Capacity building and skill development

(i) Developed capacity of 29,345 community members including 1,137 SHGs; 20 EDCs; 9 VSSs; 20 fishermen cooperatives; 18 fisherwomen cooperatives; 2 NGOs; 5 youth clubs and 950 cattle rearers covering 41 villages for enhanced community livelihoods and sustainable natural resource use.

(ii) Some of the training/capacity-building activities carried out are Sustainable fishing practices, fish processing, fish value addition, hospitality and hotel management, net mending, dry fish processing, IBM/OBM training, Nature Guide for tourism, Cookery and hospitality, SMART Apparel training, block-printing, tailoring, embroidery, pickle making, milk and milk products, shell handicrafts, value addition for coir and coir products and fish post-harvest handling. These capacity-building activities have brought skill development and behavioral changes among the fishing community.

Improvement of the ecological status in EGREE region

(i) The mangrove vegetation in the EGREE region has considerably increased due to the plantation of mangroves in the degraded stretches. The plantation has increased the biodiversity/fishery resources of the EGREE region. This mangrove ecosystem generates significant ecological and economic benefits such as protecting shoreline, sustaining livelihoods and providing carbon sink services. This mangrove ecosystem provides habitat for turtles, fin and shellfishes, bird population. The local communities are dependent on the mangroves and marine resources for their sustenance.

(ii) Industries have taken steps to reduce the pollution level by treating the effluent water before the discharge in the EGREE region and this has reduced the ecological stress.

(iii) The participation of local communities in biodiversity conservation and co-management practices has increased the ecosystem services of natural resources.

(iv) Providing incentives for conserving schedule species has brought awareness among the fishing community about the importance of conserving the coastal and marine biodiversity, these activities also reduce the loss of biodiversity in the EGREE region.

Some of these initiatives have led to the improvement of the ecological, economic and livelihood security of the people living in the EGREE region.

4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

Despite the unforeseeable political events that have effectually set-back project implementation, the Project managed to deliver considerable results by the end of its implementation. The Project implementing and executing agencies have provided satisfactory to high satisfactory support to project implementation. The project has demonstrated the capacity to create synergies and strategic partnerships with several key partners and stakeholders, which has succeeded in mobilizing a significant amount of additional funding, mainly from the productive sectors. The Project facilitated the implementation of a very successful and comprehensive capacity building programs and public awareness campaigns reached more than 32 thousand individuals. This is correctly reflected in the Project scorecards as it indicates that the Project has moved the capacity score up by **29** points since its inception **(60%).**

The constitution of the EGREE foundation establishes an important step towards the development of a formal institutional mechanism for mainstreaming biodiversity in the East Godavari River estuarine and coastal ecosystems. Yet, it was noticed that there were weak coordination and conflicting perception of biodiversity protection and management among government departments at the district level. This should be addressed to ensure EGREE Foundation sustainability and enhance work efficiency at the district level.

The Project has strongly invested in research and generation of knowledge on EGREE, particularly on the Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary (CWLS). Several masters students were involved in searching different topics in relation to mangrove protection in EGREE. The Project has successfully engaged main companies from the industrial and oil exploration sectors, which invested in promoting biodiversity conservation and enhancing awareness of their own staff concerning wildlife and biodiversity mainstreaming.

The Project is considered successful as it was able to mainstream biodiversity protection in production sectors. The Project also managed to deliver most of its planned results, however, with a substantial delay from the originally planned timeframe. Based on the review and assessment of the national context, the political situation during the Project's implementation, and taking into consideration the complex design of the Project, the project overall rating is ***Highly Satisfactory***.

The Project is very much acknowledged by the GoI, and very relevant to UNDP, GEF, and the Government's plans (at federal, state, and district levels). Yet, UNDP and GoI need to finalize an existing and sustainability strategy to ensure that the Project's deliverables and impacts are going to sustain after the closure of the Project. Nonetheless, with the confirmed interest and support provided by the UNDP and the GoI prospects for sustainability are certain, and overall sustainability is considered **likely**.

4.1 Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project

For the Design

Corrective Action 1: discuss the LF systematically with stakeholders mainly the proposed targets and indicators and ensure that targets and indicators are SMART.

For the Implementation

Corrective Action 2: make the best use of the IW to ensure that the Project design is still responding to the national context and needs by reviewing and updating the project's outputs, indicators, targets, and management arrangement.

Corrective Action 3: Adaptive management measures need to constitute part of the Project implementation review. This is crucial to effectively avoid any risks during the implementation.

For the Monitoring and Evaluation

Correction Action 4: Ensure that the Project's Reports include qualitative and quantitative analysis and provide essential information. An exit strategy that is discussed and agreed upon is also very important to be developed during the project's implementation.

4.2 Actions to follow up or reinforce the initial benefits of the project

The TE recognizes the considerable achievements of the project, particularly in achieving and preparing key deliverables and documentation, despite the delay encountered during Project implementation. The TE is focusing to a large extent on the areas of the Project that have not performed as well as was anticipated in the Project's design. The TE wishes that this does not detract from the successes of the Project and the hard work and commitment of all those who have been involved in it. As a terminal evaluation, there is little the Project itself can do. Hence, the TE would like to make the following recommendation to ensure that a clear set of actions to follow up or reinforce the initial benefits of the Project are identified:

- ***Recommendation 1:*** The project holds a workshop of stakeholders to adopt a comprehensive exit strategy to ensure the Project's results sustainability. The vision should provide a clear statement that conservation of the landscape and other natural values will be through a mixture of protection, alternative livelihoods, and sustainable use. (**UNDP/ MoEFCC/FD**).
- ***Recommendation 2:*** The Project's KMS and associated training programs to be officially launched at a national workshop. An urgent and clear plan of action needs to be developed to ensure the utilization of these products after 2018 to ensure Project's outcomes sustainability (**UNDP, MoEFCC/FD**).
- ***Recommendation 3***: In order to ensure the sustainability of the Project's outcomes (as it relates to the GEF Objective) it is necessary to institutionalize the Project's main results. The project should investigate embedding the EGREE Foundation at the Federal Governorate level through existing planning mechanisms and links to regional conservation plans. The possibility of extending the scope of work of the EGREE Foundation to cover the whole east coast of the country should be investigated in order to utilize functional existed mechanisms. **(MoEFCC to implement, UNDP to assist).**
- ***Recommendation 4:*** In addition to the alternative livelihood programs implemented by the Project, it is important that the Government with the support of UNDP investigates the possibilities for community-based and private enterprise-based sustainable natural resource management systems with a focus on the role of women. This should include:
  - income generation and employment creation through SMEs (identification of ecosystem resources with economic values, processing, marketing, etc.), and
  - capacity building of community institutions, such as women groups and CBOs, in governance, accountability, benefit distribution, etc.
- ***Recommendation 5:*** The Project has managed to produce a set of valuable Project's documentation including public awareness products, factsheets, technical notes, etc. It is recommended to develop a dissemination plan for those public awareness and outreach tools, to ensure that future initiatives would build on the Project activities and results and will incorporate the project's products in its work. (**UNDP, MoEFCC, FD)**.
- ***Recommendation 6:*** Capture lessons learned from this Project mainly on the role of the production sectors in biodiversity conservation and Supporting Sustainable livelihood alternative and share at the national/ regional/ and global level (UNDP CO).

4.3 Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

Linking the KMS to the Governments and UNDP main websites. Expand the scope of the EGREE foundation to cover the whole East Coast of the Country. The knowledge generated by the Project, databases, genetic banks and biodiversity museum and livelihood center is crucial to ensure that India has mainstreamed ecosystem conservation into key and critical production sectors.

4.4 Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance, and success

The project successfully proved several good practices that resulted in the implementation of the project that may be adopted for the formulation of other projects. Some of the best practices are:

- The TE recognizes the dedicated commitment and efforts of all actors, mainly; FD, UNDP, and MoEFCC teams in achieving the project's results despite the complex situation and critical risks the project had faced.
- The TE recognizes the interest of the Government of Andhra Pradesh which has supported the successes of the project and has the potential to ensure the outcomes are sustainable. Government ownership is key for projects' successful implementation.
- Developing adaptive management measures continuously support the project's implementation and ensure its smooth operation. For example, establishing a joint committee for Projects with a similar mandate or cover relatively similar landscape/seascape proved to be very practical, successful, and efficient.

5. Annexes

Annex 1. ToR

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Individual Contractor

1. Assignment Information

Assignment Title: International Consultant for Terminal Evaluation

UNDP Practice Area: Climate Change, Resilience and Energy

Cluster/Project: Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Production Sectors in the East Godavari River Estuarine Ecosystem, Andhra Pradesh

Post Level: Senior Specialist

Contract Type: Individual Contractor (IC)

Duty Station: Kakinada, Andhra Pradesh, India

Contract Duration: One month

2. Project Description

The East Godavari River Estuarine Ecosystem (EGREE) encompassing the Godavari mangroves (321 km2) is the second-largest area of mangroves along the east coast of India (after Sundarbans). The area is rich in floral and faunal diversity and generates significant ecological and economic benefits such as shoreline protection, sustaining livelihoods and carbon sink services. There are 35 species of mangroves, of which 16 are true mangroves and the rest associated mangrove species. This includes one nearly threatened (IUCN) species (Ceriops decandra) and three rare species. There are important nesting sites for migratory turtle species, notably the endangered Olive Ridley turtle, the critically endangered Leatherback turtle, and Green turtle. The area serves as spawning grounds and as a sanctuary for the growth and development of numerous fin and shellfish. It is an Important Bird Area (IBA) with a recorded population of 119 bird species, of which 50 are migratory.

In recognition of its national and global biodiversity significance, a part of the EGREE area is gazetted as Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary (CWLS). In addition to the biodiversity significance of the area, it is also of enormous economic significance. The last few decades have witnessed rapid economic changes and the emergence of large-scale production activities in EGREE. Currently, the main production sectors operating in the landscape/ seascape are fisheries, aquaculture, salt pans, manufacturing activities such as oil and gas exploration, fertilizers, edible oil, rice products, tourism, and ports. In addition, there is a dependency on the mangroves and marine resources by local villagers. These activities are impacting the overall ecological integrity of the EGREE particularly the mangrove ecosystems in CWLS and adjoining areas, with associated impacts on the livelihoods of local people. The existing institutional arrangements in the EGREE are quite inadequate in addressing the biodiversity-related issues from a landscape/ seascape perspective.

The long-term goal to which the project will contribute is the sustainable management of the globally significant coastal and marine biodiversity of India by mainstreaming biodiversity conservation considerations into production activities in the coastal and marine zones, while also taking into account development imperatives, need for sustaining livelihoods and also addressing retrogressive factors including the anticipated impacts of climate change.

The immediate objective of the project is to mainstream coastal and marine biodiversity conservation into production sectors in the East Godavari River Estuarine Ecosystem. The project objective will be achieved through the following outcomes and outputs.

- Outcome 1: Sectoral planning in the EGREE mainstreams biodiversity conservation considerations

- Outcome 2: Enhanced capacity of sector institutions for implementing biodiversity-friendly sector plans including monitoring and enforcement of regulations
- Outcome 3: Community livelihoods and natural resource use are sustainable in the EGREE

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title: Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity into Production Sectors in the East Godavari River Estuarine Ecosystem, Andhra Pradesh.
GEF Project ID: 3936
UNDP Project ID: PIMS/4257
Country: India
Region: South Asia
Focal Area: Biodiversity
FA Objectives: Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity into production Sectors
Executing Agency: UNDP
Other Partners involved: Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change
Department of Environment, Forest, Science and Technology, Govt. of Andhra Pradesh
GEF Financing: USD 6,023,636 (an endorsement)
Government: 18,000,000
Total Co-financing: 18,000,000
Total Project Cost: 24,023,636 (at endorsement)
Total Project Cost: 5,562,452 (till December 2018) at completion
ProDoc Signature (date project began): 8 June 2011
(Operational) Closing Date: Proposed - 6 June 2016 Actual - 31 March 2019

3. Scope of Work

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based on expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see Annex A), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The Protect strategy is outlined at Annexure J and the evaluation should be done with reference to outcomes and outputs stated therein.

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.

A list of documents that the Consultant will review is included in Annex B of this Terms of Reference.

In addition, interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: (i) Senior officers of MoEFCC; (ii) UNDP Management; (iii) Officials of industries located in EGREE region; (iv) Senior Officers of Andhra Pradesh State Forest Department; (v) Officials of State Departments of Fisheries, Tourism, and Agriculture; (vi) Officials of East Godavari District Administration; (vii) PMU/LPU Officials; (viii) representatives of various Institutions/Organizations involved in the Project implementation; (ix) Local community representatives.

4. Expected Outputs and Deliverables

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, the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to EGREE, including the following project sites Amaravati, Guntur, and Delhi.

The Terminal evaluation will look at the impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/ goals as mentioned in the project logframe at Annex A. Terminal Evaluation may also consider Capacity development and achievement scorecard (Annex 7 of prodoc).

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response that should be uploaded to UNDP-GEF's Project Information Management System (PIMS) and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The GEF SO-2 Tracking Tool (Annex 10 of Prodoc) will also be completed during the final evaluation.

Evaluation deliverables are stated in Annex-I.

Evaluation report outline is given in Annexure –F

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.[20]

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

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 to complete the co-financing table (Annex-H), which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

- Preparation of TE Team, document review, etc: 2 Days (Review and Approval by UNDP Regional Technical Advisor and UNDP Country Office)
- Preparation of TE Inception Report: 2 Days (Review and Approval by UNDP Country Office)
- TE Review Mission: 12 Days (Review and Approval by UNDP Regional Technical Advisor and UNDP Country Office)
- Draft TE Report: 7 Days (Review and Approval by UNDP Regional Technical Advisor and UNDP Country Office)
- Final Report: 4 Days
- A Stakeholder workshop to share the findings of the TE: 2 Days

5. Institutional Arrangement

a) The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international and 1 National Evaluators. The International Evaluator will act as Team Leader responsible for the leading of the TE mission and compiling the Terminal Evaluation final report; while the National Evaluator will provide facilitation and coordination support to the Team Leader.

b) The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP India. The UNDP India will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The team will be responsible for, reporting to the UNDP Country Office. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government, etc.

c) The Evaluators will also interact with the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor, if needed, to ensure that the approach and methodology, as well as the evaluation report, are sound and in line with the donor requirements.

6. Duration of the Work

The duration of the work is 30 working days. The project team and UNDP Country Office, as well as UNDP RTA, will provide feedback/comments no later than two weeks after the receipt of the draft report.

7. Duty Station

The Evaluator will need to travel to Andhra Pradesh during the period to conduct stakeholder interviews, visit the project sites and make a presentation of the initial findings of the evaluation. The consultant is expecting to be based at duty station at least 12 days and other work will be home-based.

8. Minimum Qualifications of the Individual Contractor

Qualifications for the International Evaluator

Education: Master's degree in social sciences, development studies, disaster management, environment, political science, economics, the management or a related area.

Experience:

- A minimum of 10 years of working experience in the related field is required
- Master's Degree (preferably Ph.D.) in the field of natural /Environmental/ social-sciences or a subject closely related to coastal and marine biodiversity resource management. An in-depth understanding of Seascape/landscape ecology conservation approaches and community-based natural resource management, as well as experience in inter-sectoral coordination, is desirable.
- Relevant experience in Biodiversity Conservation.
- Experience and familiarity with assessments of policies, strategies and possess enough knowledge of coastal and marine biodiversity conservation through inter-sectoral coordination matters at the national and local levels is necessary
- Familiar with conservation approaches in Asia either through the management and/or implementation or through consultancies in the evaluation of conservation projects. Understanding of local actions contributing to global benefits is crucial;
- Highly knowledgeable of participatory monitoring and evaluation processes, and experience in evaluation of technical assistance projects with major donor agencies; previous evaluation/review experience of UNDP-GEF projects is an advantage.
- Ability and experience to lead multidisciplinary and national teams, and deliver quality reports within the given time
- Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distill critical issues and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations;

Competencies: An overall approach and method[21] for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have 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) 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.

Corporate Competencies:

- Demonstrates integrity by modeling the UN's values and ethical standards.
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability.

Functional Competencies:

Development and Operational Effectiveness

- Ability to lead strategic planning, change processes, results-based management and reporting.
- Ability to lead formulation, oversight of implementation, monitoring and evaluation of programs and projects.
- Ability to apply development theory to the specific country context to identify creative and practical approaches to overcome challenging situations.

Management and Leadership

- Demonstrates team-building capacity including interpersonal and communication skills and ability to cope with a difficult environment where formal institutions of government are at the embryonic stage.
- Deals diplomatically with challenging bureaucratic processes, and pressure to meet strict deadlines.
- Consistently approaches work with energy and a positive, constructive attitude.
- Demonstrates openness to change and ability to manage complexities.
- Ability to lead effectively with the use of mentoring as well as conflict-resolution skills.
- Remains calm, in control, and is good-humored even under pressure.
- Proven networking, teambuilding, organizational and communication skills.
- Capacity to work under pressure, manage stress and adapt to rapidly evolving situations.
- Ability to work in a multicultural environment with sound understanding and capability to empower and develop the capacity of national counterparts.

Language Requirements: Excellent command of written and spoken English

9. Criteria for Evaluation

The consultant would be selected based on the following criteria:

- Technical: 70 points
    - Educational Qualification - 35 Marks
    - Relevant Experience - 35 Marks
- Financial: 30 points

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

10. 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'

11. Payment Milestones

The consultant will be paid on a lump sum basis under the following installments.

- 10% Submission of the inception report
- 50% Following submission and approval of the 1st draft terminal evaluation report
- 40% Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final Terminal evaluation report

12. APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online (www.jobs.undp.org; www.vn.undp.org) by 25 March 2019. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English (with an indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

13. Annexes to the TOR

- Annex A: Project Strategic Result Framework
- Annex B: List of documents to be reviewed
- Annex C: Evaluation Questions
- Annex D: Rating Scales
- Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct
- Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline
- Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form
- Annex H: Project Finance and Co-Finance
- Annex I: Evaluation Deliverables
- Annex J: Project Strategy

14. Approval

This TOR is approved by: [*indicate name of Approving Manager*]

Signature _____

Name and Designation _____

Date of Signing _____

Annex 2. List of documents reviewed

The TE consultant reviewed the following documents related to the Project:

I	Reports
1	Feasibility of establishing a cross-sectoral Institutional Mechanism for Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Production Sectors in the EGREE, Andhra Pradesh (AP), 2012.
2	Research Strategies for conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity in the EGREE, AP, 2012. Prepared by WII and supported under the EGREE project.
3	Biodiversity Management Plan for Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary, Andhra Pradesh 2013-2023. Prepared by Dr. Thulsi Rao, Deputy Conservator of Forest (retd.) and State Project Coordinator.
4	Asian Waterbird Census Report, 2018. Prepared by the EGREE Foundation and Wildlife Division of the AP Forest Department.
5	Developing crab and cage culture in the EGREE region held on 19th April 2018 at EGREE, Kakinada.
6	World Otter Day celebration held on 30 May 2018 at Coringa Biodiversity Centre, Coringa Complex.
7	Apiculture Training held on 7- 9 and 13 - 18 August 2018 at NG Ranga University, Hyderabad.
8	Report on Enhancing Stakeholder capacity for integrated Management and Conservation of EGREE, held between 23 - 25 August 2018 at Coringa Biodiversity Centre, Coringa Complex.
9	Report on Stakeholders' consultation for Whale Conservation Action Plan held on 29 August 2018 at Coringa Biodiversity Centre, Coringa Complex.
10	Report on the Wildlife Week celebration held during 2-8 October 2018 at Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary.
11	Exposure visit to Sundarbans Biosphere Reserve from 3-6 December 2018. Prepared by the community members, EGREE foundation and the Andhra Pradesh Forest Department.
12	Socio-economic and livelihood activities in the EGREE region. Prepared by the Landscape level Project Management Unit, EGREE Foundation, A.P Forest complex.
13	Traditional Ecological Knowledge-based investigation of historical occurrence, distribution and population trend of whale shark along the Andhra Pradesh coast. Prepared by EGREE Foundation and Wildlife Trust of India.
14	Biodiversity Friendly Tourism Sector Plan for EGREE. Prepared by JPS Associated Pvt. Ltd.
15	Biodiversity Friendly Fisheries Sector Plan for EGREE. Prepared by Dr. Padmavathi Devarapalli
16	Biodiversity Friendly Aquaculture Plan for EGREE. Prepared by D.E. Babu.
17	Biodiversity Friendly Oil and Natural Gas Sector Plan for EGREE. Prepared by SENES Consultants India Pvt. Ltd.
18	Note on the activities of State Institute of Fisheries Technology, Kakinada
19	Statement showing the Particulars of training conducted in SIFT, Kakinada for the year 2018 -19.
20	Mainstreaming Biodiversity into Coastal and Marine Fisheries Sector, 2018. Published by the Centre for Biodiversity Policy and Law, National Biodiversity Authority.

II	**Annual Work Plan, minutes of the meetings and research advisory committee meetings and certificates**
21	Reviewed the annual Work Plans between 2011-2018
22	Constitution of the Governing Board of EGREE
23	Quarterly progress report cum PO's Report Template (2013-18)
24	Office orders: (a) Constitution of Research Advisory Committee; (b) Constitution of State Project Steering Committee (PSC)
25	Certificate for undertaking research projects entitled "Ascertaining the removal efficiency of *Lemina Minor* in Froth Diminution by using Phytoremediation"
26	Certificate for undertaking a research project entitled "Decontamination of wastewater by biofiltration using invasive Bivalves".
27	Minutes of the first PSC meeting of the GoI-UNDP GEF project held on 28 June 2011 at Aranya Bhavan, Hyderabad.
28	Minutes of the second PSC meeting of the GoI-UNDP GEF project held on 21 June 2013 at Aranya Bhavan, Hyderabad.
29	Discussions of the First combined meeting of the NPSC of GoI-UNDP-GEF Projects: held on 23 January 2014 at Hotel Marriot, Goa.
30	First Research Advisory Committee meeting held on 27 March 2014 at Aranya Bhavan, Hyderabad.
31	Minutes of the 1st Core Committee Review Meeting held on 21st April 2014 at Aranya Bhavan, Hyderabad.
32	Second Research Advisory Committee meeting held on 2 July 2015 at Aranya Bhavan, Hyderabad.
33	Minutes of the Review/core committee meeting held on 9 February 2016 at Aranya Bhavan, Hyderabad.
34	Minutes of the Constitution of Core Committee for reviewing and monitoring the EGREE Project held on 21 April 2016.
35	Minutes of the second Governing Board Meeting of EGREE Foundation held on 6 June 2016.
36	Minutes of the third Governing Board Meeting of EGREE Foundation held on 6 August 2016.
37	Status of Fishing Cat and Indian Smooth-coated Otter in Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary, 2016. Prepared by the EGREE Foundation.
38	Minutes of the fourth Governing Board Meeting of EGREE Foundation
39	Minutes of the second Core Committee Review Meeting held on 4th May 2017 at Vijayawada.
40	Minutes of the combine NPSC for GoI-UNDP-GEF Projects for (i) Coastal and Marine Project in Andhra Pradesh (ii) Coastal and Marine Project in Maharashtra (III) India High Mountain Landscape Project in Kerala, held on 31 August 2017 at Krishna Conference Hall, Fourth Floor, Jal Wing, MoEFCC.
41	Finfish Atlas of EGREE Region, 2017. UNDP-GEF GoAP Project.
42	Minutes of the third Core Committee Review Meeting held on 11 December 2017 at the Conference Hall, Divisional Forest Officer, Vijayawada.

43	Minutes of the review meeting on Annual Working Plan, 2017 held on 1 January 2018 at the Conference Hall, Office of the Chief Conservator of Forest, Rajahmahendravaram.
44	Minutes of the fourth Core Committee Review Meeting held on 27 February 2018 at Innotel Hotel, Vijayawada.
45	Proceedings of the second combined meeting of the National Project Steering Committee for the GoI-UNDP GEF projects for EGREE and Sindhudurg Coast, Maharashtra.
III	**EGREE Publications (Capacity building materials)**
46	Inception Workshop Proceedings, 17 March 2012. Published under the EGREE project.
47	Mollusc species in the EGREE region.
48	Coromandel Kakinada, Bird's Paradise. Published by the Murugappa group.
49	Quarterly progress report cum PO's Report Template (2013-18)
50	A documentary film on The Power to make a difference. Prepared by the EGREE Foundation
51	Voice of the sea stories from India's Coastal communities, 2018. Published by UNDP.
52	Indian Smooth-coated Otter (*Lutrogaleper spicillata*) – The Wetland Ambassador conservation in EGREE region
53	Whale Shark (*Rhincodon typus* conservation in EGREE Region - Save the Gentle Giant
54	Sea Turtle Conservation in EGREE Region – Save the ocean Wanders
55	Threatened Ichthyofauna (Finfish) of EGREE
56	A Birdwatchers Paradise, Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary Coringa, Kakinada.
57	Birds of EGREE Region
58	Common Birds of EGREE (with checklist), 2014
59	Brochure prepared for • About the project • Eco-tourism in Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary • Coringa Biodiversity Centre
60	Newsletters: Issue 1 July 2012, Issue 2 October 2012 (ISSN No: 2319-7420) Issue 1 January 2013 (ISSN: 2319-7420)
61	7 species brochure – Knowledge products developed: • Fishing Cat, • Golden Jackal • Whale Shark, • Great Knot, • Olive Ridley Turtle, • Indian Smooth-coated Otter • Windowpane Oyster

62	Videos developed under the project: • Turning a Factory into a Bird Sanctuary- https://youtu.be/Q0FDLaQUQ18 • Transforming Lives Through Ecotourism - https://youtu.be/Z0Hd4PaJ2Bo • Saving the World's Largest Fish - https://youtu.be/lhKnMyFMHmE • On the Trail of the Fishing Cat - https://youtu.be/4Z9Fgn41rl0 • A Hotspot for Nature Lovers - https://youtu.be/aBvoX2fsbGk

Annex 3: Itinerary

International and National Experts

Dr. Amal AlDababseh and Dr. C. Thomson Jacob

Terminal Evaluation of the Project on

Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity Conservation into Production Sectors in the Godavari River Estuary, Andhra Pradesh

Mission Period: 9-18 June 2019

New Delhi, Kakinada, Guntur, Vijayawada - India

Day	Time	Interviewee (Names and Title)	Venue
Monday (10th June)	09:00 - 11:00	Introductory meeting with the terminal evaluation team: • Dr. Amal AlDababseh, International Expert • Dr. C. Thomson Jacob, National Consultant	UNDP office, New Delhi
	11:00 - 13:00	Meeting with the UNDP project team: • Dr. Preeti Soni, Chief, Climate Change, Resilience & Energy • Ms. Rita Thokchom, Knowledge Management & Coordination Associate • Ms. Akshara Saini, Finance and Administrative Assistant Strengthening State Strategies for Climate Actions	UNDP office, New Delhi
	14:00 - 15:30	Meeting with: • Dr. Tarun Kathula, Director/Scientist 'F', Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC), Government of India	MoEFCC office, New Delhi
Tuesday (11th June)	06:00 - 08:15	Travel to Vijayawada (by flight)	
	09:00 - 10:00	Discussion with: • Dr. Ravishankar Thupalli, State Project Coordinator, EGREE Foundation about the project implementation process	Inn Hotel, Gundala, Vijayawada
	11:00 - 12:00	Meeting with: • Dr. Nalini Mohan Denduluri, I.F.S., Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife), Chief Wildlife Warden, Andhra Pradesh Forest Department • Mr. P. Sathyanarayanan, Technical Officer, EGREE Foundation • Mr. G. Ramakrishna Rao, Wildlife Project Expert, EGREE Foundation	Office of PCCF, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh
	14:00 - 16:00	Meeting with: • Mr. Naresh Babu Bitragunta,	NTR Administrative block, e-Pragati

		Project Manager, e-Pragati Authority • Mr. Pentakota Raja Sekhar Project Manager, e-Pragati Authority • Mr. Vijayakumar Mopuri, Consultant, e-Pragati Authority	Authority, Vijayawada
	16:00 - 21:30	Travel to Kakinada (by road)	Royal Park Hotel, Kakinada
Wednesday (12th June)	09:00 - 09:10	Discussion with: • Dr. Ravishankar Thupalli, State Project Coordinator, EGREE about the day's program schedule	Hotel Royal Park, Kakinada
	09:20 - 09:40	Field visit to the local salt pans, aquaculture ponds, and mangrove plantations	Kakinada
	10:00 - 10:45	Visited Coringa Marine Museum (Wildlife Management showcased the biodiversity-related awareness material and preserved animal specimens available with the center) • Mr. Anant Shankar, Divisional Forest Officer,	Coringa Marine Museum, Kakinada
	11:00 - 12:30	Meeting with: • Dr. Shanti Priya Pandey, Chief Conservator of Forests • Mr. Anant Shankar, Divisional Forest Officer, Wildlife Management • Ms. Nandani Salaria, DFO, APFD and Additional CEO, EGREE	Rajahmundry circle, Rajamahendra varam
	12:30 - 13:30	Presentation by: • Dr. Ravishankar Thupalli, State Project Coordinator, EGREE.	Rajahmundry circle, Rajamahendra varam
	15:00 - 17:00	Discussion with: • Dr. Ravishankar Thupalli, State Project Coordinator, EGREE • Mr. K Ravi Kumar Kona, Finance Administration Assistant (FAA), EGREE Foundation.	EGREE Foundation, Rajahmundry
Thursday (13th June)	09:15 - 10:00	Visit Biodiversity Interpretation Centre • Dr. Ravishankar Thupalli, State Project Coordinator	EGREE Foundation, Rajahmundry
	10:00 - 11:00	• Ms. Bharathi Nakkidapu, Socio Economic Livelihood Associate, NUNV, UNDP, EGREE Foundation • Disa Women Co-operative Society, Chollangi, Corangi Self Help Group women members who participated are: • Ms. Kamala Ropanchi • Ms. Annapuravakapali • Ms. Malladi Surya Kumari	EGREE Foundation, Rajahmundry

		• Ms. Kopana Baty • Ms. RepadiVenkates Laxmi • Ms. Narala Bhagya Lakshmi • Ms. Durga Bhavani Dadala • Ms. Mulladi Kana Mahalakshmi • Ms. Neelima • Ms. Dadalar Rani	
	11:00 - 11:30	Meet with: • Mr. M. Sachare, EDC Chairman, Kobbarichetta • Whale Shark Savers, the fishing community. Fishermen who participated are: • Mr. K. Muralidhar, Secretary, Environmental NGO, Pallesare, Thalaram • Mr. S. Lovaraga, • Mr. KondalGhangaraj • Mr. M. Gopi	EGREE Foundation, Rajahmundry
	11:30 - 12:00	Meet with: • Ms. Devi Anusha. • Mr. Uppala Sudhir Kumar, • B.Tech students from the Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Kakinada. The other students who participated in the discussion are: • Mr. Repalle Gopi Krishna • Mr. Chakka Prasanth • Mr. Eluri Satish Kumar • Mr. Bopana Naga Vineetha • Ms. Maroju Manisha • Mr. Kundrupu Naidu	EGREE Foundation, Rajahmundry
	12:30 - 14:00	Visit beneficiaries- different villages: • ***Chinavalasala village*** (women entrepreneurs who are involved in dry fish processing). The International Consultant discussed with the beneficiaries the advantage and the sustainability of the project. A couple of women entrepreneurs held discussions with the international consultant and shared their profit model and the usefulness of the EGREE project. • ***Dry platforms and the waiting center*** constructed under the EGREE project (more than 30 fishers who are benefited through the project). • Interacted with 10 SHG women from the **Chinavalasala** village and visited their tailoring unit.	EGREE Project Chinavalasala village, Kakinada
	14:00 - 14:15	Witness the skill of fishers in repairing the In-Boat Motor (IBM) and Out Boat Motor (OBM) and the usefulness of the tool kit.	
	14:15 - 15:00	Lunch	

	15:30 - 17:00	Visit Coringa wildlife sanctuary: - boardwalk area, shops, mangrove plantations and other infrastructural facilities developed under the project. - A boat ride was arranged to understand the eco-tourism initiatives carried out under the project for enhancing the livelihood options of the local community.	Chollangi
	17:30 - 18:00	Visit the mangrove nursery and genetic garden developed under the project and discussed with: • Dr. R. Ramasubramanian Principal Coordinator, Coastal Systems Research.	M.S. Swaminathan Research Foundation Machilipatnam, Chollangi
	18:15 - 19:00	Discussion with: • Mr. Surya Rao: a local village leader.	Kobbari Chettu Peta
Friday (14th June)	09:00 - 09:30	Discussion with: • Dr. Ravishankar Thupalli, State Project Coordinator.	Hotel Royal Park, Kakinada
	11:00 - 12:30	Visit Coromandel International (fertilizer company) and held discussion with: • Mr. Ravi Kiran Saride, Associate Vic-President (Operations) • Mr. P.V. Rao, AGM, EHS. • A presentation on the biodiversity-related initiatives taken by Coromandel International. • Visit the ***Birds Paradis*** and examined the conservation efforts carried out inside the Coromandel factory premises	Kakinada
	12:30 - 14:00	Visit the Department of Fisheries, Government of Andhra Pradesh and held discussion with • Mr. Koteswara Rao, Additional Director of Fisheries • Mr. G. Venkateswara Rao, Vice Principal, State Institute of Fisheries Technology	Kakinada
	14:00 - 15:00	Proceed to Nallamala to visit tribal communities (by car)	
	16:00 - 20:00	Visited the man-made reservoir/boating and stayed at Maredumilli (Vanavihari), Jungle Star Eco camp and Interacted with: • Mr. T. Srisai, Forest Range officer, Wildlife Management range, Rampachodavaram • Mr. P. Sathyanarayanan, Technical Officer, EGREE	Nallamala
Saturday (15th June)	06:00 - 08:00	Trekking at Jungle Eco-camp	Nallamala
	09:00 - 15:30	Travel to Visakhapatnam	SreeKanya
Sunday (16th June)		Travel from Visakhapatnam to Delhi	

Monday (17th June)	11:00 - 11:30	A debriefing session with the UNDP project team: • Dr. Preeti Soni, Chief, Climate Change Resilience & Energy • Mr. Manish Mohandas, Project Coordinator (Resilience) • Ms. Rita Thokchom, Knowledge Management & Coordination Associate	UNDP office, New Delhi
	12:00 - 14:00	A debriefing with the MoEFCC officials: • Dr. R. Gopinath, Joint Director of Wildlife, Project Elephant, • Mr. Roy P. Thomas, Consultant • Mr. Manish Mohandas, Project Coordinator (Resilience) • Ms. Rita Thokchom, • Knowledge Management & Coordination Associate • Mr. Krishna Kumar, National Project Officer, Secure Himalayan Project	MoEFCC office, Wildlife wing, New Delhi
	15:30 - 16:30	Discussed with UNDP office and collected required materials	UNDP Office, New Delhi

Annex 4. List of persons interviewed

	Name	Title and Address
I	**Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change officials**	
1	Dr. R. Gopinath	Joint Director, Wildlife (WL), Project Elephant (PE), Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change Government of India
2	Dr. Tarun Kathula	Director/Scientist 'F', Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change Government of India
3	Mr. Roy P. Thomas	Consultant (Wildlife), Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change Government of India
II	**UNDP Project Unit**	
4	Dr. Preeti Soni	Chief, Climate Change, Resilience & Energy, United Nations Development Programme
5	Ms. Rita Thokchom	Knowledge Management & Coordination Associate, United Nations Development Programme
6	Ms. Akshara Saini	Finance and Administrative Assistant, Strengthening State Strategies for climate action United Nations Development Programme
III	**Andhra Pradesh Forest Department**	
7	Dr. Nalini Mohan Denduluri	Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife), Chief Wildlife Warden, Andhra Pradesh Forest Department, Guntur, Andhra Pradesh
8	Dr. Shanti Priya Pandey	Chief Conservator of Forests, Rajahmundry Circle, Rajamahendravaram, Andhra Pradesh
9	Mr. Ananth Shankar	District Forest Officer (Wildlife), and CEO, EGREE, Andhra Pradesh Forest Department, Andhra Pradesh
10	Dr. Nandani Slaria, DFO	APFD and Additional CEO, EGREE, Andhra Pradesh Forest Department, Andhra Pradesh
11	Mr. T. Srisai	Forest Range officer, Wildlife Management range, Rampachodavaram
V	**Project Management Unit**	
12	Dr. Ravishankar Thupalli	State Project Coordinator, EGREE Foundation, C/O A.P Forest Complex, Corangi, Tellarevu Mandal, East Godavari district, Andhra Pradesh

13	Mr. K Ravi Kumar Kona,	Finance Administration Assistant (FAA), EGREE Foundation
14	Mr. G. Ramakrishna Rao	Wildlife Project Expert, EGREE Foundation
15	Mr. P. Sathyanarayanan	Technical Officer, EGREE Foundation
16	Mrs. Bharati Nakkipadu	Socio-economic and Livelihood Specialist, United Nations Development Programme, EGREE Foundation
V	**Disha Cooperative Society:** Disha Multi Cooperative Society was established with the support of the EGREE Foundation, where a group of women comes every day to do tailoring work and they are receiving work orders from Coromandel Private Limited, Schools and forest departments for stitching uniforms and bags.	
17	Ms. Kamala Ropanchi	Self Help Group Women, EGREE Foundation
18	Ms. Annapuravakapali	Self Help Group Women, EGREE Foundation
19	Ms. Malladi Surya Kumari	Self Help Group Women, EGREE Foundation
20	Ms. Kopana Baty	Self Help Group Women, EGREE Foundation
21	Ms. RepadiVenkates Laxmi	Self Help Group Women, EGREE Foundation
22	Ms. Narala Bhagya Lakshmi	Self Help Group Women, EGREE Foundation
23	Ms. Durga Bhavani Dadala	Self Help Group Women, EGREE Foundation
24	Ms. Mulladi Kana Mahalakshmi	Self Help Group Women, EGREE Foundation
25	Ms. Neelima	Self Help Group Women, EGREE Foundation
26	Ms. Dadalar Rani	Self Help Group Women, EGREE Foundation
VI	**Whale Shark Conservation Group Fishers**	
27	Mr. M.Sachare	EDC Chairman, Kobbarichetta fishermen
28	Mr. K. Muralidhar	Secretary, Environmental NGO, Pallesare, Thalaram
29	Mr. S. Lovaraga	Fisherman, Kakinada
30	Mr. Kondal Gngaraj	Fisherman, Kakinada
31	Mr. M. Gopi	Fisherman, Kakinada
VII	**Research Students from Nehru Technological University (JNTU), Kakinada**	
32	Ms. Devi Anusha	B.Tech Student, JNTU, Kakinada
33	Mr. Uppala Sudhir Kumar	B.Tech Student, JNTU, Kakinada
VIII	**In Board and Out Board Motor Training Beneficiaries**	

34	Discussion with Chinavalasala Fishing Community (3-member Group)	EGREE foundation with SIFT, Kakinada organized IBM and OBM training to provide hands-on experience of managing a marine engine in boats. The participants were offered practice on fixing engines and were provided with a tool kit. The Evaluation team noticed the fisherman carrying the tool kit for repairing their boats.
IX	**Smoke Bin**	
35	Discussion with Chinavalasala Fishing Community (2 fishermen's wife's beneficiaries)	EGREE Foundation in collaboration with CIFT, Visakhapatnam and SIFT, Kakinada trained 53 participants on various preservation methods such as cleaning, cutting, storage, chilling, drying, packaging and smoking. Under the project, 50 beneficiaries were provided with smoke bins and during the field visit, the evaluation team had visited two of the beneficiaries' homes who are using the smoke bin.
X	**Dry Fish Processing and waiting center**	**Visited dry platforms, Chinavalasala village**
36	Discussed with around 30 fishers	Visited dry platforms and the waiting center constructed under the EGREE project and interacted with fishers who are benefited through the project.
XI	**Project Partners**	
(a)	**Fisheries Sector**	
37	Mr. Koteswara Rao	Additional Director of Fisheries, State Institute of Fisheries Technology, Department of Fisheries, Andhra Pradesh
38	Mr. G. Venkateswara Rao	Vice Principal, State Institute of Fisheries Technology, Department of Fisheries, Andhra Pradesh
(b)	**Fertilizer Industry**	
39	Mr. Ravi Kiran Saride	Associate Vice-President (Operations)
40	Mr. P.V. Rao	Additional General Manager, Coromandel
(c)	**Knowledge Management**	
41	Mr. Naresh Babu Bitragunta	Project Manager, e-pragati Authority, Department of Information Technology, Electronics and communications, Government of Andhra Pradesh
42	Mr. Raj Sekhar	Project Manager, e-Pragati Authority, Department of Information Technology, Electronics and communications, Government of Andhra Pradesh
43	Mr. Vijayakumar Mopuri	Consultant, e-pragati Authority, Department of Information Technology, Electronics and communications, Government of Andhra Pradesh
(d)	**Mangrove Conservation – Partnership with NGO**	
44	Dr. Ramasubramanian	Principal Coordinator, Mangrove Nursery Development M.S. Swaminathan Research Foundation

Annex 5. Evaluative Question Matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Indicators	Means of Verification
i. Project Strategy		
1. Project design		
Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context of achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.	Reported adaptive management measures in response to changes in context.	▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders.
Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?	Reported progress toward achieving the results	▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders.
Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country?	Endorsement of the project by governmental agencies. Provision of counterpart funding.	▪ Documents endorsements and co-financing. ▪ Interviews with UNDP, project staff and governmental agencies.
Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, considered during project design processes?	Level of participation of project partners in project design and actual inclusion in project implementation arrangements	▪ Interviews with stakeholders. ▪ Project progress reports.
Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.	Level of gender issues raised outlined in project documents	▪ Project documents
2. Results Framework/ Logframe:		
Undertake a critical analysis of the project's log frame indicators and targets, assess how "smart" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.	Indicators and targets of outcome and outputs.	▪ Project framework
Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and within its time frame?	The stated contribution of stakeholders in project implementation.	▪ Interviews with stakeholders.

Examine if progress so far has led to or could in the future catalyze beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance, etc...) that should be included in the project results in the framework and monitored on an annual basis.	Indicators of the project's outcome (from the project results framework)	▪ Field visits and interviews with local stakeholders involved with these projects and the direct beneficiaries.
Ensure the broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend smart 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.	Measures were taken to ensure proper project implementation based on project monitoring and evaluation	▪ Project's reports. ▪ Interviews with PSC/Project board members ▪ Minutes of interviews with key stakeholders
ii. Progress Towards Results		
*3. **Progress towards outcomes analysis***		
Review the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix.	Output level indicators of the Results Framework.	▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Tangible products (publications, studies, etc.) ▪ Interviews with the project's staff, partners, and stakeholders.
iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management		
4. Management arrangement		
Review the overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.	Level of implementation of mechanisms outlined in the project document	▪ Interviews with project staff and partners. ▪ Project progress reports.
Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.	Level of satisfaction (among partners and project staff) of overall management by Implementing partner.	▪ Interviews with project staff, consultants, and partner organizations
Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.	Level of satisfaction (among partners and project staff) of overall management by UNDP	▪ Interviews with project staff, consultants, and partner organizations
5. Work planning		
Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.	Level of compliance with project planning / annual plans	▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff.

Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?	List of results proposed in the work plan	▪ Project work plan.
Examine the use of the project's results framework/ logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since the project start.	Level of compliance with project results framework and logframe	▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff.
6. Finance and co-finance		
Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.	Level of compliance with project financial planning / annual plans	▪ Project financial reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff.
Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.	Level of compliance with project financial planning	▪ Project financial reports.
Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for the timely flow of funds?	Quality of standards for financial and operative management. Perception of management efficiency by project partners and project staff/consultants	▪ Interviews with the project and UNDP finance staff. ▪ Financial reports.
Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?	Level of co-financing in relation to the original planning	▪ Financial reports of the project. ▪ Interviews with project management staff and UNDP RTA.
7. Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems		
Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?	Measures were taken to improve project implementation based on project monitoring and evaluation. Level of implementation of the M&E system. Changes in project implementation as result of supervision visits/missions.	▪ Project progress and implementation reports. ▪ Interview with project staff, the UNDP team, and key stakeholders.
Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?	The number of cases where resources are insufficient. The number of cases where budgets were	▪ Project progress reports/ financial reports/ consultant contracts and report

	transferred between different budget lines.	
8. Stakeholder Engagement		
Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?	Level of participation of project partners in project design and actual inclusion in project implementation arrangements	▪ Interviews with key stakeholders
Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?	Endorsement of the project by governmental agencies. Provision of counterpart funding Perception of ownership by national and local agencies	▪ Interviews with national partners, UNDP and project staff. ▪ Project progress reports/PIR. ▪ Documented endorsements and co-financing.
Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards the achievement of project objectives?	Perceived level of collaboration and coordination. The stated contribution of stakeholders in the achievement of outputs.	▪ Interviews with the Project Management team. ▪ Interviews with stakeholders. ▪ Citation of stakeholders' roles in specific products like publications
*9. **Reporting***		
Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.	Reported adaptive management measures in response to changes in context	▪ Project progress reports ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders
Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfill GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly rated PIRs, if applicable?)	Level of alignment with the GEF mandate and policies at the time of design and implementation; and the GEF CCCD.	▪ Comparison of project documents and annual reports and policy and strategy papers of local-regional agencies, GEF and UNDP. ▪ Interviews with UNDP, project and governmental agencies.
Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.	Reported adaptive management measures.	▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders.

10. Communications		
Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?	The degree to which plans were followed up by project management. Perception of effectiveness.	▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders.
Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)	Stated the existed means of communication. The degree to which plans were followed up by project management.	▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders
iv. Sustainability		
Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs, and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.	Identified risks and mitigation measures during project design and the updated risk-log sheet in ATLAS	▪ Project document ▪ Progress report ▪ Risk log
11. Financial risks to sustainability.		
What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income-generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?	Estimations on financial requirements. Estimations of the future budget of key stakeholders.	▪ Studies on financial sustainability. ▪ Documented estimations of the future budget. ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders
12. ***Socio-economic risks to sustainability.***		
Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there enough public/stakeholder awareness in support of the long-term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could	Key factors positively or negatively impacted project results (in relation to the stated assumptions). Main national stakeholders participate actively in the implementation and replication of project activities and results.	▪ Interviews with project staff, key stakeholders. ▪ Project progress reports. ▪ Revision of literature on context ▪ Documentation on activities of key stakeholders

learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?		
13. ***Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability***		
Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures, and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.	Key institutional frameworks that may positively or negatively influence project results (in relation to stated assumptions)	▪ Analysis of existing frameworks. ▪ Interviews with project staff and key stakeholders
14. ***Environmental risks to sustainability***		
Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize the sustenance of project outcomes?	Number of identified risks	▪ Risk log and management response.

Annex 6. The questionnaire used for the interviews

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Overall project assessment, lessons learned and recommendations			
What do you perceive as the project's most significant achievements thus far?	Project achievements	Interviews Project documentation	Interviews Review of project documentation
Please comment on any lessons learned thus far through this project	Lessons learned	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews
What issues, if any, are impeding project progress and how might these be addressed?	Obstacles to progress	Interviews Project reports	Interviews Review of project documentation
Do you have any recommendations to strengthen project execution and delivery?	Recommendations	Interviews Project reports	Interviews Review of project documentation
Do you have any recommendations to maximize project impact and sustainability?	Recommendations	Interviews Project reports	Interviews Review of project documentation

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area (Biodiversity), and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional, and national levels?			
To what extent does the project correspond to local and national development priorities and organizational policies in India?	Level of consistency between project objectives and achievements and national priorities	ProDoc GEF strategy documents	Review of documentation Interviews
To what extent is the project in line with GEF Operational Programs or the strategic priorities under which the project was funded (is the project relevant to the GEF biodiversity focal area)?	Level of consistency between project objectives and achievements and the strategic priorities and programs of GEF	ProDoc GEF strategy documents	Review of project and Redocumentation
Are the objectives of the project still appropriate given the changed circumstances since the project was designed?	Level of fit between project objectives and socioeconomic/ environmental and political context.	Interviews Project reports	Interviews Review of project documentation
What is the level of country ownership of the project?	Level of country ownership	Interviews Project reports	Interviews Review of project documentation

Have the relevant representatives from government and civil society been involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?	Level of participation of key stakeholders in project implementation	Project documentation (e.g. PIRs, list of steering committee members, attendance sheets for steering committee meetings)	Review of project documentation
Has the government enacted legislation and/or developed policies and regulations in line with the project's objectives?	Draft or enacted legislation, policies or regulations that are consistent with the project	Project documentation (e.g. PIRs, list of steering committee members, attendance sheets for steering committee meetings)	Interviews Review of project documentation
Is the project relevant to UNCBD, and other international convention objectives?	The alignment between the project and the relevant international conventions objectives.	Project documents	Project document. PIF

Evaluation Criteria Questions	**Evaluation Indicators**	**Sources**	**Methodology**
Effectiveness: to what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved			
To what extent were each of the project outcomes and project objectives achieved thus far?	Each of the project outcomes and project objectives achieved thus far? Logframe indicators at the objective and outcome levels	PIRs, progress reports, consultancy reports Interviews	Interviews Review of project documentation
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	Risks are identified and a clear set of mitigation measures were identified and taken	Risks log	Review of project documentation
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	Lessons learned generated and shared	Lessons learned the report. Progress Reports	Review of project documentation Interviews

Evaluation Criteria Questions	**Evaluation Indicators**	**Sources**	**Methodology**

Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national norms and standards?			
To what extent have the results been delivered with the least costly resources possible?	Total amount spent compared to budget Amount spent per output and outcome compared to budget The total amount of co-financing secured	PIRs (particularly summaries of project expenses) Interviews	Review of the project documentation Interviews
How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	# of partnerships established.	Progress reports.	Review of project documentation Interviews
Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	# of local experts and staff engaged in the project's implementation.	Project HR documents	Review of project documentation Interview
What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?		Project financial reports and progress reports	Review of project documentation Interviews

Evaluation Criteria Questions	**Evaluation Indicators**	**Sources**	**Methodology**
Sustainability			
Are there financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes?	Amount of funding available after project termination to support project objectives	Interviews	Interviews
Has a mechanism been installed to ensure financial and economic sustainability once GEF assistance ends?	installed to ensure financial and economic sustainability once GEF assistance ends? Financial commitments or arrangements established to secure resources for post-project activities that are consistent with project objectives	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews
Is there enough stakeholder (including government and public) awareness and ownership of the project's long-term objectives?	Level of stakeholder support for project objectives	Project reports including surveys Interviews	Project reports including surveys

			Interviews
Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project benefits?	The existence of legal and policy frameworks and governance structures to enable the sustainability of project benefits	Project reports Interviews	Review of Project documentation Interviews
Are required systems for accountability and transparency, and required technical know-how, in place?	Level of capacity, accountability, and transparency to facilitate the sustainability of project achievements	Project reports Interviews	Review of Project documentation Interviews
Are there ongoing activities that may pose an environmental threat to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Presence of environmental threats to project sustainability	Project reports Interviews	Review of Project documentation Interviews

Evaluation Criteria Questions	**Evaluation Indicators**	**Sources**	**Methodology**
Project Design			
Are there any aspects of the project design that should be modified at this point to maximize project impact or to better reflect the project reality?	Design changes required	Interviews Project documentation	Interviews Review of project documentation
Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?	Content of logframe	Logframe Interviews	Review of logframe interviews
Were the main project assumptions and risks identified?	Project assumptions and risks	Logframe Interviews	Review of logframe Interviews
Were the capacities and resources of the executing institution and counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?	Capacity and resources of EA and counterparts at project entry	Interviews ProDoc	Interviews Review of ProDoc
Were the management arrangements and roles and responsibilities properly identified prior to project approval?	Detail and clarity of management arrangements	ProDoc	Review of ProDoc
Were partnership arrangements negotiated prior to project approval?	Agreements with partners on project implementation at project entry	Interviews ProDoc	Interviews Review of ProDoc
To what extent did stakeholders participate in the project formulation process?	Level of stakeholder participation in project design	Interviews ProDoc	Interviews Review of ProDoc

Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?	Project design reflecting previous lessons learned	Interviews	Interviews
Evaluation Criteria Questions	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Impact			
What are the main positive and negative impacts of the project thus far?	Project impacts (capacity, enabling framework, etc.)	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews
Has the project led to global environmental benefits or reductions in stress to ecological systems, or is there evidence that the project has put in place processes that will lead to such an impact?	Levels of land degradation Systems, structures, and capacity expected to lead to changes in levels of land degradation	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews

Evaluation Criteria Questions	**Evaluation Indicators**	**Sources**	**Methodology**
Project Implementation			
Has Implementing Agency & Executing Agency supervision and support been adequate so far?	EA and IA level of supervision and support	Interviews Project reports (PIRs, progress reports)	Interviews Review of project documentation
Has there been an appropriate focus on results by the IA and EA?	EA and IA monitoring results	Interviews Project reports (PIRs, progress reports)	Interviews Review of project documentation
Are managing parties responsive to significant implementation problems (if any) and project risks?	Response to implementation problems and risks	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews
Does the M&E plan include all necessary elements to permit the monitoring of results and clearly identify M&E roles and responsibilities?	M&E Plan	Pro.Doc.	Review of Pro.Doc.
Was the M&E Plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation?	Amount of funding designated and utilized for M&E	Pro.Doc. Interviews Project reports detailing expenses	Review of Pro.Doc. Interviews Review of project expenses
Is the project log-frame effectively being used as a management tool to measure progress and performance?	Use of log-frame	Project reports including PIRs Interviews	Review of project reports

			Interviews
Are progress and financial reporting requirements/ schedules complied with, including the timely delivery of well-developed monitoring reports (PIRs)?	Content and submission dates of project reports	Interviews Project reports	Interviews Review of project documentation
Are follow-up actions, and/or adaptive management, taken in response to M&E activities (e.g., in response to PIRs, and steering committee meetings)?	Responses to M&E activities	Project reports Interviews	Interviews Review of project documentation
If changes in planned project outputs, activities or implementation methodology were made, were these adequately justified and approved by the project steering committee?	Explanations provided for changes during project implementation	Steering committee minutes Project reports	Review of steering committee minutes and project documentation

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Stakeholders			
Is the project involving the relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation and by seeking their active participation in project implementation, and M&E?	Level of participation of stakeholders in project implementation	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Project Finance			
Is there enough clarity in the reported co-financing and leveraged resources to substantiate in-kind and cash co-financing from all listed sources?	Table specifying co-financing and leveraged resources secured and sources thereof	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews
Have the reasons for differences in the level of expected and actual co-financing been made clear and are the reasons compelling?	Explanation of the difference between expected and actual co-financing	Project reports including 2012 PIR with co-financing figures	Review of project documentation Interviews
Are externally funded project components well integrated into the GEF supported components?	Components funded by co-financing	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews
Is the extent of materialization of co-financing influencing project outcomes and/or sustainability?	Total co-financing secured. Level of achievement of project outcomes	Project reports Interviews	Review of project documentation Interviews

	Perceived project sustainability.		

Evaluation Criteria Questions	Evaluation Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Mainstreaming			
Is it possible to identify and define the positive or negative effects of the project on local populations?	Employment generated as a result of the project Impact of the project on income levels, food security, etc.	PIRs, Interviews	Review of PIRs Interviews
Do the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP CPD, CPAP, and UNDAF?	The consistency of Project with CPD, CPAP, and UNDAF	Pro.Doc., CPD, CPAP UNDAF	Review of Pro.Doc., CPD, CPAP, and UNDAF
Have gender issues been considered in project implementation? If so, how and to what extent?	Level and nature of participation of women in project implementation	PIRs, interviews	Review of PIRs, interviews

Annex 7: Summary of Field Visits

The Terminal Evaluation team conducted field visits to the Project sites during the period of **June 10-16, 2019**. A brief summary of these field visits is presented below.

Date/time	Purpose, meeting with	Summary
10 June 2019 09:00 - 11:00	Dr. Amal Dababseh, International Expert Dr. C. Thomson Jacob, National Expert	Introductory meeting
11:00 -13:00	**Meeting with**: Dr. Preeti Soni, Chief, Climate Change, Resilience & Energy, UNDP Ms. Rita Thokchom, Knowledge Management & Coordination Associate, UNDP Ms. Akshara Saini, Finance and Administrative, UNDP **Purpose**: To get first-hand information about the EGREE project implementation process, challenges, and achievements made so far.	The TE team met the UNDP team at New Delhi and the following points were discussed: • The objective of the project • Implementation challenges and success rate • Project site: spread over 321 sq.km covering the Godavari mangroves, Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary, six reserve forests, and splits of Kakinada Bay including Hope island • The objective of the project is to secure the ecological, economic and livelihood of the people who are living near to the project site. **Some of the success stories of the project include:** • Ecosystem-based conservation approach was adapted • Cross-sectoral planning was developed • Mangrove cover has increased • The livelihood of the local community has improved through ecotourism • Capacity building on the importance of biodiversity has increased • Biodiversity is conserved with the help of local communities • Bycatch reduced • Knowledge portal (e-pragati) was developed by integrating all the environment-related data and networking with the line departments. **Some of the implementation challenges are:** • The project site is located away from the foundation and there was a delay in the project implementation due to the state bifurcation and state elections • The budget and the procurement part of the project was discussed. • The change in the fund flow pattern hindered the implementation process.
14:00-15:30	**Meeting with:** Dr. Tarun Kathula, Director/Scientist 'F', Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate	• EGREE project was approved under the GEF 4 cycle during 2010 and the project was launched in June 2011. • Seven sectoral plans were developed with the help of experts.

	Change Government of India **Purpose**: To discuss the positive and negative outcomes and sustainability of the project.	• The project has brought enormous learning to the country on conserving biodiversity in the coastal region by integrating the production sector. • The biodiversity management plan was developed. • For supporting the livelihood, a revenue generation model was evolved by involving tourism and fisheries sector. • Species-specific conservation measures have been taken in collaboration with the line departments. Some of the species conserved are fishing cat, whale sharks, Olive Ridley turtle, etc. • An interpretation center was developed for creating awareness of biodiversity issues. • Around 44 micro plans have been developed • The Eco-Development Committees and Vana Samrakshana Samithis were strengthened • The livelihood of the local communities increased, and they were trained as nature guides; tailoring, pickle-making, fishing net mending, etc. • Turtle Excluder Device (TED) and square nets were provided for reducing the by-catch. The skill developed on post-harvesting measures was encouraged. Risks hindered the project: • Fund transfer mechanism has delayed the project implementation at the ground level • Frequent transfer of officials • Self-sustainability of the project was not yet achieved The project needs to be upscaled to other coastal states through the proposed Global Climate Change fund.
11 June **06:00 - 08:15**		Travel to Vijayawada (by flight)
09:00 - 10:00	**Meeting with:** Dr. Ravishankar Thupalli, State Project Coordinator, EGREE Foundation **Purpose**: To understand the efficiency of implementation at the ground level.	Discussion about the project implementation process, Vijayawada
11:00-12:00	**Meeting with**: Dr. Nalini Mohan Denduluri, I.F.S., Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife), Chief Wildlife Warden, Andhra Pradesh Forest Department.	The Project has brought out capacity and awareness to the local community on conserving the coastal and marine biodiversity. Some of the outcomes of the project are as follows: • For sustaining the project, a corpus fund was generated through CSR activities, consultancy, and educational programs and a self-sufficient model was evolved

	Purpose: Discussed the efficiency, effectiveness, and impact of the project for the fishing community in the EGREE region.	• The knowledge management system was developed • Awareness was created among local communities on bycatch issues and the usage of square net and TED for conserving fishery resources • Awareness for the release of 9 endangered species was created among the fishing community through local language educational materials • The incentive was provided to the fisher, who was helping the whale shark to escape by cutting their nets • For hygienic handling of fish resources, cold storage boxes were provided to the fishing community and the post-harvesting techniques were taught for better handling of fishery resources • Value addition techniques such as pickle making, smoking, and drying were taught to the SHG women towards increasing their livelihood options • Local communities and school students have involved in the celebration of a beach festival and all other environment-related celebrations. Competitions were organized for the school students to stimulate their interest in conserving biodiversity. • This project was linked with other Government of India schemes such as Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (NREGA) and Swachh Bharat (Clean India). **Lesson learned:** • The modification of the fund flow mechanism has delayed the project implementation process for the last 2 years. Around INR 1.6 crores is yet to be released. If the money would have been directly released to EGREE, the implementation would have been quicker. • The importance of knowledge management was realized, and this initiative will be continued under the State Government ‘s budget. • The incentive provided for the fishing community has increased their involvement in conserving whale shark and other schedule species. • An appointment of a full-time CEO would have made the project implementation process quicker and more effective.
14:00-16:00	**Meeting with**: Mr. Naresh Babu Bitragunta, Project Manager, e-Pragati Authority	**A Knowledge Management System (KMS) supports:** • The KMS is an online environmental information portal (EIA assist.org) and a knowledge repository. It is a useful portal for researchers, academia, and scientists for retrieving secondary information on various environmental parameters.

	Mr. Pentakota Raja Sekhar, Project Manager, e-Pragati Authority. **Purpose:** To understand the e-Pragati (knowledge management System) initiative developed by the Andhra Pradesh Government.	• Nearly 36 departments are linked and networked. Environmental information is collated from central and state government institutions and this information is being converted as an environmental knowledge base for the benefit of the policymakers for taking important decisions • KMS is used for the preparation of Environmental Impact Assessment Reports, feasibility study, etc. • Some of the data already integrated are air quality, air pollution, hydrology and water pollution, soil conservation, hydrogeology, socioeconomics, and disasters • Ongoing data integration include noise and vibration, risk and hazard and solid and hazardous waste • Some of the information published pertaining to the project are expert referrals, community discussions, regulatory information, research articles and journals • Organizations benefited through the KMS portal are: EGREE Foundation, Department of Forest, BSI, ZSI, Agricultural Department, State Ground Water Board, State Pollution Control Board, Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute, universities, and colleges, etc • It is recommended that PBR can be integrated into this network with restricted user access.
12 June **Wednesday** **09:20 - 09:40**	**Purpose:** To understand the degraded ecosystem in the EGREE region due to the establishment of salt pans, aquaculture ponds, and industrial establishments	**Field visit to the local salt pans, aquaculture ponds and mangrove plantations, Kakinada** 
10:00 - 10:45	**Visit Coringa Marine Museum and Meeting with**: Mr. Anant Shankar, Divisional Forest Officer, Wildlife Management **Purpose**: To visit the Coringa Marine Museum and reviewed the awareness materials prepared under the project.	**Visited Coringa Marine Museum.**  • A tour to the Center showed that the biodiversity-related awareness materials available with the museum and the collection of animal specimens available with the Coringa Marine Museum, Kakinada.

		• The Nagarvanam at Rajammahendravaram is an urban forest and it provides space for city dwellers. • The marine museum provides awareness to the school students and the public. The museum includes a biodiversity lab, open Amphitheatre, arboretum, walking tracks, medicinal plant garden, and children games arena. It is the first Nagarvanam house established under the project.
11:00 - 12:30	**Meeting with:** Dr. Shanti Priya Pandey, Chief Conservator of Forests Mr. Anant Shankar, Divisional Forest Officer, Wildlife Management Dr. Nandani Salaria, DFO, APFD and Additional CEO, EGREE **Purpose:** To study the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, stability, and impact of the project	The success story and the uniqueness of the project. Points discussed: • This project has successfully accomplished the objective of the project *viz* cross-sectoral planning; enhance the capacity of sectoral institutions and improve community livelihood • The project implementation process is good learning for the forest officials for taking important policy decisions for conserving biodiversity in EGREE region • Restoration of the ecosystem has increased the migratory and residential bird population • Supported livelihood project and brought economic security for the Self-Help Groups • Conserved flagship species such as fishing cat, whale shark, etc • Extensive awareness and capacity building programs have been implemented for the benefit of the local community for conserving biodiversity • Bycatch of the fishery resources is reduced, and the species covered under the scheduled list is protected • Turtle breeding areas were protected, and hatchlings have been safely released into the sea. TED used for the escape of turtle. • Strengthened EDC, VSS, BMCs covering 41 villages The project should have investigated the financial sustainability, sectoral integration. These can be supported through CSR activities and through the upcoming GCF project: Lessons: • A full-time CEO is required to handle these types of projects. • The positive take-ups away are the biodiversity of the EGREE region is conserved and awareness on the importance of biodiversity is increased among forest officials • The proposed GCF project should involve more states and more community in the coastal areas • Priority should be given for species-specific conservation measures and the infrastructural development

		• Territorial management of water and marketing support for the community needs to be strengthened.
12:30 - 13:30	Meeting with the Project team **A presentation about the Project:** To understand the implementation of the project at the ground level. Also, to learn the success stories and challenges faced while implanting the project.	The SPC made a presentation on Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity conservation into the production sectors in the EGREE region
15:00 - 17:00	**Discussion with:** Dr. Ravishankar Thupalli, State Project Coordinator, EGREE Mr. K Ravi Kumar Kona, Finance Administration Assistant (FAA), EGREE Foundation on co-financing issues	• Obtained co-financing details from EGREE office
13 June Thursday **09:15 - 10:00**	**Discussion with:** Dr. Ravishankar Thupalli, State Project Coordinator **Purpose**: To learn about the Biodiversity Interpretation Centre	**Visit Biodiversity Interpretation Centre** The State Project Coordinator showcased the awareness materials and exhibits (various sectors) developed under the project • The Coringa Biodiversity Centre constitutes an in-house biodiversity laboratory and a library established by the EGREE Foundation. The establishment of the Centre was an initiative towards supporting research, awareness and knowledge management. • The Centre features 3D models of the seven important production sectors of the EGREE region, namely, Fisheries, Aquaculture, Tourism, Oil and Natural Gas, Ports and Shipping, Fertilizers and Salt Pans. • The Lab educates visitors about the key species in the region and promotes consciousness among them about biodiversity. It showcases a total of 520 species encompassing fishes, snakes, amphibians, reptiles, and different marine specimens. The Lab also showcases specimens of 34 species of crabs and 15 species of snakes. 200 shells have also been identified, classified, marked and displayed at the Centre. • The Biodiversity Library hosts approximately 1,500 information-oriented books and EGREE publications on different subject areas including Conservation Law, Animal Behavioral Studies, Mangroves and Wetlands and on different production sectors such as Fisheries, Aquaculture, Tourism, Oil and Natural Gas, Ports and Shipping, Fertilizers and Salt Pans.

		National and international journals are also available in the library.
10:00 - 11:00	**Discussion with:** Ms. Bharathi Nakkidapu, Socio-Economic Livelihood Associate, NUNV, UNDP, EGREE Foundation **Purpose**: To Discuss with the DISA Women Co-operative Society about the project impact and sustainability. Self Help Group women members who participated are: Ms. Kamala Ropanchi Ms. Annapuravakapali Ms. Malladi Surya Kumari Ms. Kopana Baty Ms. RepadiVenkates Laxmi Ms. Narala Bhagya Lakshmi Ms. Durga Bhavani Dadala Ms. Mulladi Kana Mahalakshmi Ms. Neelima Ms. Dadalar Rani	**The socio-economic livelihood associate facilitated the discussion between the terminal evaluation team and the DISA Women Co-operative Society, Chollangi, Corangi**  **a) Discussion with DISA Women Multi Co-operative Society** • The EGREE foundation supports the local communities by strengthening village level community-based organizations such as EDCs, VSS, SHGs, etc. Some of the important community-related activities carried out are capacity development of the community institutions; training on sustainable livelihood; gender empowerment through the formation of women Entrepreneur Society Groups through the formation and establishment of multi-cooperative society in EGREE region; implementation of livelihood diversification strategy and related socio-economic interventions based on market and community needs; exposure visit; village development activities and eco-tourism. • The terminal evaluation team met the DISA Multipurpose Cooperative Society that was established with the support of the EGREE Foundation. An apparel training center was established at Coringa, where a group of women come every day and do stitching work. They are currently receiving orders for making jute bags, gloves from the Coramandal Private Limited, school uniforms from Velugu DRDA and APSW Guru Kula Patasala, Ramgampeta. • The skill development programs helped these women earn around INR 2,000 to 3,000 and contributing 10 to 20% for their family revenue. Also, the project has brought unity, self-respect, and confidence among women and they have developed togetherness and help other SHGs also in getting business contacts. • It is recommended to produce better quality bags with better design with some value addition for fetching better market and to scale up the activities to the other coastal states by involving and networking with more SHGs. It was also suggested to open a separate Facebook for selling their products online and to

		network with forests and nearby industries to get new contracts. • Some of the requests raised by the SHG are to provide permanent office space, high skilled training and to provide marketing support for selling their products. • Some of the concerns raised by the SHG are No revolving fund generated under the project; inconsistency in members participating in the SHG activities; frequent change of officers. It was also informed that of the 10-sewing machine purchased and only 6 are in working condition.
11:00 - 11:30	**Discussion with:** Mr. M. Sachare, EDC Chairman, Kobbarichetta Mr. K. Muralidhar, Secretary, Environmental NGO, Pallesare, Thalaram Mr. S. Lovaraga, Mr. KondalGhangaraj Mr. M. Gopi **Purpose:** To learn about the usefulness of the project among the fishing community and the awareness generated in conserving the scheduled species.	**Mr. M. Sachare, EDC Chairman, Kobbarichetta facilitated the discussion between the terminal evaluation team and the Whale Shark Savers, the fishing community** **Interaction with Whale Shark Savers** • Whale Sharks and their fins are highly valued in the International markets. Due to overexploitation, incidental catch due to lack of awareness among the fisherman community, the whale shark population has declined. Apart from fishing, the other contributory factors for their decline are oil exploration, boat, and marine traffic, marine pollution, etc. • Under the project, training was provided for all the enforcement staff and local fishing communities for effective enforcement and monitoring of the giant fish. Conferences and workshops for knowledge sharing with regional, national and international researchers, academicians, policymakers, etc were organized towards conserving the whale shark and protecting other scheduled marine species mentioned under the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972. • The Terminal Evaluation team held a discussion with the local fishing community and a video of the release of a Whale Shark back into the sea was shown. It was informed that an incentive of INR 18,000 and a new net was given to the fisherman who released the Whale Shark back into the sea. The Whale Shark was accidentally caught in the net. • It was informed that awareness pamphlets have been prepared in the local language for conserving the scheduled species and it was widely circulated to the fishing community. Also, the fishing holiday of 61 days is strictly implemented in the project site. This project has also contributed fisher in their behavioral change in adapting square net, TED and hygienic handling of fish after the post-harvest of fish catch.
11:30 - 12:00	**Discussion with research scholars:**	• Ms. Devi Anusha and Mr. Uppala Sudhir Kumar, B.Tech students from the Jawaharlal Nehru Technological University, Kakinada

	Ms. Devi Anusha and Mr. Uppala Sudhir Kumar, B.Tech Mr. Repalle Gopi Krishna Mr. Chakka Prasanth Mr. Eluri Satish Kumar Mr. Bopana Naga Vineetha Ms. Maroju Manisha Mr. Kundrupu Naidu **Purpose:** To understand how the EGREE project was useful for undertaking research activities	shared their experience on how the EGREE project was useful in undertaking their research activities. • Ms. Devi Anusha mentioned that she was using the laboratory facilities to analyze the water quality and she is studying how macrophytes can help in removing the contaminants from the wastewater. • Similarly, Mr. Uppala Sudhir opined that the laboratory facilities and the library were very useful in undertaking a research study on removing Iron and Magnesium using the natural material from the groundwater.
12:30 - 13:00	**Discussed with:** 20 fisherwomen **Purpose:** To understand how the EGREE project has empowered the women and maximize the project impact and sustainability	• The Terminal Evaluation team visited the Chinavalasala village and interacted with the women entrepreneurs who are involved in dry fish processing. As a fish value addition process, training was organized by EGREE in collaboration with CIFT, SIFT to gain experience of various preservation methods of the fish, cleaning process, cutting, storing, drying, etc and 53 smoke bins were provided to the participants. • The team visited the place where women  entrepreneurs were involved in drying the fish using the smokeless bins. Earlier, the fishing communities were using traditional smoke bins, which is dangerous and hazardous to the health of the fishing community. • A couple of women entrepreneurs held discussions with the team and shared their profit model and the usefulness of the EGREE project.

13:00-13.30	**Discussed with:** 30 fishermen **Purpose:** To study the usefulness of dry platform and the usefulness of waiting center constructed under the project	• The Terminal Evaluation team visited dry platforms and the waiting center constructed under the EGREE project and interacted with more than 30 fishers who have been benefited through the project. • Platforms were built for the Chinavalasala village for frying the fish and for stitching their nets. In addition, a waiting hall was constructed for the fishing community under the project. • The fishing community has suggested to de-silting the creeks and to facilitate easy movement of boats during high tide. • Also, they have raises concerns that the fish catch was reduced because of pollution from the Reliance Oil and Gas company. • It was suggested to the constructed elevated table for solar drying instead of drying the fish on the floor.
13:30-14:00	**Discussed with:** 10 SHG women **Purpose**: Interacted with SHG women to study the usefulness and the impact of the EGREE project for their livelihood improvement	• Interacted with 10 SHG women from the Chinavalasala village and visited their tailoring unit. These fishermen's wives support their partners and contribute nearly 20-30% of their monthly family income.
14:00 - 4:15	**Discussed with:** 20 Fishermen **Purpose:** To study the use of tool kit for repairing boats provided under the project	• The team witnessed the skill of fishers in repairing the In-Boat Motor (IBM) and Out Boat Motor (OBM) and the usefulness of the tool kit. The tool kit provided under the EGREE project was useful in repairing their boats.
15:30 - 17:00	**Purpose:** To study ecotourism project implemented in CWLS and its economic sustainability	• Terminal Evaluation team visited the Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary (CWLS) located at Chollangi, 18 km away from Kakinada. The Eco-tourism activities in CWLS were established with the collaboration of the AP Forest Department and the EGREE. • Eco-tourism activities in the region were initiated with the dual objective of (i) reducing pressure on the mangroves by creating alternative livelihoods for the economically backward local communities dependent on mangroves for their livelihoods, and in the process, (ii) supplementing their income levels. • The mangrove cover at CWLS spreads across an area of around 323 square kilometers. One of the main attractions at CWLS is the elevated boardwalk through the mangrove forest. It covers approximately 3.5 Km. • The boating experience offers an opportunity to enjoy nature and sight species of fauna including the Painted Stork, Spot-billed Pelican, Great Egret, Golden Jackal, Indian

		Smooth-coated Otter and even endangered species like the Fishing cats. The nature guides trained under the project were employed and they provide information on the various flora and fauna found in the sanctuary.
17:30 - 18:00	**Discussion with:** Dr. R. Ramasubramanian Principal Co-ordinator, Coastal Systems Research **Purpose:** To study the diversity of mangroves in EGREE region and the partnership model in conserving the Mangrove genetic resources	 • Dr. R. Ramasubramanian showed the mangrove nursery and genetic garden developed under the project. The mangrove genetic garden was developed by the MSSRF foundation in collaboration with EGREE. • Nearly 8 different species were propagated, and 16 different species were collected from different parts of the country. Around 22 beds are prepared for raising 45,000 saplings and these saplings will be planted in and around the Coringa wildlife sanctuary towards increasing the Mangrove cover. • The saplings raised in the nursery are: *Avicennia officinalis, Avicennia marina, Ceriops decandra, Excoecaria agallocha, Xylocarpus granatum, Rhizophora apiculata, Bruguiera cylindrical and Bruguiera gymnorrhiza.*
18:15-19:00		Discussion with the local village leader Mr. Surya Rao about the usefulness and the livelihood options developed under the project.
14th June **11:00 - 12:30**	**Discussion with:** Mr. Ravi Kiran Saride, Associate Vic-President (Operations) Mr. P.V. Rao, AGM, EHS **Purpose:** To study the success story and the uniqueness of Coromandel Bird Habitat	The Terminal Evaluation team visited the Coromandel International (fertilizer company) and met the President and the AGM and learned how the company has benefited through the EGREE project. • The company is partnering with the EGREE foundation and converted the 350 acres of land into a bird sanctuary. The resident and the migratory birds are visiting this wetland for roosting and breeding in a larger group. • Under the CSR budget, the company has spent around INR 4.5 crores (approx. 6,42,857 in USD) for protecting the avian fauna in the Coromandel region. Annually INR 5,00,000 is spent on conservation-related activities. • The company has won two awards for their exemplary work in the field of biodiversity. The National Biodiversity Authority and the State Biodiversity Board, AP has given these awards.

		 Mr. P.V. Rao made a brief presentation on the initiative of Coromandel International in conserving the Avifauna. • Coromandel and EGREE foundation is mutually associated with the identification, protection, and development of bird habitat at Coromandel, Kakinada • A six-member bird conservation committee was formed and exclusively 4 staff was dedicated for maintaining and patrolling activities • The species population of the bird has gradually increased from 94 (during 2014) to more than 271 species (during 2019), which includes resident and migratory birds • Around 350 acres of wetland land area was converted for green belt developmental activities • Nearly 150 birds were saved during the Hud-Hud cyclone • Creating public awareness for school students and staff members about the importance of biodiversity. • Noise-free zone and no horn zone is created inside the factory premises • Important environment days are observed in the factory premises and exposure visits are organized for their staff and family members to have more insight on biodiversity issues The Terminal Evaluation team also visited the bird habitat and examined the conservation efforts carried out inside the Coromandel factory premises.
12:30 - 14:00	**Discussion with:** Mr. Koteswara Rao, Additional Director of Fisheries, State Institute of Fisheries Technology, Kakinada Mr. G. Venkateswara Rao, Vice Principal, State Institute of Fisheries Technology **Purpose:** To learn about the activities of the State	• Mr. Koteswara Rao informed that the SIFT is conducting training programs for the department's officers, fishers, technicians, students, etc. Some of the training programs organized are various aspects of installation, maintenance and repairs to IBM/OBM engines, mending of nets and reservoir fishing techniques to tribal fishermen, deep-sea fishing hygienic handling of post-harvest fish catch, ornamental fish breeding, aquarium fabrication, value addition, etc. He opined that the EGREE project should continue in organizing various skill-based training for the needy. SIFT conducts a year "Tindal –cum-Driver" course for coastal fisherman boys. So far 3,000 boys in 68

	Institute of Fisheries Technology (SIFT) and their participation in the EGREE partnership program.	batches have undergone a training program. He also showed the evaluation team regarding various laboratory facilities available within SIFT such as PCR lab, microbiology lab, water, and soil analysis lab and feed analysis labs, etc.
16:00 - 20:00	**Discussion with:** Mr. T. Srisai, Forest Range Officer, Wildlife Management range, Rampachodavaram Mr. P. Sathyanarayanan, Technical Officer, EGREE **Purpose:** To study the ecotourism promoted by the Forest Department by involving the local tribes	• Visited the man-made reservoir/boating and stayed at Maredumilli (Vanavihari), Jungle Star Eco camp. All the eco-tourism facilities are managed by the local tribes with the support from the Andhra Pradesh Forest Department. This has provided an opportunity for the local community to spread awareness to the public mass and generate their livelihood through responsible tourism.
Saturday & Sunday		
Monday (17th June) 11:00 - 11:30	**Discussion with:** Dr. Preeti Soni, Chief, Climate Change Resilience & Energy Mr. Manish Mohandas, Project Coordinator (Resilience) Ms. Rita Thokchom, Knowledge Management & Coordination Associate **Purpose:** Debriefing with UNDP officials on the outcome of the mission visit	**Dr. Aldababseh expressed her satisfaction with the implementation of the project. She said it is very important to scale up good practices/success stories that emerged under this project.** • The biodiversity conservation and the involvement of SHGs in livelihood projects are very effective and it has achieved the objective of the project. For attaining sustainability, some handholding is required for e.g., permanent space for the SHG women; better designing skills; market linkages with the line departments and the companies for establishing their business. • She observed that the success of the project is due to the ownership and the involvement of State and Central Government officials in the implementation process. **TE shared the preliminary findings of the mission.**
	Discussion with Dr. R. Gopinath, Joint Director Wildlife, Project Elephant, Mr. Roy P. Thomas, Consultant Mr. Manish Mohandas, Project Coordinator (Resilience) Ms. Rita Thokchom, Knowledge Management & Coordination Associate	Evaluation team had a second debriefing with the MoEFCC officials: The international evaluator presented the methodology adopted for the study includes: (i) Review of the literature (PIF/PD/AWP Inception report); (ii) Field visit (Discussion with relevant stakeholders); (iii) Debriefing Presentation at UNDP and MOEFCC; and (iv) Submission of the draft report after two weeks from the mission. **Findings presented:**

	Mr. Krishna Kumar, National Project Officer, Secure Himalayan Project. **Purpose:** Debriefing with MoEFCC officials on the outcome of the mission visit	The international evaluator said that the mission visit was satisfactory, and the project has brought good intervention among the fishing community for their livelihood improvement. A good model has been evolved and this need to be replicated to another states /ecosystem and some of the positive outcome from this project can be integrated into the newly proposed climate change project. She presented some of the positive outcomes of the project: • Seven sectoral plans have been developed and the biodiversity management plan was developed. • Knowledge Management portal was created by integrating all the state institutions and EGREE • Necessary skill/capacity was created for conserving biodiversity and to have a sustainable livelihood practice • Some of the scheduled species listed in the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972 is protected. • Behavioral change has been noticed among the fishing community for conserving the whale shark and other aquatic animals. Bycatch is reduced, Square net and TED is used by the fishermen and fishing holiday is strictly implemented. • Partnership with Fisheries department, MSSRF foundation and Coromandel International was very effective. This successful model can be replicated in other coastal states. **Some of the points need immediate attention includes;** • Sustainability of the project needs to be examined after the completion of the project • Partnership Memorandum of Understanding needs to be signed with the partnering institutions • The project's co-financing to be calculated and communicated with the team. • M&E needs to be strengthened by adhering to UNDP/GEF M&E plans. • Adaptative management is crucial for project success. • Risks and issues management is critical to ensure smooth implementation of the project's interventions. • The budget head issue should be solved. A mechanism should be put in place for other projects.

Annex 8: List of Project's Key Events

Type of Workshop	Audience	Content	Title	District	Number Participated	Approximate percentage of women
Awareness	General Public	Mangrove value	Awareness campaign - General Public	East Godavari	28000	50%
Training	Fishermen	Net mending		East Godavari	125	0
Training	Women	Pickle making		East Godavari	250	100
Training	Fishermen	Sustainable Fishing and Allied Practices	Sustainable Fishing and Allied Practices	East Godavari	200	10%
Training	Fishermen	Sustainable Fisheries in the Marine Sector	Sustainable Fisheries in the Marine Sector	East Godavari	55	10%
Training	Fishermen	Repairs & Maintenance	Repairs & Maintenance	East Godavari	25	0
Training	Fishermen	Vessel Monitoring APP for Boat Drivers	Vessel Monitoring APP for Boat Drivers	East Godavari	47	0
Training	Women	Post-Harvest Technology for Women	Post-Harvest Technology for Women	East Godavari	25	100%
Training	Fishermen	FCS Management and Bookkeeping	FCS Management and Bookkeeping	East Godavari	85	35%
Training	Fishermen	Vessel Monitoring APP for Boat Crew	Vessel Monitoring APP for Boat Crew	East Godavari	50	0
Training	Women	Post-Harvest Technology for Women	Post-Harvest Technology for Women	East Godavari	21	100
Training	Women	Post-Harvest Technology for Women	Post-Harvest Technology for Women	East Godavari	32	100
Training	Fishermen	FCS Management and Bookkeeping	FCS Management and Bookkeeping	East Godavari	46	27
Training	Fishermen	Vessel Monitoring APP for Boat Crew	Vessel Monitoring APP for Boat Crew	East Godavari	49	0
Training	Fishermen	OBM & IBM Repairs	OBM & IBM Repairs	East Godavari	25	0
Training	Fishermen	Net Mending	Net Mending	East Godavari	25	0
Training	Fishermen	OBM/IBM Repairs & Maintenance	OBM/IBM Repairs & Maintenance	East Godavari	25	0

Training	Women	Post-Harvest Technology for Women	Post-Harvest Technology for Women	East Godavari	25	100
Training	Fishermen	OBM/IBM Repairs & Maintenance	OBM/IBM Repairs & Maintenance	East Godavari	25	0
Awareness	Fishermen	Refresher Training Courses for departmental officers on various aspects of capture and culture fisheries sectors on need base.	Refresher Training Courses for departmental officers on various aspects of capture and culture fisheries sectors on need base.	East Godavari	65	20%
Awareness	Fishermen	Awareness Program to fisherfolk and aqua farmers.	Awareness Program to fisherfolk and aqua farmers.	East Godavari	800	30%
Training	Fisherwomen	Special training to fisherwomen in post-harvest technology & value addition.	Special training to fisherwomen in post-harvest technology & value addition.	East Godavari	125	100%
Training	Fisher Men and Women	Training programs on “Community based Cyclone Disaster Preparedness”.	Training programs on “Community based Cyclone Disaster Preparedness”.	East Godavari	250	20
Training	Students	Academic Training Programs and Exposure visits to B.Sc. Fisheries, M.Sc., Fisheries, B.F.Sc., M.F.Sc. Students.	Academic Training Programs and Exposure visits to B.Sc. Fisheries, M.Sc., Fisheries, B.F.Sc., M.F.Sc. ents.	East Godavari	20	10
Training	Fishermen	Income-generating Training programs to fishers on various aspects such as Installation & Maintenance and Repairs to IBM / OBM engines, Repairs & Maintenance of FRP Navas	Income-generating Training programs to fishers on various aspects such as Installation & Maintenance and Repairs to IBM / OBM engines, Repairs & Maintenance of FRP Navas	East Godavari	255	0
Training	Fishermen	Teppas, Repairs & Mending of Nets and Reservoir Fishing Techniques to Tribal Fishermen.	Teppas, Repairs & Mending of Nets and Reservoir Fishing Techniques to Tribal Fishermen.	East Godavari	75	0
Training	Women	Training program on Hygienic maintenance of Fishing	Training program on Hygienic maintenance of Fishing Harbors & Landing centers to the stakeholders.	East Godavari	250	100

		Harbors & Landing centers to the stakeholders.				
Training	Fishermen Co-operative and Fisherwomen co-operatives	Training program on Dynamics & Bookkeeping for MMGs, Coop Management for institutional (CBO's) building	Training program on Dynamics & Bookkeeping for MMGs, Coop Management for institutional (CBO's) building	East Godavari	85	40%
Training	Women	Post-Harvest Practices, Value addition, etc., for women groups for their better income generation.	Post-Harvest Practices, Value addition, etc., for women groups for their better income generation.	East Godavari	150	100
Training	Fishermen	Special Training Programmes to Educated Unemployed Youth in Aqua labs Operation & Management and Hatchery operations for self-employment.	Special Training Programmes to Educated Unemployed Youth in Aqua labs Operation & Management and Hatchery operations for self-employment.	East Godavari	100	27
Awareness	Students	The project works to graduate & postgraduate students of P.G. Colleges & Universities as part of their education curriculum.	The project works to graduate & postgraduate students of P.G. Colleges & Universities as part of their education curriculum.	East Godavari	15	6

GENDER DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES 2012- 2019

S. No	Activity	No of programs	Women
1	Trainings	17	472
2	Capacity building	23	606
3	Awareness programs	107	4560
4	Meetings	127	3902
5	Exposure visits	3	89
	Total	277	9,629

Source: EGREE Foundation, 2019

LIVELIHOOD IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES CARRIED (2012 -2019)

S. No	Activity	No of programs	Male	Female	Total
1	Trainings	54	512	794	1,306
2	Capacity building	88	918	1,162	2,080
3	Awareness programs	388	7,352	8,935	16,287
4	Meetings	439	5,346	7,353	12,699
5	Exposure visits	15	131	178	309
	Total	984	14,259	18,422	32,681
Percentage of men and women trained			43.6%	56.4%	

Source: EGREE Foundation, 2019

Annex 9: Updated Capacity Scorecards

Project Name: Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity into Production Sectors in the East Godavari River Estuarine Ecosystem, Andhra Pradesh

Project Cycle Phase: Project Terminal Evaluation **Date:** July 2019

Systemic level indicators of the capacity development scorecard.

Strategic Area of Support	Capacity Level	Indicator	**Score 0**	**Score 1**	**Score 2**	**Score 3**	**Scores At baseline**	**Score At TE**
1. Capacity to conceptualize and formulate policies, legislations, strategies, and programs	Systemic	**There is a strong and clear legal mandate for mainstreaming biodiversity into production sector activities in the EGREE**	There is no legal framework for biodiversity mainstreaming into production sector activities	There is a partial legal framework for biodiversity mainstreaming into production sector activities, but it has many inadequacies	There is a reasonable legal framework for biodiversity mainstreaming but it has a few weaknesses and gaps	There is a strong and clear legal mandate for biodiversity mainstreaming into production sector activities	2	3
1. Capacity to conceptualize and formulate policies, legislations, strategies, and programs	Institutional	**There is a multi-sectoral institutional mechanism responsible for mainstreaming biodiversity concerns into production sector activities in the EGREE that is able to prepare effective strategies and plans to this end**	There is no multi-sectoral institutional mechanism responsible for mainstreaming biodiversity concerns into production sector activities in the EGREE	There is a multi-sectoral institutional mechanism responsible for mainstreaming biodiversity concerns into production sector activities in the EGREE but there is no clear strategy to this end	There is a multi-sectoral institutional mechanism responsible for mainstreaming biodiversity concerns into production sector activities in the EGREE, and there is an initial strategy to this end	There is a multi-sectoral institutional mechanism responsible for mainstreaming biodiversity concerns into production sector activities in the EGREE, and there is a regularly updated strategy developed through wide stakeholder participation	0	3
2. Capacity to implement policies,	Systemic	**There are adequate skills for mainstreaming**	There is a general lack of skills	Some skills exist but in largely in sufficient quantities to	Necessary skills for effective biodiversity	Adequate quantities of the full range of skills necessary for effective	1	3

legislation, strategies, and programs		**biodiversity into production sector activities in the EGREE**		guarantee effective biodiversity mainstreaming	mainstreaming into production sector activities do exist but are stretched and not easily available	biodiversity mainstreaming into production sector activities are easily available		
2. Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies, and programs	Systemic	**There is an oversight mechanism with a clear responsibility to monitor and enforce biodiversity mainstreaming into production sector activities in the EGREE**	There is no oversight at all	There is some general oversight on environmental compliance but it lacks the capacity to specifically monitor and enforce compliance with biodiversity considerations	There is a reasonable oversight mechanism in place providing for regular review of biodiversity considerations but it lacks transparency (e.g. is not independent, or is internalized)	There is a fully transparent oversight mechanism in place providing for regular review of biodiversity considerations	1	3
2. Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies, and programs	Institutional	**Production sector institutions have regularly updated, biodiversity-compatible sectoral plans for the EGREE that have been prepared with the effective participation of land users**	Production sector institutions do not have biodiversity-compatible sectoral plans	Production sector institutions have biodiversity-compatible sectoral plans, but these are not developed through consultations with land users	Production sector institutions have biodiversity-compatible sectoral plans, developed through consultations with land users, but there is no process for regular review and updating of the plans	Production sector institutions have biodiversity-compatible territorial plans, developed through consultations with land users, and there is a process for regular review and updating of the plans	0	2
2. Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies, and programs	Institutional	**Biodiversity-compatible sectoral plans in the EGREE are implemented in a timely manner effectively achieving their objectives**	There is very little implementation of biodiversity-compatible sectoral plans	Biodiversity-compatible sectoral plans are poorly implemented, and their objectives are rarely met	Biodiversity-compatible sectoral plans are usually implemented in a timely manner, though delays typically occur and some objectives are not met	Biodiversity-compatible sectoral plans are implemented in a timely manner effectively achieving their objectives	0	2
2. Capacity to implement policies,	Institutional	**Production sector institutions in the EGREE are able to**	Production sector institutions	Production sector institutions have some funding and are able	Production sector institutions have reasonable capacity	Production sector institutions are able to adequately mobilize	1	3

legislation, strategies, and programs		**mobilize sufficient funding, and human and material resources to effectively implement the biodiversity mainstreaming mandate**	typically are severely underfunded and have no capacity to mobilize sufficient resources	to mobilize some human and material resources but not enough to effectively implement their biodiversity mainstreaming mandate	to mobilize funding or other resources but not always in sufficient quantities for effective implementation of their biodiversity mainstreaming mandate	sufficient quantity of funding, human and material resources to effectively implement their biodiversity mainstreaming mandate		
2. Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies, and programs	Individual	**Human resources in production sector institutions in the EGREE are well qualified and motivated to mainstream biodiversity concerns into sectoral plans**	Human resources (HR) are poorly qualified and unmotivated	HR qualification is spotty, with some well qualified, but many only poorly and in general unmotivated	HR in general reasonably qualified, but many lack in motivation or those that are motivated are not sufficiently qualified.	Human resources are well qualified and motivated, and a compendium of best practices for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in production sectors and other training materials produced under the project is available as a ready resource for new staff that join government departments	1	3
2. Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies, and programs	Individual	**There are appropriate systems of training, mentoring, and learning in place to maintain a continuous flow of new staff with the capacity to mainstream biodiversity in sectoral plans in the EGREE**	No mechanisms exist	Some mechanisms exist but unable to develop enough and unable to provide the full range of skills needed	Mechanisms generally exist to develop skilled professionals, but either not enough of them or unable to cover the full range of skills required	There are mechanisms for developing adequate numbers of the full range of highly skilled professionals able to mainstream biodiversity in territorial plans	0	2
3. Capacity to engage and build consensus	Systemic	**Biodiversity-compatible Strategic Plan for**	There is no political will at all, or worse,	Some political will exists but is not strong	The reasonable political will exists but is not always	There are very high levels of political will to support biodiversity	1	3

among all stakeholders		**the EGREE (incl. sectoral plans) have the political commitment they require**	the prevailing political will runs counter to the interests of biodiversity mainstreaming into sectoral plans	enough to make a difference	strong enough to fully support biodiversity mainstreaming into sectoral plans	mainstreaming into sectoral plans in the EGREE		
3. Capacity to engage and build consensus among all stakeholders	Systemic	**Biodiversity-compatible Strategic Plan for the EGREE (incl. sectoral plans) have the public support they require**	The public has little interest in a Strategic Plan for the EGREE (incl. sectoral plans) and there is no significant lobby for it	There is limited support for Biodiversity-compatible Strategic Plan (incl. sectoral plans)	There is general public support for Biodiversity-compatible Strategic Plan (incl. sectoral plans) and there are various lobby groups such as environmental NGO's strongly pushing for them	There is tremendous public support in the country for Biodiversity-compatible Strategic Plan (incl. sectoral plans)	0	2
3. Capacity to engage and build consensus among all stakeholders	Institutional	**Production sector institutions can establish the partnerships needed to achieve biodiversity mainstreaming objectives in the EGREE**	Production sector institutions operate in isolation	Some partnerships are in place but there are significant gaps, and existing partnerships achieve little	Many partnerships in place with a wide range of agencies, NGOs, etc., but there are some gaps, partnerships are not always effective and do not always enable efficient achievement of biodiversity mainstreaming objectives	Production sector institutions establish effective partnerships with other agencies and institutions, including provincial and local governments, NGO's and the private sector to enable achievement of biodiversity mainstreaming objectives in an efficient and effective manner	0	2
4. Capacity to mobilize information and knowledge	Systemic	**Production sector institutions have the biodiversity information they need to develop and monitor biodiversity-compatible**	Information is virtually lacking	Some information exists, but is of poor quality, is of limited usefulness, and is not always available at the right time	Much information is easily available and mostly of good quality, but there remain some gaps in quality, coverage, and availability	Production sector institutions have the biodiversity information they need to develop and monitor sectoral plans	1	3

		sectoral plans for the EGREE						
4. Capacity to mobilize information and knowledge	Individual	**Individuals working on sectoral planning work effectively together as a team**	Individuals work in isolation and don't interact	Individuals/sectors interact in a limited way and sometimes in teams but this is rarely effective and functional	Individuals interact regularly and form teams, but this is not always fully effective or functional	Individuals interact effectively and form cross-disciplinary functional teams	1	2
5. Capacity to monitor, evaluate, report and learn	Systemic	**Society monitors the state of biodiversity mainstreaming into sectoral plans in the EGREE**	There is no dialogue at all	There is some dialogue going on, but not in the wider public and restricted to specialized circles	There is a reasonably open public dialogue going on but issues that particularly magnify the conflict between economic activities and biodiversity considerations are not discussed	There is an open and transparent public dialogue about the state of biodiversity mainstreaming into sectoral plans in the EGREE	1	2
5. Capacity to monitor, evaluate, report and learn	Institutional	**Production sector institutions have effective internal mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation, reporting and learning on biodiversity mainstreaming in the EGREE**	There are no mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation, reporting or learning	There are some mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and learning but they are limited and weak	Reasonable mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and learning are in place but are not as strong or comprehensive as they could be	Institutions have effective internal mechanisms for monitoring, evaluation, reporting, and learning	1	2
						Total Score points	**11**	**40**
						Percentage	**23%**	**83.3%**

Annex 10: Updated tracking tool

The TE international consultant comments/notes are inserted in RED below:

Tracking Tool for Biodiversity Projects in GEF-3, GEF-4, and GEF-5

Objective 2: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors

Objective: To measure progress in achieving the impacts and outcomes established at the portfolio level under the biodiversity focal area.
Rationale: Project data from the GEF-3, GEF-4, and GEF-5 project cohort will be aggregated for analysis of directional trends and patterns at a portfolio-wide level to inform the development of future GEF strategies and to report to GEF Council on portfolio-level performance in the biodiversity focal area.
Structure of Tracking Tool: Each tracking tool requests background and coverage information on the project and specific information required to track portfolio level indicators in the GEF-3, GEF-4, and GEF-5 strategy.
Guidance in Applying GEF Tracking Tools: GEF tracking tools are applied three times: at CEO endorsement, at project mid-term, and at project completion.
Submission: The finalized tracking tool will be cleared by the GEF Agencies as being correctly completed.

Important: Please read the guidelines posted on the GEF website before entering your data

I. General Data	Please indicate your answer here	Notes
Project Title	Mainstreaming Coastal and Marine Biodiversity into Production Sectors in the East Godavari Riverine Estuarine Ecosystem, Andhra Pradesh	
GEF Project ID	3936	
Agency Project ID	4257	
Implementing Agency	UNDP	
Project Type	FSP	
Country	INDIA	
Region	AFR	
Date of submission of the tracking tool	Thursday, June 27, 2019	
Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion date	Ravishankar Thupalli 27-06-2019	
Planned project duration	5 years	
Actual project duration	8 years	

Lead Project Executing Agency (ies)	Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change (MoEFCC); State Government of Andhra Pradesh; Government of India/Wildlife Wing: Environment, Forests, Science and Technology Dept.	
Date of Council/CEO Approval	March 3, 2011	
GEF Grant (US$)	6,023,636	
Cofinancing expected (US$)	18,000,000	
Please identify the production sectors and/or ecosystem services directly targeted by the project:		The Manufacturing sector has been removed from this section per MTR recommendation because different relevant aspects of manufacturing are covered individually by the other sectors identified 7 Production sectors were proposed. 4 sectors were directly targeted by the project as described below.
Agriculture (Fertilizers)	1	1: Primarily and directly targeted by the project 2: Secondary or incidentally affected by the project
Fisheries	1	1: Primarily and directly targeted by the project 2: Secondary or incidentally affected by the project
Forestry & Wildlife (Part of the project ecosystem covered)	1	1: Primarily and directly targeted by the project 2: Secondary or incidentally affected by the project
Tourism	2	1: Primarily and directly targeted by the project 2: Secondary or incidentally affected by the project
Mining		1: Primarily and directly targeted by the project 2: Secondary or incidentally affected by the project
Oil & Gas	1	1: Primarily and directly targeted by the project 2: Secondary or incidentally affected by the project
Transportation		1: Primarily and directly targeted by the project 2: Secondary or incidentally affected by the project
Other: Aquaculture	1	1: Primarily and directly targeted by the project 2: Secondary or incidentally affected by the project
Other: Salt Panning	1	1: Primarily and directly targeted by the project 2: Secondary or incidentally affected by the project
Other: Seaports	2	1: Primarily and directly targeted by the project 2: Secondary or incidentally affected by the project
II. Project Landscape/Seascape Coverage		
1. What is the extent (in hectares) of the landscape or seascape where the project will directly or indirectly contribute to biodiversity conservation or sustainable use of its components? An example is provided in the table below.		
Foreseen at project start (to be completed at CEO approval or endorsement)		
Landscape/seascape [1] area directly[2] covered by the project (ha)	46,450	

Landscape/seascape area indirectly [3] covered by the project (ha)	33,550	
The explanation for indirect coverage numbers:	Indirectly impacted through awareness programs, capacity and skill development, and outreach covering all the stakeholders.	
Actual at mid-term		
Landscape/seascape [1] area directly[2] covered by the project (ha)	40,000	
Landscape/seascape area indirectly [3] covered by the project (ha)	25,000	
The explanation for indirect coverage numbers:	Through awareness programs, Exchange of lessons learned, Capacity building strategies	Please indicate reasons
Actual at project closure		
Landscape/seascape [1] area directly[2] covered by the project (ha)	46,000	This comprises of Coringa wildlife sanctuary and 8 other reserve forests in adjoining no sanctuary area. The area also includes seascape comprising of 17,600 area of Kakinada Bay and 3,000 ha area of Godavari estuary. Verified using official reports
Landscape/seascape area indirectly [3] covered by the project (ha)	33,500	Includes the geographical area of 41 villages where capacity building and awareness generation was conducted. Verified using official reports
The explanation for indirect coverage numbers:	Awareness programs such as Coringa Bird Festival, Wildlife Week Celebrations, pre corporate summit, etc. had reached beyond the area under the direct influence due to the dissemination of outreach material.	Verified using official reports
2. Are there Protected Areas within the landscape/seascape covered by the project? If so, names these PAs, their IUCN or national PA category, and their extent in hectares		
Name of Protected Areas	IUCN and/or national category of PA	The extent in hectares of PA
1 Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary	IV	23,570.29
3. Within the landscape/seascape covered by the project, is the project implementing payment for environmental service schemes? If so, please complete the table below. An example is provided.		
		Please Indicate Environmental Service: Ecotourism
		The extent in hectares: 323 sq.km
		Payments generated (US$)/ha/yr if known at the time of CEO endorsement
Foreseen at project start (to be completed at CEO approval or endorsement)		Please Indicate Environmental Service
		Extent in hectares
		Payments generated (US$)/ha/yr: *65, 947.59*

Actual at mid-term		Please Indicate Environmental Service
		Extent in hectares
		Payments generated (US$)/ha/yr
Actual at project closure		Please Indicate Environmental Service
		Extent in hectares
		Payments generated (US$)/ha/yr
Part III. Management Practices Applied		
4. Within the scope and objectives of the project, please identify in the table below the management practices employed by project beneficiaries that integrate biodiversity considerations and the area of coverage of these management practices. Please also note if a certification system is being applied and identify the certification system being used. Note: this could range from farmers applying organic agricultural practices, forest management agencies managing forests per Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) guidelines or other forest certification schemes, artisanal fisherfolk practicing sustainable fisheries management, or industries satisfying other similar agreed international standards, etc.		
The first step for promoting mainstreaming of coastal and marine biodiversity conservation into production sector activities-by development of a landscape-level, biodiversity-friendly strategic Plan that examines current land use patterns in the project area and provides a plan for how land uses by the different sectors can be made more compatible with the conservation needs of the EGREE. The Strategic Plan defined specific changes to management practices of the production sectors.	Developed a landscape-level, Biodiversity- Friendly Strategic Plan which directed how land uses by seven different sectors could be more compatible with the conservation needs of the EGREE Region. A specific BF Strategic Management Plan for the Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary (Protected Area) is also developed and given management directions for the implementing agencies that mainstream biodiversity conservation into production sectors in its operational Eco-sensitive and buffer zones. Basing on the prescriptions of the plan's management practices have been under implementation.	EGREE Foundation has been established for facilitating a common platform for the implementation of various sectoral plans for mainstreaming coastal and marine biodiversity conservation into production sectors operating in EGREE region Verified using official reports, site visits, and meetings with stakeholders.
Foreseen at project start (to be completed at CEO approval or endorsement) **From baseline TT:** Note to the table below: Under this project, the first step for promoting mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation considerations into production sector activities will be the development of a landscape-level, biodiversity-friendly Strategic Plan. This will look at current land use in the project area and will	**1. Conservation sector: E.g., Eco-restoration of degraded mangrove areas.**	Area of coverage
	Management Effectiveness Evaluation Scorecard (developed by WII)	Biodiversity Management Plan prepared for CWLS covering 23570 ha and rest covered by Working Plan of the District
	Around 50,000 ha. Further 1700 ha will be taken up for mangrove restoration.	Area covered is 31600 ha including the 23570 ha under Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary
	2. Livelihoods/ subsistence sector: sustainable fisheries management system defined under the micro plan; sustainable grazing regime, sustainable fuelwood extraction	Please indicate specific management practices that integrate BD:

then provide a plan for how land uses by the different sectors can be made more compatible with the conservation needs of the EGREE. Once background studies and assessments are completed and the Strategic Plan (including sector-by-sector plans) are defined, specific changes to management practices of the production sectors will become clear. This is especially true of the various manufacturing units that operate in the EGREE. Therefore, at this stage, the table below is only indicative.	N/A	Name of certification system being used (insert NA if no certification system is being applied)
	50,000 ha	Area of coverage
	3a. Fisheries: E.g., Modification to catch size, fishing tools (nets, etc), better management of fishing activity to minimize associated waste, etc	Please indicate specific management practices that integrate BD
	N/A	Name of certification system being used (insert NA if no certification system is being applied)
	174,000 ha	Area of coverage
	3b. Aquaculture: E.g., Promotion of organic aquaculture practices	Please indicate specific management practices that integrate BD:
	N/A	Name of certification system being used (insert NA if no certification system is being applied)
	4,000 ha	Area of coverage
	3c. Manufacturing sector: This could range from stricter enforcement of national air and water pollution standards to specific additional measures for reducing the impact on the EGREE that will be determined as part of the Strategic Plan (and constituent sectoral plans)	Please indicate specific management practices that integrate BD:
	ISO	Name of certification system being used (insert NA if no certification system is being applied)
	10,000 ha	Area of coverage
	4. Ports: E.g., how does the management of the Kakinada port need to be modified to be made more biodiversity compatible?	
	N/A	Name of certification system being used (insert NA if no certification system is being applied)
	1000 ha	Area of coverage

Actual at mid-term	**1. Conservation sector: Mangrove protection, mangrove regeneration, and participatory conservation including Marine Turtle Conservation Programme, Fishing cat and Smooth Coated otter conservation program, Whale shark conservation program and Community Based Eco-Tourism, Clean environment campaign through coastal cleanup programs involving Coast Guard and Marine Police, youth, schools, colleges, and industries.**	Please indicate specific management practices that integrate BD
	Management Effectiveness Evaluation Scorecard (developed by WII)	Name of certification system being used (insert NA if no certification system is being applied)
	Mangrove protection: 33,093 ha including both inside a protected area and 1493.00 ha Outside RF including Villages (Thallarevu, I.Polavaram, Katrenikona, Kakinada R); Mangrove Regeneration: 55.00 ha; Participatory Conservation: ~10,000 ha	Area of coverage
	2. Livelihoods/ subsistence sector: II. Livelihood/ Subsistence Sector: Promotion of livelihood options for local communities (with special focus on women and youth groups) as mentioned to the right	A. Skill development: Conducted Skill development (71) to women (1433 women) to earn better income generation for leading a better life through preparing articles with locally available material such as coir, shell, bamboo, and garment designing. Established a unit for Industrial Apparel Training and Designing for manufacturing textile. started pilot Fish Stall/ Community fish processing center for preparing fish products Information Centre for youth etc., on a pilot basis. Conducted Exposure trips to Fishery Research Institutes / Cooperatives/ Dairy development Institutes/ Alternative Livelihoods etc., B.i. Capacity building programs Conducted capacity building programs (10) to the elected representatives and leaders (30 out of 66elected) such as State Ministers, Member of Parliament through campaigns, Conservation festivals, and to Member of Legislative Assembly, ZillaParishat Council members, Sarpanchs, MPTCs, and Ward members through trainings awareness generation Programmes and meetings, & citizen dialogues and info dissemination activities B.ii. Capacity Building of women representatives Working and capacitating the 487 women representatives of various Groups such as SHG/women Cooperatives/ Forest Protection groups for social and economic empowerment. Conducted exclusive awareness meetings and workshops, skill training programs (58) to SHG/women members for enhancing their skillset and capacity for best utilization of resources. C. Networking Initiated Networking (6 networks) (Sarpanch Samikya snagham), Forest Protection Groups (Federation of Eco-development committees and Vansmarakshana Samities) and Fishermen groups(District Fishermen Association) and village leaders for 1.Better

		governance and for initiating pro-conservative activities 2. strengthening the networks 3. activating the village assemblies/Gramasabhas for discussing and addressing the village development and biodiversity conservation activities (Micro plans). D. Institutional Strengthening Carried 20 Capacity building programs and strengthened 15 institutions such as Training, Awareness programs and Exposure trips to strengthened the CBOs /NGOs/Coops of various fields for mainstreaming the conservation and sustainable resource utilization E. Awareness building programs Carried 208 Awareness building programs 4372 members on the sustainable fisheries management system, grazing regime and fuelwood extraction defined under the micro plans F. Village level Consultations and Tieups Village level Consultations (345) with resource users and Tie-ups (4 institutions) for capacity building and distribution of supporting implements on Fisheries regarding modifications to catch size, fishing tools(nets, etc), better management of fishing activity to minimize associated wast, etc. G. Distribution of equipment Distributed Fish Storage supporting equipment (Ice Boxes-75) H. Infrastructure Development Provided necessary infrastructure such as Community halls- 8; Market Yard-1; Drainage & Sanitation - 4; Fish Processing Centre -1; Milk Collection Centre -1; Fish Drying Platforms -2 ; Renovation of creeks -1; Fish Stall -1; Other-1.
	N/A	Name of certification system being used (insert NA if no certification system is being applied)
	40,000 ha	Area of coverage

	3a. Fisheries	Regular monitoring by enforcement agencies like coast guards, marine police, fisheries and forests department conducted. Other key activities include - I. Establishment of STPs / ETPs at the source of discharges from industries/ urban sewage treatment to improve the Habitat/ Species improvement in the aquatic environment of the EGREE region. II. Awareness and capacity building program to community Institutions/ People representatives and enforcement Depts. III. Strict observation of Ban Period with the initiation of District and State/administration as per APMFRI act (Implementation resulted in high fish production this year 2015) IV. Strengthening the Fishermen Community Institutions towards sustainable management of fish resources by involving traditional management measures. V. Infrastructure support to Major and Minor landing center VI. Establishing the Interpretation center at CWLS VII. Installing BRDs /JRDs/ TED/Solar equipment to MFVs / Storage equipment in coordination with concerned organizations VIII. Cold chain development and processing of value-added products: Esta IX. Providing basic service facilities at a small-scale fishery landing center for Five villages (Uppalanka, Balusutippa, Pedavalasala, Kottapalem, Kumbhabhisekam
	N/A	Name of certification system being used (insert NA if no certification system is being applied)
	80000	Area of coverage
	3b. Aquaculture	1. Motivated local people /Institutions/ Depts to regenerate the abandoned aqua farms with mangroves 2. Reduced Fish/Prawn collection from the wild by establishing a hatchery 3. Unregistered aquaculture ponds have been discouraged
	N/A	Name of certification system being used (insert NA if no certification system is being applied)
	80000	Area of coverage
	3c. Manufacturing sector	This sector has been removed from the management practices section, in keeping with the removal of the manufacturing sector from the sectors targeted.
	ISO	Name of certification system being used (insert NA if no certification system is being applied)
	40000	Area of coverage

	4. Ports	EGREE Foundation, in association with Coast Guards and Forest Department, is assisting the existing port to evolve as Environmentally friendly Green Port by adopting the following. • Blue Economy Strategies in the port's influence area • Use of low emission bunker fuels in Port (LNG initiatives) • Implementation of Emission Control Area (ECA) • Reduction/Minimize of Air, Water, and Noise pollution • Use alternative energy or better energy efficiency equipment • Innovative Port Governance and Public-Private Partnerships
	N/A	Name of certification system being used (insert NA if no certification system is being applied)
	40000	Area of coverage
Actual at project closure	**1. Conservation sector: Mangrove protection and regeneration, Marine Turtle Conservation Programme, Fishing cat and Smooth Coated otter conversation program, Whale shark conservation program and Community Based Eco-Tourism, Clean environment campaign through coastal cleanup programs involving Coast Guard and Marine Police, youth, schools, colleges and industries.** • Established Mangrove Genetic Resource Conservation Centre to revive RET species. Through this, about 36,000 saplings belonging to 12 species have been raised. • Camera trap studies conducted in Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary and adjoining reserve forests using the spatially explicit capture-recapture technique for accurate estimation • Conducted Asian Waterbird Census for 7 years to monitor avifauna at 7 wetlands in the EGREE Region. • Conducted a marine turtle conservation program with community involvement. Ex-situ and In-situ conservation of turtle nests being carried out at 7 sites and 7,83,453 hatchlings released till project closure. • Conducted massive awareness campaigns through Corinaga Bird Festival, Wildlife Week Celebration, and International whale shark day celebrations. A cross-sectoral workshop on enhancing the regional capacity for Integrated Management and Conservation.	**Fisheries sector**: Some of the management practices help in mainstream biodiversity into the fishery sector includes: Reduction in bycatch - Square nets and Turtle Excluder Devices (TED) was provided to the fishing community. Square net helps the juvenile to escape and TED helps turtle and other schedule species to escape. Fishing holiday - The 61-day fish ban period was strictly followed in the EGREE region. This allowed the fish to reproduce. As a result, a 20% increase in fishermen's income. The training was provided on wildlife crime and trade with special emphasis on scheduled coastal and marine species falls under the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972. The awareness on the scheduled species was given to the forest, fisheries department officials, coast guard, customs department and other production sectors. This has reduced the wild catch of schedule species listed in the WLPA, 1972. Specifically, Whale sharks were rescued by providing incentives. A separate chapter on Marine Conservation was included in the Wildlife Action Plan of India (2017 to 2031). Micro-plans for 41 villages in the EGREE Region was completed and implemented for strengthening SHGs/Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) in natural resource use and sustainable livelihoods. The collection of broodstock in the brackish water region was restricted. **Aquaculture:** Management strategies and best practices for responsible aquaculture developed. Mangrove plantation provides nursery and breeding ground for fin and shellfish species, oysters, mussels and gastropods. Mangrove acts as a biofilter and reduces the intensity of effluent and pesticides. Sea ranching of native varieties Conservation of native broodstock species. Eco-friendly aquaculture and poly culture are practiced. **Manufacturing:** Mapping of ecologically sensitive areas.

	• Exposure visits to Sindhudurg and Sundarbans were conducted for the enforcement department and production sector representatives.	Declaration of the critically vulnerable coastal area and to develop a coastal zone management plan. Declaration of community reserves Mapping of the migratory route of Olive Ridley turtle Establish the extent of important bird areas. Clean technology/best practices incorporated **Ports:** Sectoral Plan for Port and Shipping prepared in consultation with and shared with the Port authorities Biodiversity friendly management practices port operations prepared. Bio-fouling management initiative. Ballast water management. Green port development
	Management Effectiveness Evaluation Scorecard (developed by WII)	Name of certification system being used (insert NA if no certification system is being applied)
	46000	Area of coverage
	2. Livelihood/ subsistence sector: Promotion of livelihood options for local communities (with special focus on women and youth groups):	Please indicate specific management practices that integrate BD Established infrastructure for livelihood generation such as Community Livelihood Centre and Food court at Corangi Forest complex. Capacity building training programs on Apiculture, Cookery, and Hospitality, Fish Value Added products were conducted. Infrastructure development in Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary such as the boardwalk, watchtower, speed boats, boat jetties, a wooden platform, display boards and tourist stay arrangements to increase footfall to make community-based eco-tourism sustainable. Participation of community members on exposure visits to Sindhudurg and Sundarbans to study livelihood practices such as community-based ecotourism, Crab farming, and Oyster culture.
	N.A.	Name of certification system being used (insert NA if no certification system is being applied)
	33500	Area of coverage

	3a. Fisheries Sector: Modification to catch size, fishing tools (nets, etc), better management of fishing activity to minimize associated waste, etc	Please indicate specific management practices that integrate BD 1. Training on the maintenance of IBM/OBM given and fishers were provided tool kits 2. Workshop on net-mending was conducted and beneficiaries were provided with necessary tools. 3. Marine Mammal Monitoring App developed to monitor bycatch to be reported by fishers. 4. Capacity building training and consultation workshops with fisher community to draft whale shark conservation management plan was formulated with the help of Wildlife Trust of India. Fishers who rescued whale sharks were felicitated.
	N.A.	Name of certification system being used (insert NA if no certification system is being applied)
	33500	Area of coverage
Part IV. Market Transformation		
5. For those projects that have identified market transformation as a project objective, please describe the project's ability to integrate biodiversity considerations into the mainstream economy by measuring the market changes to which the project contributed. The sectors and subsectors and measures of impact in the table below are illustrative examples, only. Please complete the objectives and specifics of the project.		
Foreseen at project start		
Name of the market that the project seeks to affect (sector and sub-sector)	N/A	Unit of measure of market impact
	N/A	
	N/A	
Actual at mid-term		
Name of the market that the project seeks to affect (sector and sub-sector)	N/A	Unit of measure of market impact
	N/A	
	N/A	
Actual at project closure		
Name of the market that the project seeks to affect (sector and sub-sector)	N/A	Unit of measure of market impact
	N/A	
	N/A	
Part V. Policy and Regulatory frameworks		

6. For those projects that have identified addressing policy, legislation, regulations and their implementation as project objectives, Please complete these tables for each sector that is a primary or a secondary focus of the project. Please answer (1 for YES or 0 for NO) to each statement under the sectors that are a focus of the project.
The entry-point for this project is at the landscape level in the project site. In this landscape, the project will aim to strengthen the enabling environment for biodiversity mainstreaming by developing a landscape-level Strategic Plan that includes individual sector plans for the key sectors that impact biodiversity. This site-level experience will provide important lessons that can progressively be integrated into national policy and regulatory frameworks.

Please note that this section is not relevant to the project's work in the Oil & Gas sector, which is why scores are not provided for that sector below and in the baseline TT.

		Manufacturing has been removed from the targeted sectors, as recommended in the MTR. This was suggested because individual manufacturing sectors are targeted and assessed individually
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy		
Agriculture	0	Yes = 1, No = 0
Fisheries	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Forestry & Wildlife	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Tourism	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Oil	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Other: Aquaculture & Salt Pans (*under "Agriculture" in baseline TT*)	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Other: Ports	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Biodiversity considerations are mentioned in sector policy through specific legislation		
Agriculture	0	Yes = 1, No = 0
Fisheries	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Forestry	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Tourism	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Other: Aquaculture & Salt Pans (*under "Agriculture" in baseline TT*)	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Other: Ports	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Regulations are in place to implement the legislation		
Agriculture	0	Yes = 1, No = 0
Fisheries	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Forestry	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Tourism	1	Yes = 1, No = 0

Other: Aquaculture & Salt Pans (*under "Agriculture" in baseline TT*)	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Other: Ports	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
The regulations are under implementation		
Agriculture	0	Yes = 1, No = 0
Fisheries	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Forestry	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Tourism	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Other: Aquaculture & Salt Pans (*under "Agriculture" in baseline TT*)	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Other: Ports	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Other: Manufacturing		Yes = 1, No = 0
The implementation of regulations is enforced		
Agriculture	0	Yes = 1, No = 0
Fisheries	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Forestry	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Tourism	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Other: Aquaculture & Salt Pans (*under "Agriculture" in baseline TT*)	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Other: Ports	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Enforcement of regulations is monitored		
Agriculture	0	Yes = 1, No = 0
Fisheries	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Forestry	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Tourism	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Other: Aquaculture & Salt Pans (*under "Agriculture" in baseline TT*)	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
Other: Ports	1	Yes = 1, No = 0
All projects please complete this question at the project mid-term evaluation and at the final evaluation, if relevant:		

6. **Within the scope and objectives of the project, has the private sector undertaken voluntary measures to incorporate biodiversity considerations in production? If yes, please provide a brief explanation and specifically mention the sectors involved.**

Under the CSR initiative following activities have been carried out:

- Provide habitat for nearly 271 species of birds which includes resident and migratory birds.
- 350 acres of land was converted into bird sanctuary and for green belt developmental activities.
- Rehabilitated nearly 150 birds during the Hud-Hud cyclone
- Nearly 4.5 crores (approx. 6,42,857 in USD) were spend under the CSR activities for protecting the avian fauna in the Coromandel region.
- Annually Rs. 500000 is spending for conservation related activities.
- Noise free zone and no horn zone is created inside the factor premises

Annex 11: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Evaluators/Consultants:

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 the 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 it and how issues should be reported.
5. They 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. They 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 limitations, findings, and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

Terminal Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

Name of Consultant:

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT

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

Signed at (Jordan) on (July 2019)

Signature: 

Annex 12: Evaluation Report Clearance Form

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by
UNDP Country Office

Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

UNDP GEF RTA
Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Annex 13: Annexed in a separate file - TE Audit Trail