

## **Project**

***Conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity and  
maintenance of ecosystem services of protected  
wetlands of international importance***

Wetlands Project No. 88054 PIMS 4966

# **Final Term Evaluation (FTE)**

**Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación (SINAC)  
United Nations Development Program (UNDP)**

Evaluator  
**Erick Vargas Campos**

July 16, 2018  
Costa Rica

## Table of contents

i. Opening page .....	6
ii. Acronyms & Abbreviations .....	7
iii. Executive Summary .....	9
iii.1 Project Summary Table .....	9
iii.2 Project description .....	9
iii.3 Evaluation ratings .....	10
iii. 4 Summary of conclusions and recommendations .....	10
1. Introduction.....	13
1.1 Purpose of the evaluation .....	13
1.2 Methodology .....	13
1.3 Structure of the Final Term Evaluation (FTE) report .....	14
2. Project description and development context.....	15
2.1 Project start and duration .....	15
2.2 Problems that the project sought to address .....	15
2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project .....	16
2.4 Main stakeholders.....	17
2.5 Expected Results .....	18
3. Findings .....	19
3.1 Project Design / Formulation .....	19
3.1.1 Analysis of Results Framework/Logical Framework.....	19
3.1.2 Project risks .....	21
3.1.3 UNDP comparative advantage .....	22

3.1.4 Stakeholder participation in the design .....	23
3.1.5 Lessons from other relevant projects .....	23
3.1.6 Linkages between project and other interventions .....	24
3.1.7 Replication approach .....	25
3.1.8 Management arrangements .....	25
3.2 Project Implementation .....	26
3.2.1 Project financing / co-financing .....	26
3.2.2 UNDP as implementing agency for GEF .....	27
3.2.3 SINAC as Executing Agency .....	27
3.2.4 Monitoring and Evaluation.....	28
3.2.5 Participation of stakeholders in Project implementation .....	29
3.2.6 Adaptive management .....	30
3.2.7 Implementation / execution .....	32
3.3 Project Results.....	32
3.3.1 Overall results .....	32
3.3.2 Relevance .....	36
3.3.3 Effectiveness in achieving results.....	37
3.3.4 Efficiency in the implementation of the Project .....	39
3.3.5 Country ownership.....	40
3.3.6 Mainstreaming .....	41
3.3.7 Sustainability .....	42
3.3.7.1 Financial Resources .....	42
3.3.7.2 Socio-political .....	43
3.3.7.3 Institutional framework and governance.....	43

3.3.7.4 Environmental .....	44
3.3.7.5 Overall likelihood of sustainability .....	45
3.3.8 Impact.....	45
4. Conclusions, Lessons & Recommendations .....	46
4.1 Conclusions.....	46
4.2 Lessons .....	47
4.3 Recommendations .....	48
5. Annexes .....	50
Annex No. 1: ToR.....	50
Annex No. 2: Work Plan .....	67
Annex No. 3: List of key people interviewed.....	68
Annex No. 4: Interviews and field visits .....	69
Annex No. 5: Questionnaire model used with key informants .....	70
Annex No. 6: UNDP-GEF MTE Report Audit Trail .....	72
Annex No. 7: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form .....	79
Annex No. 8: Evaluation Report Clearance Form.....	80

## Tables included in this report

Table 1. Project Summary .....	9
Table 2. Evaluation Ratings .....	10
Table 3. Structure of the Final Term Evaluation (FTE) report .....	14
Table 4. Adaptations to the original design of the Logical Framework .....	20

Table 5. Project risks according to ProDoc and how they were approached .....	21
Table 6. Planned and actual co-financing to date .....	27
Table 7. Stakeholders and their role in the implementation of the Project .....	29
Table 8. IIPW Total budget (excluding donations and income generated by PAs) .....	34
Table 9. IIPW Donations and income generated by PAs .....	34
Table 10. Total finances of the wetland system.....	35
Table 11. Total system expenses and financial needs (basic management scenario) .....	36
Table 12. Change in ecological representation in eleven IIPW .....	37
Table 13. Estimation of the METT score .....	38

## **i. Opening page**

**Title of UNDP supported GEF financed Project:** Conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity and maintenance of ecosystem services of protected wetlands of international importance

**UNDP ID (PIMS#):** 88054

**GEF ID (PIMS#):** PIMS 4966

**Final Term Evaluation time frame:** June 8 to July 16, 2018

**Date of Final Term Evaluation report:** July 16, 2018

**Countries included in the project:** Costa Rica

**GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program:** Biodiversity

**Implementing Partner and other project partners:** Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, SINAC / Programa Costa Rica por Siempre, Proyecto GIZ/BIOMARCC

**Name of Evaluator:** Erick Vargas Campos

## ii. Acronyms & Abbreviations

ACHN	Huetar Norte Conservation Area (Área de Conservación Huetar Norte)
AWP	Annual Work Plan
AyA	Instituto Costarricense de Acueductos y Alcantarillados (Costa Rican Institute of Aqueducts and Sewers)
BCCR	Banco Central de Costa Rica (Central Bank of Costa Rica)
BIOMARCC	Proyecto Biodiversidad Marino Costera y Adaptación al Cambio Climático
CA	Conservation Area
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CC	Climate Change
CCT	Centro Científico Tropical
CENIGA	Centro Nacional de Información Geo-Ambiental (National Center for Geo-Environmental Information)
CGR	Contraloría General de la República (Office of the Comptroller General)
CIMAR	Centro de Investigación en Ciencias del Mar y Limnología
CINPE	Centro Internacional de Política Económica para el Desarrollo Sostenible
CNE	Comisión Nacional de Emergencias (National Emergencies Commission)
CONAC	Consejo Nacional de Áreas de Conservación (National Council of Conservation Areas)
CONAHU	Consejo Nacional Asesor sobre Humedales (National Advisory Council on Wetlands)
CRXS	Programa Costa Rica por Siempre (Forever Costa Rica Program)
DA	Dirección de Aguas (Water Management Agency)
ENSO	El Niño South Oscillation
FONAFIFO	Fondo Nacional de Financiamiento Forestal (National Fund for Forest Financing)
FSS	Financial Sustainability Scorecard
FTE	Final Term Evaluation
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GIZ	German Cooperation Agency for Development
HNTS	Humedal Nacional Terraba Sierpe
ICE	Instituto Costarricense de Electricidad (Costa Rican Institute of Electricity)
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank (Coastal Marine Biodiversity and Adaptation to Climate Change)
IIPW	Internationally Important Protected Wetlands
INDER	Instituto de Desarrollo Rural (Rural Development Institute)
INH	Inventario Nacional de Humedales (National Wetland Inventory)
INTA	Instituto Nacional de Innovación y Transferencia de Tecnología Agropecuaria (National Institute of Innovation and Transfer of Agricultural Technology)
JICA	Agencia de Cooperación Internacional del Japón
MAG	Ministerio de Agricultura y Ganadería (Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock)
MAPCOBIO	Proyecto para la Promoción del Manejo Participativo en la Conservación de la Biodiversidad
MEP	Ministerio de Educación Pública (Ministry of Public Education)

METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for Protected Areas
MINAE	Ministerio de Ambiente y Energía (Ministry of Environment and Energy)
MINSA	Ministerio de Salud (Ministry of Health)
MTR	Mid Term Review
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
OTS	Organization for Tropical Studies
PA	Protected Area
PES	Payments for Ecosystem Services
PIF	Project Identification Form
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PMU	Project Management Unit
PN	Parque Nacional
PNE	Patrimonio Natural del Estado (lands of natural importance owned by the state)
PNH	Programa Nacional de Humedales (National Wetland Program)
PPG	Project Preparation Grant
PPS	Programa de Planificación y Promoción Social (Program of Planning and Social Promotion)
RB	Reserva Biológica
RCU	UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit
RNVS	Refugio Nacional de Vida Silvestre
SC	Steering Committee
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SE	Secretaría Ejecutiva del SINAC (SINAC's Executive Secretariat)
SENARA	Servicio Nacional de Aguas Subterráneas, Riego y Avenamiento (National Service of Groundwater, Irrigation and Drainage)
SETENA	Secretaría Técnica Nacional Ambiental (National Environmental Technical Secretariat)
SINAC	Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación (National System of Conservation Areas)
SNIT	Sistema Nacional de Información Territorial (National Territorial Information System)
ToR	Terms of Reference
TPC	Tripartite Committee
UCR	Universidad de Costa Rica (University of Costa Rica)
UNA	Universidad Nacional de Costa Rica (National University of Costa Rica)
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNDP-CO	UNDP Country Office
USD	US Dollars

### iii. Executive Summary

#### iii.1 Project Summary Table

**Table 1. Project Summary**

Project Title	<i>Conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity and maintenance of ecosystem services of protected wetlands of international importance</i>			
GEF Project ID	PIMS 4966		<u>At endorsement</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>	<u>At completion</u> <u>(Million US\$)</u>
UNDP Project ID	00088054	GEF financing	3,705,873.00	N/A
Country	Costa Rica	SINAC	8,062,710 funds 7,225,608 in kind 15,288,318.00 total	N/A
		UNDP Other (Forever Costa Rica Program and GIZ BIOMARCC)	300,000.00 1,600,000.00	
Focal Area	Biodiversity	Total co-financing	17,188,318.00	N/A
Executing Agency	SINAC	Total Project Cost:	20,894,191	N/A
Other Partners involved	Vice Minister of Waters and Seas	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		<b>28/04/2014</b>
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: March 2019	Actual: August 2018

#### iii.2 Project description

The project was designed to: Improve the management of Internationally Important Protected Wetlands (IIPW) in Costa Rica in order to increase their conservation, sustainable use and maintenance of the ecosystem services they provide. Also, it aims to produce substantial global environmental benefits by increasing the conservation and sustainable use of eleven (11) IIPWs; as well as increasing the representation of wetland ecosystems within the national Protected Areas (PA) system and improving the management effectiveness of seven (7) IIPWs.

### iii.3 Evaluation ratings

**Table 2. Evaluation Ratings**

<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution</b>	<b>Rating</b>
M&E design at entry	HS	Quality of UNDP Implementation	HS
M&E Plan Implementation	HS	Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	HS
Overall quality of M&E	HS	Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	HS
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<b>Rating</b>
Relevance	HS	Financial resources	ML
Effectiveness	HS	Socio-political	ML
Efficiency	HS	Institutional framework and governance	ML
Overall Project Outcome Rating	HS	Environmental	ML
		Overall likelihood of sustainability	ML
HS: Highly Satisfactory		ML: Moderately Likely	

### iii. 4 Summary of conclusions and recommendations

#### Summary of conclusions

The governance of the Project responded to its needs in terms of guidance, teamwork, management, planning, use of resources, control, and communication, with a flexible and adaptive structure; The Project was highly favored by the accumulated experience of United Nations Development Program, UNDP, as the implementing agency and the Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, SINAC (National System of Conservation Areas) as the executing agency for other capacity building projects in SINAC, which placed them in an ideal position to take advantage of their lessons learned; The Wetland Project implemented actions that integrated the Sustainable Development Goals, SDG, particularly 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, and 15; The Project Management Unit, PMU, operated as an integral part of SINAC, following institutional norms and guidelines, working in coordination with the technical and administrative staff members of the Secretaría Ejecutiva, SE (SINAC's Executive Secretariat), and the Conservation Areas, CAs, executing the

Project effectively and efficiently, with products that were reviewed, received feedback and were approved to the satisfaction of SINAC; Despite the limited human, material and financial resources, the National Wetlands Program played a strategic role in the implementation of the Project, both at the strategic and operational levels, from the SE and with the CAs. Its strengthening will be key to the sustainability of the Project outcomes; The Project provided an ideal framework for SINAC to fulfil pending international commitments with the Ramsar Strategic Plan and with the Montreux Record, as well as with provisions of the Contraloría General de la República, CGR (Office of the Comptroller General); With the implementation of the Project, SINAC was strengthened on wetland management with trained and aware staff members, practical experience, technical products, management tools and strategic alliances. All this increased its capacity to work not only on wetland conservation but also on sustainable uses; Costa Rica achieved an important Project appropriation through several macro instruments of national planning, as well as through policy instruments and regulations, which positioned the topic of wetlands in the country's environmental agenda; Although the topic of gender was not included in the design of the Project, during implementation, efforts were made to improve the approach to gender in SINAC and to contribute to other projects in this field; The sustainability of the Project outcomes is moderately likely due to the existence of financial, socioeconomic, political, institutional and environmental risks that hinder the conservation and sustainable use of wetlands.

## **Summary of recommendations**

### **Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project:**

#### For UNDP:

1. In the design of future projects UNDP should focus on getting a clearer identification of other of its priorities, such as the SDGs, which should be articulated with different indicators, activities and outputs.
2. From the design of projects, with an early and specific identification of the stakeholders that cause threats to wetland ecosystems (or any other biodiversity element) UNDP may further enhance project beneficiaries and allies, as well as inclusion of relevant social groups on prioritized issues (gender, fight against poverty, others).
3. UNDP should position gender as a necessary and strategic topic from the formulation phases of the projects, with clear indicators.

#### For SINAC:

4. In the implementation of a project, SINAC should take into account regional differences in leadership, administrative capacity, technical skills and previous experiences to design a strategy for not leaving any conservation area behind.

5. SINAC should define a mandatory mechanism for the CAs and the institution as a whole to adequately and timely quantify and report their co-financing of projects, with a specific format and training of staff members on its use.
6. SINAC should proactively promote strategic alliances with partners and allies that can strengthen or complement specific project activities and outputs, and quantify their corresponding co-financing.
7. SINAC should integrate staff members as part of the full-time PMU technical team.

**Follow-up actions and reinforcement of the initial benefits of the project:**

For MINAE and SINAC Authorities:

8. MINAE should appoint the National Wetlands Program as the focal point of the Ramsar Convention in order to achieve an expeditious and timely follow-up of the compliance with the Ramsar Strategic Plan and with the Montreux Record.
9. MINAE and SINAC should strengthen the National Wetlands Program with human, material and financial resources, as a key player in the sustainability of processes associated with wetland management and in future projects.
10. SINAC should make the National Wetland Inventory publically available through the SNIT and other platforms, in a transparent and open manner.
11. SINAC should implement the financial mechanisms resulting from the Project to improve its resource gaps and optimize the income that can be contributed to wetland conservation.
12. SINAC should empower staff members involved in coordination, execution, administration and evaluation of projects with knowledge about gender, so that they understand social relationships between men and women and can implement affirmative actions aimed at achieving equity.
13. SINAC should update its Strategic Plan 2016-2026 in relation to wetlands and the PNH, given that those are almost absent from that important planning tool.
14. SINAC and the CAs should formalize the wetlands liaisons as part of the sustainability of wetland management, keeping in those positions staff members who have already developed capacities and accumulated experience through the Project.
15. The PNH and the CAs should actively disseminate project outputs such as the technical reports, valuation studies, educational fun games and others that contribute to promoting the value of wetlands and their ecosystem services among different sectors of the population.
16. The CAs should continue to strengthen the capacities of their staff members on the Project's outputs and tools through means such as regional workshops and others.

# **1. Introduction**

## **1.1 Purpose of the evaluation**

The Final Term Evaluation (FTE) report seeks to provide a comprehensive and systematic analysis of the performance and accomplishment achievement of the general objective and outcomes of the Project “Conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity and maintenance of ecosystem services of protected wetlands of international importance” (Wetlands Project 88054 PIMS 4966).

The Project was designed to: Improve the management of Internationally Important Protected Wetlands (IIPW) in Costa Rica in order to increase their conservation, sustainable use and maintenance of the ecosystem services they provide.

The FTE was conducted according to the *“Guidance For Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects”* (UNDP, 2012) and the *“Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation for Full-sized Projects”* (GEF, 2017). The objectives of the evaluation were:

1. Assess the achievement of project results.
2. Draw lessons that can improve the sustainability of benefits from this project.
3. Aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

## **1.2 Methodology**

The Evaluation began with the preparation of the Inception Report, which included the Work Plan (see Annex No. 2). The documents were reviewed, including those recommended in the ToR (see Annex No. 1), as well as others provided by the Project Management Unit (PMU). With the support of the PMU, a list of key informants to be interviewed was drawn up (see Annex No. 3). A timeline was defined for interviews with key informants. Also, a visit was coordinated with the ACHN for a session with five staff members who were key in Project implementation in their region (see Annex No. 4). A questionnaire for key informants was prepared (see Annex No. 5) and different questions were applied depending on each individual’s area of experience with the Project.

The Evaluator conducted an M&E analysis for the design and implementation phases. He also evaluated the performance of the Implementing Agency (UNDP) and the Executing Agency (SINAC) during execution. An evaluation of Project results in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact was also conducted, according to the *“Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results”* (UNDP, 2009).

### 1.3 Structure of the Final Term Evaluation (FTE) report

The general structure of the Final Term Evaluation (FTE) report includes the following sections:

**Table 3. Structure of the Final Term Evaluation (FTE) report**

**Section 1.** Introduction

**Section 2.** Project description and development context

**Sección 3.** Findings

3.1 Project Design / Formulation

3.2 Project Implementation

3.3 Project Results

**Sección 4.** Conclusions, Lessons & Recommendations

**Sección 5.** Annexes

## 2. Project description and development context

### 2.1 Project start and duration

The Government of Costa Rica signed the Wetland Project in March 2014, to be implemented in five years (2014-2019). It started in October 2014 with the appointment of the general coordination. The Project Executing Unit (PMU) was established in February 2015 with the hiring of a team of professionals in several technical subjects. Although the original plan was to complete the Project in March 2019, it actually concluded in July 2018, complying with all its indicators.

### 2.2 Problems that the project sought to address

The ProDoc identifies several threats that endanger IIPW biodiversity in Costa Rica:

- **Damaging agricultural practices:** Related to crops such as banana and pineapple, often associated with the intense use of agrochemicals, excess water for irrigation, expansion of agricultural and cattle ranching frontiers and fires in wetland areas.
- **Illegal fishing, hunting, and unsustainable wetlands resources use:** This includes commercial and sport fishing activities in IIPW, both illegal and traditional, as well as unsustainable collection of mollusks for human consumption.
- **Change in land use for the construction of infrastructure and other developments (both large and small scale):** Works may include hydroelectric dams, marinas, roads, airports, urban projects and tourism infrastructure, among others, as well as the presence of communities and associated development in upper and middle watersheds. All of this results in contamination, sedimentation and a reduction in river flows.
- **Deforestation of mangrove forests for different uses:** Mangroves are being replaced by shrimp farms and other aquaculture activities, as well as by agricultural crops based on intensive practices.
- **Unsustainable tourism:** Insufficiently managed and monitored tourism practices in wetland areas can be detrimental to wetland biodiversity by affecting nesting sites, feeding practices, and causing pollution of habitat.
- **Introduction and dissemination of exotic invasive species:** Wetlands are especially vulnerable to invasions of exotic species, which alter ecosystem habitat structure, reduces biodiversity levels, and modifies food webs.

- **Climate change (CC):** In the future, those life zones found in high elevations may be more sensitive to increases in temperature, while those at low elevations may be more susceptible to changes in precipitation. Climate events such as hurricanes, which cause flooding, and drought that is related to the El Niño South Oscillation (ENSO), may contribute to changes in wetland structure and composition. CC can also affect the spawning behavior of many species in wetlands.

In this context, several direct and underlying causes are identified:

- **Institutional weakness and lack of coordination among wetland authorities:** There is a lack of effective coordination mechanisms between governmental agencies and a lack of adequate mechanisms for stakeholder participation to improve IIPW governance.
- **Planning gaps:** The boundaries of many IIPW are poorly defined and boundary demarcation is unclear or difficult to understand in coastal areas. Zoning is sometimes inappropriate, particularly for water surfaces and water columns that are usually considered to be homogenous.
- **Legal limitations:** Legal frameworks allow changes to the boundaries of a PA, a process that is used by some stakeholders to reduce marine areas in exchange for terrestrial areas to be used for infrastructure development. This threatens marine ecosystems by establishing barriers to land-sea connectivity.
- **Unregulated agricultural and urban growth near to and within the drainage areas of IIPW:** This is one of the principal direct causes associated with the current threats to wetlands biodiversity. The unregulated expansion of agriculture and urban land uses impacts wetlands through direct ecosystem conversion and drainage.

The Wetland Project was proposed to mitigate these threats and ensure the effective conservation and sustainable management of IIPW wetlands. It also seeks to strengthen the institutional framework and capacities to increase the effectiveness of PA management, as well as effective inter-institutional coordination mechanisms and financial sustainability.

## 2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project

According to the ProDoc, the Project objective is “**To improve management in order to increase the conservation, sustainable use, and maintenance of the ecosystem services of internationally important wetlands, IIPW**”. The Project includes two components:

1. Protected area (PA) system representation and emplacement of institutional capacity for the sustainable management and conservation of wetlands.

2. Resources for sustainable management of internationally important protected wetlands increased and diversified.

## 2.4 Main stakeholders

The main stakeholders that were expected to be included in the implementation are:

- **Ministerio de Ambiente y Energía, MINAE (Ministry of Environment and Energy):** It is the governing entity that regulates natural resources in Costa Rica.
- **Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, SINAC (National System of Conservation Areas):** SINAC is the Executing Agency of the Project, its Executive Director is also Project Director and the Coordinator of the PNH is also the Institutional Coordinator of the Project. The PNH is part of the Department of Information and Regularization of the Territory. SINAC is responsible for the administration of all PA in the country, the management of forests and wildlife both inside and outside PA, and the conservation and protection of the use of watersheds and hydrological systems.
- **Consejo Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, CONAC (National Council of Conservation Areas):** It is the highest decision-making body in SINAC and is chaired by the Minister of Environment and Energy.
- **Consejo Nacional Asesor sobre Humedales, CONAHU (National Advisory Council on Wetlands):** It provides advice and support to the Minister of Environment and Energy, SINAC and other institutions responsible for wetland management, promotion, education, planning, sustainable development and rational use. It also supports actions for the national implementation of the Ramsar Convention.
- **Other government institutions:** The Project sought to work with several public institutions during its implementation (FONAFIFO, MAG, INDER, others).
- **Municipalities:** Local governments are responsible for land planning outside of PAs, which may include wetlands.
- **Local communities:** The Project sought to work closely with communities in or near IIPW.
- **Universities, research institutes and NGOs:** The Project sought to work with several academic entities (UCR, UNA) and research centers (CCT, OTS).
- **UNDP Country Office in Costa Rica, UNDP-CO:** It is the Project's Implementing Agency and is responsible for its financial and technical supervision.
- **UNDP Regional Bureau (RBLAC) and the Regional UNDP/GEF Offices:** Regional Technical Advisory, responsible for the monitoring and technical quality during the Project cycle.
- **Other cooperation initiatives:** The ProDoc describes co-financing by the Forever Costa Rica Program (CRXS) and the GIZ/BIOMARCC project (Coastal Marine Biodiversity and Adaptation to Climate Change).

## 2.5 Expected Results

During the implementation of the Wetland Project, some changes based on adaptive management were made to some outcomes and outputs of the ProDoc. These were the following:

### **Component 1: Protected area (PA) system representation and emplacement of institutional capacity for the sustainable management and conservation of wetlands.**

Outcome 1.1, *Output 1.1.1* and its indicator changed in the 2015 PIR. The amendment was based on the Solís Rivera Administration's decision not to increase current PAs or declare new ones, given common conflicts with occupants over land tenure. Here are the proposed changes:

- Outcome 1.1 Increase in the ecological representation of wetlands in the national protected areas system by 20,000 hectares.
- *Output 1.1.1* - Scientific analysis, public consultation, boundary demarcation, legal notification, and gazettal of the increase in 20 thousand hectares of wetland ecosystems under the category of IIPW or Ramsar site, in line with the country's conservation gap analysis and updated national wetland inventory.

In the 2015 PIR, a new numeral 1.2.1 "a National Wetland Policy" was added as an output and an indicator and goal were assigned:

- *Output 1.2.1*. A National Wetland Policy.

About *Output 1.2.2* – "Protection and control plans drafted in eleven (11) and implemented in seven (7) internationally important wetlands", in session of August 19, 2016, the Steering Committee decided not to work on this output because CRXS was working on a similar product and the SC wanted to avoid duplicating efforts. Therefore, it was replaced by the development of four (4) general management plans for PA. The indicators associated with the output did not change.

*Output 1.2.4* evolved to the establishment of the Nature Index as a pilot for monitoring Ramsar wetlands.

### **Component 2: Resources for sustainable management of internationally important protected wetlands increased and diversified.**

In relation to *Output 2.1.2*, the financial mechanisms originally proposed required a specific legal framework that turned out to be unfeasible during the Project timeline. Because of this, since the 2015 PIR the output was changed to:

- *Output 2.1.2*. Improvement of three (3) existing financial mechanisms to increase available financial resources to manage IIPW under the ecosystem approach.

## 3. Findings

### 3.1 Project Design / Formulation

#### 3.1.1 Analysis of Results Framework/Logical Framework

The design of the Project required a Project Preparation Grant (PPG Phase) to carry out studies and analysis for the formulation of the ProDoc, which were based on the Project Identification Form (PIF) approved by the GEF: Available information on wetlands was reviewed, outcomes were proposed, indicators and baselines were determined and products were defined. The ProDoc describes changes that took place in the PPG Phase, which did not represent a deviation from the Project strategy originally defined in the PIF and did not have an impact on the budgeted funds.

In relation to the financial mechanisms, according to the ProDoc during the PPG phase an assessment of various mechanisms to increase and diversify the level of resources available for IIPW was performed. Eight potential financial mechanisms were assessed. About this, SINAC reports that the proposed mechanisms did not seem feasible to be implemented during the Projects lifecycle and that there was neither time nor resources to carry out additional studies. In that context, UNDP recommended including three proposed mechanisms in the Project, which received the authorization of the Director of SINAC, in the understanding that during Project implementation efforts would be made to try to carry them out or find alternative mechanisms.

The analysis of the Results Framework determined that, during Project implementation, the following changes were made:

- An increase of the value of the goal over the "Total area (in hectares [ha]) of IIPW within SINAC", from 581,805 ha to 589,742 ha.
- Since 2015, the National Wetlands Policy was incorporated as a new product and an indicator was created.
- A reduction of the expected Térraba-Sierpe National Wetland area increment goal from 12,063 ha to 5,000 ha: The Project determined that it was only possible to add those 5,000 since they were the only ones uninhabited, and including the rest could have provoked a conflict with local occupants and affected any participatory consultation process; other APs expanded by 15,000 to be declared as RAMSAR sites and so the total increment of IIPW area goal remained in 20,000.
- About the Protection and Control Plans drawn up for eleven (11) and implemented in seven (7) HPIL wetlands, the Project Steering Committee made the decision not to implement these products.
- The original indicator for the invasive common pleco fish (*Hypostomus plecostomus*) proposed a reduction in the spawning rate of 25% by the end of the project. This indicator was considered unfeasible from the beginning of the Project, so it was substituted for a 20% reduction in density per square meter.
- The products of the goal "financial mechanisms" (PES incentive for ecosystem conservation, REDD+/C-Neutrality, and tourism and other recreational fees) were replaced

by the improvement of three existing financial mechanisms: Water Consumption Canon, Wastewater Canon, and funds from Art. 43 of the Biodiversity Law # 7788.

These changes are shown in the following table:

**Table 4. Adaptations to the original design of the Logical Framework**

Objective/ Outcome	Description of Indicator	Original goal	Modified goal
Development Objective	Total area (in hectares [ha]) of IIPW within the SINAC	581,805 ha (Térraba-Sierpe: 12,063 ha, expanded)	589,742 ha (Térraba-Sierpe expands by 5,000 ha and other ecosystems expand by 15,000 and are declared Ramsar sites)
	Originally no indicator was included	0	National Wetland Policy (Executive Decree 40244, La Gaceta N° 68, April 5, 2017)
Outcome 1	Total area (ha) of IIPW area demarcated and legalized for conservation purposes, and recognized by stakeholders by year 3.	12,063 ha (Térraba-Sierpe IIPW)	589,742 ha (Térraba-Sierpe expands only by 5,000 ha, while other ecosystems expand by 15,000 and are declared Ramsar sites)
	Change in the spawning rate of the devil fish ( <i>Hypostomus plecostomus</i> ), an invasive species in two IIPW (Caño Negro and Caribe Noreste)	25% decrease by the project end	20% reduction in density per square meter by the end of the project
Outcome 2	Annual income (USD) for IIPW by type of financial mechanisms implemented.	<p>PES incentive for ecosystem conservation: change from \$626,415 USD to \$1,311,982 USD</p> <p>REDD+/C-Neutrality: change from \$0 USD to \$722,324 USD</p> <p>Tourism and other recreational fees: change from \$1,442,000 to USD \$3,197,250 USD</p>	<p>Water Consumption Canon</p> <p>Wastewater Canon</p> <p>Improvement of the collection of funds from Art. 43 of the Biodiversity Law (percentage of the amount of patents and construction permits) for the environment in the region that generates them. 70% for SINAC and 30% local governments, 100% must be invested in environmental improvement projects.</p>

Source: Prepared by the author on the basis of information provided by the Wetland Project.

It is interesting to notice that some goals were exceeded. Although the modified goal for the total area of IIPW within SINAC was 589,742 ha (equivalent to an increase of 12,063), at the end, 605,104 ha were achieved (an increase of 35,402 ha, almost three times compared to the original estimation). There were also new goals, especially the National Wetland Policy, a positive and relevant addition not included in the Project's original design.

The 20% reduction in density per square meter of the pleco fish will not be achieved because it is impossible to catch it with a hook and the legal framework prohibits the use of massive fishing gear such as the cast net, which is suitable for its capture. To facilitate the control of invasive species, the Project prepared a biological justification for SINAC to propose the modification of Art. 67 and 68 of the Wildlife Conservation Law to allow the use of cast nets in cases of invasive alien species.

### 3.1.2 Project risks

The ProDoc identified risks that could prevent the achievement of the Project's objectives. These adequately reflect the conditions of the context at the time of Project formulation and were useful for approaching the products. The evaluation determined that the risks indicated did not limit the development of the Project or the achievement of the outcome. The following table describes to what extent the risks emerged and how they were faced during Project execution:

**Table 5. Project risks according to ProDoc and how they were approached**

Project risks raised in the ProDoc	How they emerged
New administration to be elected in 2014 no longer prioritizes wetland conservation and sustainable use; staff capacity built through the project is lost with the associated staff turnover. Rating: Low.	The Government that took office in 2014 continued to give priority to wetlands. The Vice Minister of Water and Sea actively joined the Steering Committee. The design of a National Wetlands Policy was also proposed and strongly supported by the Vice Ministry.
Insufficient commitment of key institutions with influence over wetlands to incorporate environmental sustainability criteria and ensure the protection and sustainable use of wetlands. Rating: Medium.	<p>The overall balance was positive in terms of the commitment of public institutions with some influence on wetlands (MAG, INDER, AYA, others), although the response varied from one CA to another.</p> <p>In the regional workshops on climate change, institutional representation was good; With the collaboration of INTA-MAG, the Project implemented nine courses on identification and delimitation of wetlands soils; staff members from several public institutions also received training on wetland issues; in the Northeast Caribbean the Project worked with MAG and INDER on local management issues; The Project also that involves staff members from SINAC, MINSA, INDER, MAG, and other institutions. All these efforts raised awareness on wetlands among key actors in the public sector. In fact, Project products have been requested by AYA, SENARA and INDER.</p> <p>With the exception of INTA's contribution, MAG was not directly linked to the implementation of the Project from a central level, which can be considered as a limitation. Most of the participation of MAG staff took place mainly at the</p>

Project risks raised in the ProDoc	How they emerged
	regional or local levels.
Lack of funding for a PES incentive for ecosystem conservation reduces the expected level of available funding for IIPW management. Rating: Medium/High.	Because the goal of financial mechanisms on PES Incentives for the conservation of ecosystems and REDD + / C-Neutrality was eliminated in the PIR, the indicators lost their practical usefulness in the context of the Project.
Climate change (CC) negatively impacts wetland biodiversity. Rating: Low.	Due to extreme climatic events, there were minor delays in the implementation of some activities in the field and in the local communities. This did not prevent the fulfillment of the Project's objectives. In addition, rehabilitation activities of Palo Verde contributed to CC adaptation.

Source: Prepared by the author on the basis of information provided by the Wetland Project.

### 3.1.3 UNDP comparative advantage

UNDP has a long history as an Implementing Agency for GEF projects focused on conservation and sustainable management of PAs. The UNDP-CO in Costa Rica has significant experience working with the Government on biodiversity conservation, PA management and sustainable development. Experienced UNDP-CO staff members participate in the supervision of the Wetland Project. This includes a Sustainable Development and Resilience Officer who manages the environmental portfolio, a Biodiversity and Ecosystem-based Adaptation Specialist who focuses on Biodiversity Focal Area (BD-1) projects, a Program Assistant with experience in UNDP and the Assistant Resident Representative who acts as supervisor in chief. There is also a Regional Technical Advisor in biodiversity based in the UNDP Regional Bureau (RBLAC) and the UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) in Panama, who provides technical support in key stages of the project cycle (design, annual monitoring, evaluations and closure).

The Wetland Project was framed within the following four strategic documents relevant to UNDP: 1) The UNDP Strategic Plan in force at the time of formulation; 2) the United Nations Development Assistance Framework, UNDAF (2013-2017), which defined as a product the rehabilitation and conservation of wetlands, PAs and PES; 3) the draft Country Program document (2013-2017), which indicated that UNDP would provide technical and financial assistance to Costa Rica to strengthen protection and sustainability of its natural heritage, as well as its capacity for climate change adaptation; 4) the National Development Plan in force at the time of formulation. A role for UNDP was to ensure that input from these four strategic documents was aligned with the Project's expected outcomes and outputs.

#### **3.1.4 Stakeholder participation in the design**

The Government of Costa Rica identified the need for the Project through MINAE and SINAC, and these institutions chose UNDP to be the implementing Agency. UNDP played an important role facilitating the design of the Project. SINAC's participation was also relevant given its legal competence in relation to wetlands. The work done by each institution was useful to identify SINAC's needs and understand the relevance of the objectives and products proposed by the Project.

One role of UNDP during project design was the "combining and sequencing" of resources, which is relevant when working with GEF resources. Based on this principle, the Project included outputs that were connected to previous investments considered important by UNDP, or that visualized potential future investments. An example of combining and sequencing is the National Wetland Inventory. When the Wetland Project was designed, the expectation was to combine and sequence the previous investments of the IDB-Cadaster project, specifically the SNIT (National Territorial Information System), which is a product of its Component I "Formation of the Cadaster". The INH was then conceived as a product that would be available and visible to the public through the SNIT. Another role of UNDP was to ensure that the Project was approved by GEF. In order to accomplish that, UNDP was responsible for preparing the proposals in a language relevant to that entity.

For SINAC and MINAE, the Project represented an opportunity to articulate actions with other strategic efforts, particularly the Forever Costa Rica Program (CRXS), which aims to comply with the country's conservation goals within the framework of a commitment assumed by the government of Costa Rica under the CBD and with the CBD's Programme of Work on Protected Areas. For this reason CRXS was included as part of the co-financing.

#### **3.1.5 Lessons from other relevant projects**

UNDP has led the development of financial mechanisms to promote PA financial sustainability. UNDP has also developed tools to measure its sustainability, such as the Financial Sustainability Scorecard, FSS. This is why its position is solid to implement a project that seeks to strengthen funding for PAs.

Prior to the Wetlands Project, the UNDP-CO in Costa Rica served as the Implementation Agency of two other SINAC projects with resources from GEF:

- 1) Overcoming Barriers to Sustainability of Costa Rica's Protected Areas System 2009-2014 (Project 56040): This project promoted the development of institutional and systemic

capacities to remove barriers for the sustainability of Costa Rica's Protected Areas System. The project had many ups and downs in execution, including coordination challenges between SINAC and UNDP.

- 2) Consolidating Costa Rica's Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) 2011-2014 (Project 78129): This project, known as "Barreritas", was based on GRUAS II's conservation gaps. It promoted the increase of marine ecological representation through the expansion and creation of marine protected areas in under-represented marine ecosystems that are essential to maintain biodiversity. Its management was outstanding thanks to SINAC's institutional coordination and the coordination's execution model. Adding the project Coordinator as a consultant to the Wetland Project allowed taking advantage of Barreritas' products and lessons learned.

The participation of UNDP as the implementing agency and SINAC as the executing agency in these two projects placed them in an ideal position to take advantage of their lessons learned in terms of capacity building in SINAC.

### **3.1.6 Linkages between project and other interventions**

The ProDoc proposed that the Wetland Project should complement several initiatives that were taking place in SINAC's PAs, specifically:

- 1) The Coastal Marine Biodiversity and Adaptation to Climate Change Project (BIOMARCC Project, 2010-2014), executed by SINAC with the collaboration of the German Cooperation Agency for Development (GIZ), worked on vulnerability studies to climate change in the Pacific and Caribbean coasts. The Wetlands Project was able to use BIOMARCC's products designed for Las Baulas Marine National Park and the Ostional Wildlife Refuge.
- 1) Second Debt-for-Nature Swap between Costa Rica and the United States, signed in 2010 and administered by the Forever Costa Rica Program (CRXS), which is destined to finance the consolidation of SINAC's PAs. SINAC participated actively during both the negotiation and execution of this initiative.
- 2) The Project for Promoting Participatory Management in Biodiversity Conservation (MAPCOBIO Project) is an alliance between SINAC and the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). The relationship between the Wetland Project and the MAPCOBIO project was very close. MAPCOBIO shared information on its participatory monitoring, which provided useful feedback for the Nature Index for Ramsar Wetlands of Costa Rica. Also, specialists from both projects worked very closely in different participatory activities.
- 3) The Sustainable Tourism Program in PAs, developed thanks to a loan from the IDB, aimed to consolidate ecotourism products and services in selected PAs and their surroundings.

Some inputs from the IDB-Tourism project were used in Caño Negro and in the Northeast Caribbean.

### **3.1.7 Replication approach**

The ProDoc generates expectations regarding the replication of the Project. At the site level, the experience accumulated by SINAC and the CAs will allow them to replicate actions in IIPW where the Project carried out little or no work: Prepare new local management plans, generate awareness among stakeholders and implement restoration and adaptation measures to CC, among others. Although the ProDoc refers to replication of the REDD + pilot project, this goal was eliminated in the 2015 PIR. At the national level, replication is feasible throughout the system of PAs, thanks to the improvement of institutional and individual capacities in SINAC and the CAs. This requires, of course, a healthy fiscal environment and an administrative and financially sound institution.

At the international level, the expectation was to disseminate best practices and lessons in Latin America and the Caribbean, so that they could be used in the design and implementation of similar projects. Several elements of the Wetland Project were replicated in another wetland project that UNDP supports in El Salvador. Project results were also shared in different events: A member of the PMU participated with the SINAC Director at COP12 (Uruguay 2015), a presentation was shown in Panama about the experience in wetland restoration and several SINAC park rangers participated in different congresses. Recently, UNDP shared the Wetland Project as a good practice with a South-South mission of African GEF focal points that visited Costa Rica. Also, the Revista Ambientico dedicated an issue to the results of the Wetland Project (# 266 of April 2018), which is an effective means to disseminate the experience widely.

### **3.1.8 Management arrangements**

The governance of the Wetland Project responded to its needs in terms of direction, management, programming of activities, use of resources, control and communication. During the implementation of the Project, the organization structure proposed in the ProDoc operated with flexibility and adaptability to the changes that arose. SINAC served as the Executing Agency and its Executive Director was Project Director. The PMU carried out its activities from inside SINAC, in coordination with the technical and administrative staff of the SE and the CAs.

The Project Steering Committee (SC), formally integrated by the UNDP Assistant Resident Representative or her delegate and the Executive Director of SINAC, added the Vice Minister of Water and Sea who actively participated in the process, the Coordinator of the Wetland Project

(PMU) and a representative of CRXS. SINAC's Institutional Coordinator / PNH Coordinator also participated in most of the sessions. The presence of the Vice Minister, in particular, gave the SC and the Project greater relevance from the perspective of public policy. The minutes provide evidence that the SC met periodically to approve the AWP, learn about the progress in the implementation of actions, discuss changes in outputs, results and indicators (which were subsequently sent by UNDP to GEF for approval) and other issues. In order to guarantee the ultimate responsibility of UNDP, the decisions of the SC were made in accordance with rules that guarantee the development results, the best value for money, impartiality, integrity and transparency. The ProDoc also defined the establishment of an inter-institutional advisory committee that would coordinate with other institutions and organizations related to wetlands. Since 2017 this role has been carried out by the CONAHU (a National Advisory Council on Wetlands), created in 2015 (Decree No. 39161-MINAE).

The PMU directed, coordinated and executed the Project in an effective and efficient manner, as is clear from the PIRs. The main responsibility of the Project Coordinator was to deliver the products according to the required quality standards and within the timeline and budget. The PMU followed the guidelines received from SINAC's Director and from the SE to ensure that the work was done within the legal and administrative framework pertinent to the institution. In fact, the PMU worked based on the principle that its staff was an integral part of SINAC. The PMU also sought articulation with other SINAC projects, actions and products to maximize resources and avoid duplicating efforts. The implementation of actions in the CAs was planned, coordinated and executed with different staff members, as appropriate. In general, those CAs that understood the Project as an opportunity and those with greater leadership achieved more benefits in terms of products, management tools, training, equipment, and others. In the case of the ACHN, the project started late due to internal administrative problems, which made initial coordination, planning and execution of actions difficult.

## **3.2 Project Implementation**

### **3.2.1 Project financing / co-financing**

The Wetland Project's financial resources were executed in an appropriate manner, with active participation of UNDP, the PMU and SINAC (including its Financial Department). Co-financing is the additional contribution to the GEF resources and includes financial inputs from UNDP, SINAC, CRXS and GIZ-BIOMARCC. In order to have the complete scenario, it is necessary updated data of SINAC's contributions per CA, which is not available at the time of the FTE:

**Table 6. Planned and actual co-financing to date**

Co-financing Type/Source	UNDP own financing		SINAC Government		Partner Agency PROGRAM Forever CR		PROJECT GIZ/BIOMARCC		Total	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants	300.000	300.000	8.062.710	8.409.886					8.362.710	8.709.886
Loans /Concessions	N/A								8.825.608	Pending
In-kind support			7.225.608	Pending	1.000.000	1.995.654	600.000	Pending		
Totals	300.000	300.000	7.225.608	Pending	1.000.000	1.995.654	600.000	Pending	17.188.308	Pending

Source: Information provided by the Wetland Project. Currency: USD

There were several experiences with co-financing not included in the design of the Project, two of them with UNA. 1) The School of Psychology formulated a proposal and obtained funding for the extension project *“Community processes for the conservation of the Caño Negro wetland: An approach from critical psychology”*. This has its own financing and ends in 2019. 2) UNA’s Center for General Studies and the School of Economic and Social Planning, with the participation of UCR and CNE, are currently implementing the Local Management Plan for Tempisque, Mata Redonda Ramsar Site and Corral de Piedra, which is funded by CONARE. Contributions by other public institutions, including municipalities, must also be considered in co-financing.

### 3.2.2 UNDP as implementing agency for GEF

**Rating:** Highly Satisfactory (HS)

UNDP provided technical and financial support to the Project; applied results-based management to stay within the original expectations of the Project; resorted to adaptive management to respond to the institutional and regulatory framework, as well as to the general conditions of the country; took advantage of political windows of opportunity to increase the Project’s relevance, for instance, the opportunity to elaborate the National Wetland Policy; applied the Project’s M&E tools to monitor progress and the use of resources; stayed in contact with SINAC and the PMU, giving follow-up to the implementation of Project activities; took advantage of the strengths of the UNDP agents located at different levels to provide feedback to the Project.

### 3.2.3 SINAC as Executing Agency

**Rating:** Highly Satisfactory (HS)

The implementation of the Wetland Project has been a great challenge for SINAC, since there are several internal actors with relevant roles both at the level of the Executive Secretariat and in the

CAs. In addition, the PMU and its human resources is an integral part of SINAC, although it maintains contractual links with UNDP. SINAC applied results-based management to stay within the original expectations of the Project; resorted to adaptive management to respond to the institutional and regulatory framework, as well as to the general conditions of the country; sought articulation with other institutional projects, actions and outputs to maximize resources and avoid duplication of efforts; the PNH was proactive in the design of management tools for the use of the financial resources from the Water Canon by the PNH and the CAs; applied the Project's M&E tools to monitor progress and the use of resources; sought the integration of the Project with its own planning and management, in line with SINAC's current regulations.

### **3.2.4 Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Rating:** Highly Satisfactory (HS)

The Wetlands Project has an M&E plan based on the Project Results Framework, its performance and impact indicators and the corresponding means of verification. The M&E was designed in accordance with the established UNDP and GEF procedures.

Several actors responsible for monitoring participate in the implementation of the M&E plan, with different levels of authorization and crosschecks. The M&E plan includes several tools, among which are: The Annual Work Plans (AWP), the Quarterly Progress Reports and the annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) reports. AWP's apply results-based management, so they are built following the logic of outcomes, outputs, indicators, goals, actions, quarterly schedule and budget. AWP's and budgets are submitted to the SC. Quarterly Progress Reports outline the main changes in the progress of the Project and are provided by the PMU to the local UNDP-CO and the UNDP-GEF RCU. The PMU used the METT (Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for Protected Areas) to monitor the evolution of IIPW management effectiveness with data from baseline, mid-term and project closure. Progress is monitored in the UNDP Results Based Management Platform and the risk register is regularly updated in ATLAS, based on the initial risk analysis included in the ProDoc.

PIR's are an essential management and monitoring tool for project managers and are useful for drawing lessons from ongoing projects. The UNDP-CO must complete a PIR every year, along with the PMU. The PIR must then be discussed at the TPC meeting to be agreed upon by the project, the Implementing Partner, the UNDP-CO and the RCU in Panama. At the time this Final Term Evaluation was taking place, the PIR 2018 was being prepared, so it was possible to have access to partial information from it. Results-based management facilitates the efficient and effective implementation of the Project and allows seeing progress per goal and percentage of implementation.

In addition to these mandatory tools, the PMU designed its own tool to periodically monitor progress of activities and sub-activities until completing the products defined in the ProDoc. The results were useful to feed the PIR. For its part, every six months the PNH submitted a report to SINAC's Department of Technical and Financial Cooperation to verify compliance of actions approved in the AWP. The report is prepared in accordance with guidelines and procedures for managing SINAC's technical and financial cooperation projects.

It should be noted that several recommendations from the MTR were adopted, including the following: The guidelines on Art. 43 submitted to SINAC; the publication of the Exotic Plants Guide; actions by both the PMU and the PNH to disseminate the products; drafting by the PNH Coordinator of a Training Plan on wetland management for stakeholders outside SINAC, in the framework of the National Wetland Policy.

### 3.2.5 Participation of stakeholders in Project implementation

The Project was successful working with different stakeholders. In the development of many products and activities it showed the capacity to plan, coordinate and interact with CA staff members, staff from other public institutions, members of local communities, people from the productive sectors, and others. Below is a brief account of the main stakeholders and their roles in the implementation:

**Table 7. Stakeholders and their role in the implementation of the Project**

<b>Stakeholders</b>	<b>Role in the implementation of the Project</b>
UNDP Costa Rica	It is the Project's Implementing Agency and is responsible for its financial and technical supervision.
Ministerio de Ambiente y Energía, MINAE (Ministry of Environment and Energy)	During the Project implementation, the Vice Minister of Waters and Seas had an active participation in the Steering Committee.
Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, SINAC (National System of Conservation Areas)	SINAC is the Executing Agency of the Project, and its Executive Director is also Project Director. The implementation of most of the Project activities was carried out in coordination and planning with the CAs. In total, 376 staff members participated in the training activities.
Project Management Unit, PMU	The PMU is an executing unit hired by UNDP to support the Project, which scope is national and is under the responsibility of SINAC. The PMU operates within SINAC, in coordination with the technical and administrative staff of the SE and the CAs.
Programa Nacional de Humedales, PNH (National Wetland Program)	The PNH is part of the Department of Information and Regularization of the Territory, at SINAC. The Coordinator of the PNH is also the Executive Secretary of CONAHU and she is responsible for following up on the execution of agreements. She is also SINAC's Institutional Coordinator of the

Stakeholders	Role in the implementation of the Project
	Project. She has participated in the SC sessions, has facilitated the coordination with the CAs, and has monitored the progress of the Project products. SINAC and other public institutions legally authorized to do so must provide the PNH with the necessary material and human resources for its operation within the framework of its support to CONAHU.
Consejo Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, CONAC (National Council of Conservation Areas)	By law CONAC is responsible for the approval of strategies and policies for the consolidation and development of SINAC. It contributed to the Project by supporting the implementation of some products within SINAC.
Consejo Nacional Asesor sobre Humedales, CONAHU (National Advisory Council on Wetlands)	It was created in 2015 and has been meeting regularly since 2017. Several Project products have been presented to the Council, such as the Nature Index, a draft of the National Wetland Inventory, and others.
Municipalities	The Project was able to work with 35 municipalities in the implementation of actions in IIPW located in their cantons.
Local Communities	Nearly 110 communities benefit from the ecosystem services provided by the Ramsar sites prioritized by the Project. With CA staff members, the Project was able to work with many of those in awareness-raising activities and in the design of Local Management Programs.
Other government institutions	Several public institutions participated in the implementation of actions related to the Project; staff members of various institutions participated in training activities; institutions (FONAFIFO, DA, INTA, MAG, MEP, SETENA, INDER, MINSa, AYA, SENARA, ICE) have approached the Project with the interest of using its products.
Productive Sectors	Representatives of several productive sectors participated in some Project activities: Coffee growers, African palm growers, rice farmers, pineapple growers, and shrimp farmers, among others. They are willing to receive information and want to be up to date.
Universities, research institutes and NGOs	The Project worked with two departments at the Universidad Nacional, UNA: The Centro Internacional de Política Económica para el Desarrollo Sostenible, CINPE (International Center for Economic Policy and Sustainable Development), and the Program of Planning and Social Promotion, PPS, which belongs to the School of Planning. From Universidad de Costa Rica, UCR, the Project coordinated activities with the Centro de Investigación en Ciencias del Mar y Limnología, CIMAR (Marine Sciences and Limnology Research Center). The Project received information from the Centro Científico Tropical, CCT (Tropical Scientific Center) and the Organization for Tropical Studies (OTS).

Source: Compilation based on information supplied by ProDoc, the Project, and key informants.

### 3.2.6 Adaptive management

During the Project implementation some changes were necessary to better adapt it to the conditions of the country, take advantage of the opportunities, move it towards more realistic results and maintain its relevance. An example of taking advantage of the opportunities was the

decision to support the design of a National Wetland Policy. Negotiations between UNDP-CO and the Vice Ministry of Water and Seas led to the conclusion that Costa Rica needed a policy on wetlands as a framework to better address challenges such as impacts from agricultural and urban expansion on wetlands, and future creation of opportunities for sustainable productive activities. This proposal was consulted with the UNDP regional advisors, who in turn consulted with UNDP-GEF, which finally agreed to include it as a new goal.

Another adaptive management decision was the modification of the "Protection and control plans drafted in eleven (11) and implemented in seven (7) IIPW" by four (4) general management plans for wetlands. CRXS was working on a similar product and the SC wanted to avoid duplication of efforts and misuse of time and money. The SC adopted this change in session of July 28, 2015, which was reiterated in the 2016 PIR. CRXS was requested to include in its list the wetlands originally covered by the Project. At the request of the Arenal Tempisque (ACAT) and Tempisque (ACT) Conservation Areas, general management plans were elaborated for the mangroves located along the Gulf of Nicoya's coast. A Plan for the sustainable use of Piangua (*Anadara tuberculosa* and *Anadara similis*) in the mangroves at the HNTS was also drafted as a complementary tool to the general management plan, as a way to support the communities' livelihood.

One of the most relevant changes involved the financial mechanisms proposed in the ProDoc. Its inclusion aimed at removing financial barriers -which was in accordance with the GEF projects- to generate more resources for the institutional framework and achieve the sustainability of its processes. Sometimes, when implementation comes, the conditions of the context have changed. Also, existing institutions and legislation might prevent the progress of proposed activities. Therefore, other options must be studied. The original goal for financial mechanisms included PES Incentives for ecosystem services provided by wetlands and a pilot REDD+ project/C-Neutrality. Although these were relevant to measure the outputs originally expected by the project, it was clear that they would require a new legal framework that had to be approved by Congress, which could take a long time. Instead, three existing financial mechanisms with real possibilities for improvement were chosen: Water Consumption Canon, Wastewater Canon, and funds from Article 43 of the Biodiversity Law # 7788. The Project drafted proposals to make it possible to link these existing mechanisms to SINAC and the CAs, which is relevant in the current context of fiscal deficit. The fact that these changes were made in a timely manner shows good adaptive management by the Project.

There are several levels of checks and balances involved in making these decisions. In general, changes to Project outputs or indicators are initially proposed in the SC and have to be technically justified. Then, the UNDP-CO consults with the RCU in Panama. If it cannot be settled there, then it is consulted at a higher level in New York. All the changes described went through these filters to be formally approved. There is a double verification that involves justifying the changes in the PIR, which must then be approved by the UNDP-CO Officer and the Technical Advisor in Panama.

### **3.2.7 Implementation / execution**

The Wetland Project was implemented in only 4 years, when the original timeline was five years. Co-financing by partners and allies (UNDP, SINAC, CRXS, BIOMARCC), plus non programmed contributions by UNA were added; the tools proposed in the M&E Plan were used by actors responsible for monitoring in UNDP, SINAC and the PME, with different levels of authorization and cross-checks; close monitoring of Project outcomes, outputs and indicators was carried out; the activities to be implemented were planned, coordinated and executed with staff members from PNH and the CAs; staff from other public institutions, communities members, people representing productive sectors and other stakeholders were incorporated in different Project activities; adaptive management allowed to efficiently respond to the institutional and regulatory framework; relevant and good quality products were achieved, since they responded to the Project outcomes and outputs and were also reviewed and approved by SINAC.

## **3.3 Project Results**

### **3.3.1 Overall results**

This section describes progress in the implementation of actions and outputs after the MTR:

*Outcome 1.1 Increase in the ecological representation of IIPW through the addition of 20,000 ha in an innovative governance scheme. The original ProDoc outcome changed in the 2015 PIR.* In relation to the addition of 20,000 hectares of IIPW to SINAC, a proposal was submitted to the Department of Information and Regularization of the Territory through the PNH to increase the Ramsar sites in 32 thousand ha distributed in the following IIPW: Caribe Noreste, Las Baulas, Caño Negro, Terraba Sierpe, plus the addition of the Refugio Mixto de Vida Silvestre Ostional as a Ramsar site; it contains the technical report and the 12 updated Ramsar Information Sheets. The topographic demarcation was made in the following sectors of the Humedal Caribe Noreste: West of PN Tortuguero, Islas and laguna Penitencia. The blueprints are being drawn to later register them; they had already been made but the Registro Inmobiliario (real estate Registry) changed the size of the sheet; modifications are being made to submit the corrected product to SINAC's Department of Information and Regularization of the Territory that will later include the blueprints in the cadaster and proceed to their registration as PNE.

Regarding the demarcation of eleven existing IIPW, 22 points of blueprint No. 51425714-2010 (from points 11 to 32) were marked, Humedal Refugio Nacional Mata Redonda; 40 milestones

were placed in Humedal Palo Verde; images taken with drones were processed to delimit and add mangroves in Pacífico Central and HNTS to PNE.

*Outcome 1.2 Framework in place to mitigate natural and anthropomorphic threats to biodiversity in eleven (11) existing IIPW.* Product completed; on April 18, 2018 the Caño Negro and Maquenque cadastral mosaic was completed, presented and submitted to the ACHN with copy to PNH; this product was requested by the ACHN to respond to provisions of the CGR. Instead of the originally proposed control and protection plans, General Management Plans were elaborated in 2016; field guides to wetland plants were elaborated in two CAs. Equipment for adaptation measures was submitted to the HNTS; completion of field work for measuring vegetable fuel for the forest fire risk mapping system in Corral de Piedra, Mata Redonda, Cipancí, PN Palo Verde and RB Lomas Barbudal wetlands; restoration works in the drainage of Mata Redonda were completed and received by the ACT; ecological restoration works in the Humedal Quebrada La Mula (PN Palo Verde) were completed and received by the ACAT. In relation to the Nature Index for Ramsar sites, indicators for birds and mammals are being updated; the Project coordinated with the PNH and with CENIGA-SINIA to give sustainability to this product. The National Wetland Inventory was validated by each CA.

*Outcome 1.3 – The management effectiveness of seven (7) internationally important wetland protected areas increases by 20%.* Information was disseminated on the zoning of PN Marino Las Baulas (map were printed); no progress was made with the implementation of the Caño Negro wetlands fire management plan because of administrative issues at ACHN; training and technical assistance were provided to rural families in the buffer zone of the Humedal Caribe-Noreste; eleven jigsaw puzzles depicting biodiversity of the IIPW prioritized by the Project were designed, illustrated and printed.

Activities and products to publicize the Project's progress: 11 articles were published in UNA's Revista Ambientico to disseminate outcomes and outputs of the Wetland Project; twelve Noti-Humedales were drafted and disseminated; the results of the Wetland Project were presented at the wetland Pre-COP session in San José, March 12, 2018, and before the UNDP technical team on the same day; in the same event Project materials were exhibited as tools for improving the management of Ramsar sites, as well as a sample of the photographic exhibit "Face of the Wetlands"; a document was drafted on the systematization of Project outcomes and outputs; the systematization of the drafting and implementation of IIPW Palo Verde local management plans was diagrammed; The "Guía Denuncia" (Art. 98 of the Law on Wildlife Conservation) was diagrammed.

*Outcome 2.1 – Funding for eleven (11) internationally important wetland protected areas increases by 20% (as measured by UNDP/GEF Financial Sustainability Scorecard).* According to updated data from FSS (Reyes, 2018) to determine compliance with the Project's financial, institutional and policy goals and indicators, it was determined that SINAC's budget for PAs has been reduced by -

29% from the baseline (2012) and in -21.9% from 2016 to 2017. This is partly due to the change in SINAC's accounting systems, as well as to the reduction in PA staff and operating expenses:

**Table 8. IIPW Total budget (excluding donations and income generated by PAs)**

Financial Analysis of the Sub-System IIPW	Baseline year (US\$) 2012 [1][2]	Year 2016 (US\$) [3][4]	Year 2017 (US\$) [3][4]
<b>Available Finances[5]</b>			
(1) Total annual central government budget allocated to PA management (excluding donor funds and revenues generated for the PA system)	7.610.593,00	6.912.256,00	5.398.825,00
- operational budget (salaries, maintenance, fuel etc)	7.610.593,00	6.921.256,00	5.398.825,00
- infrastructure investment budget (roads, visitor centres etc)			

Source: GEF BD Tracking Tool PIMS 4966-IIPW Costa Rica 2018; Reyes Gatjens. June 2018.

In relation to income from other sources, there was an increase in CRXS's contribution in relation to the Project's baseline estimation, as well as a reduction from the IDB-Tourism Project (see the following table). Regarding direct revenues generated by the PAs, these increased by 21.3% from the baseline, although they decreased by -13.6% when considering the MTR. This was due to the decrease in PES funds, although visitation revenues increased significantly in 2016 and 2017. Concession revenues increased significantly from 2016 to 2017. This was due to the concession of non-essential services in Chirripó, which corresponds to the Turberas de Talamanca wetland, and to the payment of concessions in Palo Verde for grazing.

In order to improve fund collection obtained through Art. 43 of the Biodiversity Law, a draft decree was prepared to clarify and organize the transfer of funds from municipalities to SINAC and another draft decree was prepared to improve the Wastewater Canon. In 2017, the revenue from the Water Consumption Canon started to be specifically quantified in the new context provided by changes in SINAC's accounting system (which previously added it to the general budget). The following table presents information related to income generated by PAs:

**Table 9. IIPW Donations and income generated by PAs**

Financial Analysis of the Sub-System IIPW	Baseline year (US\$) 2012 [1][2]	Year 2016 (US\$) [3][4]	Year 2017 (US\$) [3][4]
(2) Extra budgetary funding for PA management	0,00	0,00	0,00
- Total of A + B -	1.330.200,00	1.179.341,00	1.179.341,00
A. Funds channelled through government - total			
- PA dedicated taxes			
- Trust Funds			
- Donor funds			
- Loans			
- Debt for nature swaps	100.000,00		
- Others			
BIOMARCC Project	15.000,00		
Sustainable Tourism Project (IDB)	1.038.000,00	998.968,00	998.968,00

Financial Analysis of the Sub-System IIPW	Baseline year (US\$) 2012 [1][2]	Year 2016 (US\$) [3][4]	Year 2017 (US\$) [3][4]
Forever Costa Rica Program	177.200,00	180.373,00	180.373,00
B. Funds channelled through third party/independent institutional arrangements – total			
- Trust Funds			
- Donor funds			
- Loans			
- Others			
(3) Total annual site based revenue generation across all PAs broken down by source[6]	2.068.415,00	2.907.584,00	2.510.301,00
- Total	0,00	0,00	0,00
A. Tourism entrance fees	1.400.000,00	2.064.177,00	2.073.371,00
B. Other tourism and recreational related fees (camping, fishing permits etc)	42.000,00	256.781,00	245.044,00
C. Income from concessions		130.802,00	191.580,00
D. Payments for ecosystem services (PES)	626.415,00	455.824,00	306,00
- water			36.344,00
- carbon			
- biodiversity			
E. Other non-tourism related fees and charges (specify each type of revenue generation mechanism)			
- scientific research fees			
- genetic patents			
- pollution charges			
- sale of souvenirs from state run shops			
(4) Percentage of PA generated revenues retained in the PA system for re-investment[8]	17,00%	17,00%	17,00%
(5) Total finances available to the PA system [line item 1+2.A+2.B]+ [line item 3 * line item 4]	9.292.423,55	8.585.886,00	7.004.917,17

Source: GEF BD Tracking Tool PIMS 4966-IIPW Costa Rica 2018; Reyes Gatjens. June 2018.

In relation to total finances, they decreased by **-24.6%** from the baseline to 2017, mainly due to the reduction in revenues from the budget of the Central Government to SINAC:

**Table 10. Total finances of the wetland system**

Financial Analysis of the Sub-System IIPW	Baseline year (US\$) 2012 [1][2]	Year 2016 (US\$) [3][4]	Year 2017 (US\$) [3][4]
(5) Total finances available to the PA system [line item 1+2.A+2.B]+ [line item 3 * line item 4]	9.292.423,55	8.585.886,00	7.004.917,17
Available for operations	9.292.423,00	8.585.886,00	7.004.917,00
Available for infrastructure investment			

Source: GEF BD Tracking Tool PIMS 4966-IIPW Costa Rica 2018; Reyes Gatjens. June 2018.

Expenditures as well as revenues and total finances decreased significantly from **-21.9** from the baseline to 2017 and **-19.6%** from 2012 to 2016, with high levels of budget sub-execution of around 50%:

**Table 11. Total system expenses and financial needs (basic management scenario)**

Financial Analysis of the Sub-System Internationally Important Protected Wetlands	Baseline year (US\$) 2012 [1][2]	Year 2016 (US\$) [3][4]	Year 2017 (US\$) [3][4]
(1) Total annual expenditure for PAs (all PA operating and investment costs and system level expenses)[9]	4.840.337,15	4.698.209,00	3.776.491,00
Total Expenditure	52,09%	55,00%	53,91%

Source: GEF BD Tracking Tool PIMS 4966-IIPW Costa Rica 2018; Reyes Gatjens. June 2018.

### 3.3.2 Relevance

**Rating:** Highly Satisfactory (HS)

The Wetland Project relates to the main objectives of the GEF focal area: It has contributed to improving the sustainability of Costa Rica's protected areas, specifically those related to wetlands; it has mainstreamed biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, particularly in those wetlands that play a role in the livelihood of local communities; it has safeguarded biodiversity through the control and management of invasive alien species (Typha, pleco fish).

There was relevance from the Project design phase thanks to its high relation with the country's conservation goals supported by CRXS Program, for its focus on institutional strengthening and for its contribution to the versions of the National Development Plan and SINAC's Institutional Strategic Plan in force at moment of formulation.

During implementation, SINAC took advantage of the framework provided by the Wetland Project to move along in several pending international commitments for the compliance with the Strategic Plan of the Ramsar Convention and with the Montreux Record. The need to respond to the delay in complying with these obligations had been underlined by the CGR since 2011. Some actions included the updating of the Ramsar Information Sheets, the preparation of the National Wetland Policy (Executive Decree 40244, La Gaceta No. 68, April 5 2017) and measures for the restoration of degraded areas of IIPW Palo Verde. The National Wetland Policy in particular was not included in the original design of the Project, but was added later and its importance lies in the fact that it makes the issues of conservation and sustainable use of wetlands even more visible and well positioned. All these actions allowed SINAC to make significant progress in pending issues, which was acknowledged by a note from CGR in December 17, 2017.

The experience of the Huetar Norte Conservation Area (ACHN) with the Project was relevant for the staff members who dramatically increased their knowledge on wetlands, understood their value, and recognized the need of their conservation and sustainable use as regional priorities. They learned, among other things, that the ACHN is the CA with the largest number of wetlands nationwide and, because of that, they had to give them higher priority in their daily work. This change of awareness was largely possible thanks to their direct participation in the

implementation of Project activities. They also acquired valuable skills for the identification and characterization of wetlands.

The Wetland Project also made significant efforts to support the needs of the stakeholders. For example, the Project was creative within the complex Costa Rican legal framework in proposing a "Regulation for the Rational Use of Aquatic Resources Approved in General Management Plans of Wetlands" (Decree No. 39411, La Gaceta No. 37, February 23, 2016). This was based on Art. 3.1 of the Ramsar Convention and Art. 9 and 13 of the Law on Fisheries and Aquaculture (Law No. 8436), achieving a practical legal tool to improve the management of Ramsar sites and, at the same time, support local people who use mangrove resources sustainably.

### 3.3.3 Effectiveness in achieving results

**Rating:** Highly Satisfactory (HS)

The Wetland Project was effective in increasing ecological representation of the IIPW, as shown in the following table:

**Table 12. Change in ecological representation in eleven IIPW**

IIPW	Baseline (ha)	Accomplished June 2018 (ha)
Open water	1,299	2,149
Shallow waters	1,299	8,564
Palm forest	61,582	71,582
Mixed wetlands	809	809
Lagoons	141	1,118
Mangroves	17,345	19,933
Other wetlands	3,844.57	8,903

Source: Wetland Project. June 2018.

Based on a geodesic, topographic and cadastral support to SINAC and the CAs, the Project proposed to increase the Caño Negro, Northeast Caribbean, Baulas and HNTS Ramsar sites, as well as the inclusion of Ostional Wildlife Refuge as a new Ramsar site. In relation to the increase of 20% in the management capacity in seven IIPW, measured with the METT Scorecard tool, there was an outstanding increase in the score for almost all areas, according to the following table:

**Table 13. Estimation of the METT score**

Ramsar site	Baseline (ProDoc)	MTR	FTE
PN Palo Verde	57	76	81
RB Lomas Barbudal	52	76	79
RNVS Mata Redonda	40	74	77
RNVS Cipancí	46	68	83
Humedal Palustrino Corral de Piedra	48	69	75
Humedal Laguna Madrigal	43	16	27
El Tendal	42	24	61
Humedal Nacional Terraba Sierpe	63	67	74
RNVS Caño Negro	57	54	76
RNVS Maquenque	39	56	59
RNVS Caribe Noreste	53	63	73
RNVS Gandoca Manzanillo	56	65	76
PN Marino Las Baulas (Tamarindo)	56	69	76

Source: Wetland Project. June 2018.

The Wetland Project also helped enable the framework to mitigate natural and anthropomorphic threats to biodiversity in IIPW. A key tool is the National Wetland Inventory (INH), which was validated by each CA. From this baseline, each CA can use it as a management tool, identifying and implementing measures to improve management and reduce threats. With the submission of the INH to the Department of Information and Regularization of the Territory of SINAC, the institution will be responsible to comply with the corresponding administrative processes for its transfer to the CENIGA and its visualization in the SNIT. The databases were designed in coordination with CENIGA to standardize the information according to national regulations. The framework to mitigate threats was also strengthened with the support provided by the Project to SINAC's efforts for Palo Verde wetlands restoration and connectivity. The Project also contributed to the National Risk Management Forum, as well as to the formulation of the National Risk Management Policy 2016-2030 and the National Risk Management Plan 2016-2020. The latter includes three products related to wetlands as crucial ecosystems for resilience, protection and risks prevention.

Although at the national level the Project was effective in achieving the proposed outcomes, there were differences between CAs, some performing better than others. This could be attributed to factors such as: Perceiving the Project as an opportunity or as an overload of work, the level of leadership and capacity for management/response of each CA director, the level of technical skills of staff members and their previous experience in related actions (e.g. wetland restoration, local management activities). In addition, the resources of any project are always insufficient to respond to all the needs of CA, SINAC and the country.

In the ACHN, due to internal administrative problems the implementation of Project activities started one year behind schedule. Despite of this, the Program was effective in accomplishing the main products: Technical training in wetland delimitation for staff members, the updating of the

Ramsar Information Sheets (Caño Negro, Maquenque), the ACHN wetland inventory, the process for promoting awareness in the communities of Maquenque and the drafting of the local management plans for Maquenque and Caño Negro. In fact, staff members interviewed for this evaluation highlight the capacity of the PMU staff to listen to their needs and jointly plan and coordinate activities. They also emphasize the importance of the ACHN wetland inventory, which is a practical tool that increases their capacity to respond to legal actions or permit requests, which can eventually reduce threats derived from changes in land use. However, ACHN staff members did not meet all their expectations from the Project, such as getting fire control equipment. They also regret that some products remained unfinished, such as the fire strategy and the Caño Negro regulations (although these products were not completed because the ACHN experienced several administrative conflicts and fell behind the Project's schedule). Finally, after the process for promoting awareness in Maquenque, a conclusion was that there was not social feasibility for SINAC to begin the drafting of a new general management plan for the refuge.

### **3.3.4 Efficiency in the implementation of the Project**

**Rating:** Highly Satisfactory (HS)

The Wetlands Project was implemented according to the norms and standards of the UNDP, the GEF and the country. The monitoring plan and the results-based management tools facilitated the monitoring of the progress of the outcomes and outputs. The execution of the financial resources was also adequate, with accompaniment by UNDP, the PMU and SINAC, including its Administrative-Financial Management. The Project also resorted to adaptive management to support the efficient use of its resources. In all these processes, different levels of authorization and crosschecks worked. Although the Project concluded before the scheduled date, that did not affect its execution since all the programmed outputs were finalized.

The Coordinator of the National Wetlands Program was designated by SINAC's Executive Director as liaison with the PMU, given her role as institutional coordinator of the project. Her roles included institutional counterpart, facilitator, interlocutor and coordinator of the actions implemented by the PMU. Within SINAC, she coordinated with the different instances to assist in the execution of actions by the PMU. The PNH also verified that the actions of the Project responded to SINAC's Mission and Vision and to the institutional needs in relation to wetlands. She also verified that the Project complied with the regulations and administrative processes to which SINAC responds. To the extent of its possibilities, the PNH participated in the evaluation of the main service proposals received by the PMU and approved all the products of the Project, following the institutional procedures defined by Internal Control. SINAC's Technical and Financial Cooperation Department, for its part, also contributed to the follow-up of the Wetland Project: They helped understand the ProDoc, advised the PNH on compliance with internal guidelines and regulations, supported the control of financial execution and participated in the evaluations.

At the regional level, there were internal conditions in the ACHN, including the absence of a Director for several months, which delayed the beginning of the Project and made it difficult to implement some actions efficiently. Also, some internal administrative authorizations were given untimely.

The Project was also efficient in taking advantage of local capacity in those places where the Local Management Plans have been implemented. These made it possible to identify stakeholders from the local communities and the productive sector who felt alien to IIPW conservation and sustainable use and who now are connected and committed to those processes.

### **3.3.5 Country ownership**

The evidence indicates that the country has well received the Project, which could benefit the sustainability of its outputs and its positive environmental impact. In the context of planning at the national level, there were goals of the Wetland Project that were integrated into the National Development Plan (2015-2018), the National Biodiversity Policy (2015-2030) and the National Biodiversity Strategy (2016-2025). This indicates that there was an appropriation of the Project through several macro instruments of national planning. Information generated by the Project on the status of wetlands was also included in the Estado de la Nación report (2017), which is a system for monitoring Costa Rica's performance in a wide range of development fields, including environment. The Central Bank is also making an effort to incorporate the issue of wetlands into the national environmental accounting.

It should be noted that the Wetland Project acquired greater relevance in terms of its scope and impact over time thanks to the support provided to a public policy tool such as the National Wetlands Policy 2017-2030, aligned with the Aichi Targets (2011-2020), the Ramsar Strategic Plan (2016-2024) and the Sustainable Development Goals, SDG (2016-2030). In this way, the Project extended its impact in at least 12 years into the future.

In terms of regulations, the Project contributed to generate several legal tools. Some examples are: The Regulation on the rational use of aquatic resources of wetlands (Executive Decree No. 39411), the proposed decree on technical criteria to characterize wetlands, the proposed decree to modify the regulation on the Wastewater Canon, and the draft Law on fishing methods for invasive alien species. Now, SINAC must follow up on the corresponding procedures so that these proposals are approved and enter into force.

### 3.3.6 Mainstreaming

The Wetland Project implemented actions that integrated other UNDP priorities, such as the SDG. The following are some specific examples. A legal tool such as Decree No. 39411 *"Regulation for the rational use of approved aquatic resources in the general wetland management plans"* clearly contributes to Goal No. 1 "No poverty" and to Goal No. 2 "Zero hunger". The wetland educational fun games contribute to Goal No. 4 "Quality education". The Local Management Plans sought representation, participation and empowerment of women, which contributes to Goal No. 5 "Gender equality". The financial mechanism associated with the Wastewater Canon contributes with Goal No. 6 "Clean water and sanitation". The Plan for the sustainable use of Piangüa in the mangroves at the HNTS clearly contributes to Goals No. 1 and 2, and to Goal No. 12 "Responsible consumption and production". The wetland restoration works in Palo Verde contribute with Goal No. 13 "Climate action". Proposals to expand existing Ramsar sites and incorporate the Ostional Wildlife Refuge into this category contribute to Goals No. 14 "Life below water" and No. 15 "Life on land".

Gender equality remains a challenge. The Project design failed to address this situation and to include gender empowerment explicitly in its Project Document, but actively made efforts during implementation to identify gender relations that constrained women's participation. The Project also supported the implementation of several Wetland Local Management Plans such as in ACTO-Tortuguero, where two groups conformed mostly by women, ASOLIVI and ASOPRO had the opportunity to participate in training activities.

The Project's gender analysis reveals that in SINAC, despite the fact that in the last decades women have increasingly assumed professional positions, there still persists a significant imbalance in the ratio of female to male labor force representation. The number of men is more than twice the number of women, which explains to a large extent the low participation of women in the strengthening and capacity-building activities of the Wetland Project: Of the 376 SINAC staff members who participated in training, 127 were women and 249 were men. Additionally, women who work at SINAC do not necessarily take technical positions required for fieldwork: Of the 149 staff members that participated in the National Wetland Inventory, only 22 were women. Despite this, the women who took part showed to be as technically qualified as men.

On the participation of women and men in the Wetland Project's training plan and related activities, key actors such as staff members from public institutions, members of NGOs and people from community-based organizations were represented. Although the participation of women was quantitatively lower, they showed commitment and made important technical contributions to achieve the objectives of each activity. In the design of Local Management Plans, the number of women who participated was significantly lower compared to men (more than 60%). For the most

part, men took charge in terms of exposing and discussing ideas, while women took a more passive and condescending role vis-à-vis men and their proposals.

### **3.3.7 Sustainability**

#### **3.3.7.1 Financial Resources**

**Rating:** Sustainability Moderately Likely (ML)

As shown in the analysis of the information generated by the Financial Sustainability Scorecard, since the Solis Rivera administration the operating budget assigned to SINAC by the Central Government is been reduced and a hiring freeze instruction has been issued. The new administration Alvarado Quesada is also taking measures to reduce the Central Government's spending and the fiscal deficit, which in the short and medium term could affect the sustainability of resources to finance wetland conservation.

Regarding the financial mechanisms proposed by the Project to generate resources for improving the management of wetlands, a strategy was proposed to increase income from the Water Consumption Canon and improve investments in the watersheds where those resources are raised. The Wastewater Canon could generate income for wetland conservation but, being an indirect mechanism, negotiations between SINAC and the Ministry of Health are required for this purpose. In relation to funds associated with Art. 43 of the Biodiversity Law, the Project explored options with the BCCR and proposed guidelines to improve the transfer and application of those resources.

It is important to highlight the institutional efforts led by the PNH and the Department of Information and Regularization of the Territory to which it belongs, in terms of providing technical strength to the decision of how SINAC and the CAs could take full advantage of the financial resources generated by the Water Consumption Canon. First, the Department unified the operation of the Watershed and Water Resources Program and the PNH, which allows the Department to lead the Water Consumption Canon process. A matrix was then designed to help identify those activities related to water resources and wetlands that are already included in SINAC's planning instruments. To this end, inputs from the following tools were considered: SINAC Strategic Plan, Budget Plans (Planes-Presupuesto), the Institutional Operational Plan, Protected Areas' General Management Plans and the Local Management Plans (Planes de Gestión Local). The matrix can be used by the watershed liaisons and the wetland liaisons in the CA to plan their activities and products and to suggest to CA directors how to properly budget the Water Consumption Canon revenues (for example, technical studies, water harvesting, water quality, wetland restoration, others). For an adequate implementation, the support of the Accounting Financial Department of SINAC will be required.

These mechanisms are a leap forward in accomplishing stable financial resources to support the conservation of wetlands, but they are not enough. The country's fiscal situation and SINAC's shortcomings in terms of administrative and financial management are serious risks for the financial sustainability of wetland management.

### ***3.3.7.2 Socio-political***

**Rating:** Sustainability Moderately Likely (ML)

Politically, a new administration has taken office in the country precisely when the Wetland Project is coming to an end. Therefore, in order to achieve the sustainability of outcomes and outputs it is necessary that the new government understands their importance for IIPW conservation and adopts them as part of their management. The existence of the National Wetland Policy can be considered a strength, since it made conservation and sustainable use of wetlands visible topics. Besides, it should be implemented by the authorities.

From a socioeconomic perspective, the design of the Local Management Plans involved the participation of important stakeholders such as community-based organizations, people representing productive activities, members of NGOs, and staff members from CAs and from other institutions. Also, the wetland educational fun games were designed based on inputs identified locally in order to achieve authenticity and relevance. These products aim at promoting a cultural change that motivates people to know and value wetlands, recognize and face threats, and implement sustainable socio-productive activities. A risk to socioeconomic sustainability can come from the CAs ceasing the implementation of the plans and that the educational materials are not used with the target audiences. This could happen if the support from the government and from SINAC weakens and if the CAs lack of enough human, material and financial resources to implement actions. As a result, stakeholders may lose interest in deepening their understanding of ecosystem services and in developing actions on conservation and sustainable use in Ramsar wetlands.

### ***3.3.7.3 Institutional framework and governance***

**Rating:** Sustainability Moderately Likely (ML)

The National Wetlands Program is the office within SINAC responsible for the general management of issues related to wetlands, the operation of the CONAHU Secretariat and the execution of its agreements, the planning of actions on wetlands in the national territory along with staff from the CAs, the coordination with other public institutions, productive sectors and other stakeholders, and the monitoring and updating of the Project's outputs. Given all these responsibilities, the sustainability of the Project's outcomes is limited to the extent that the PNH

continues to lack human, financial and material resources to fulfill all those tasks. Also, by not been the focal point of the Ramsar Convention, the promptly and expeditiously follow-up to the compliance with the Convention's Strategic Plan becomes a difficult task. Besides all this, wetlands and the PNH are invisible in the SINAC's Strategic Plan 2016-2026, which is an important institutional planning tool.

The sustainability of the Project outcomes and the effective protection of the IIPW can be strengthened with the assistance and advice of the CONAHU (National Advisory Council on Wetlands), which is a body of the country's governance on wetlands. CONAHU was created by Decree No. 39161-MINAE (published in La Gaceta No. 191, October 01, 2015), which was drafted with the legal advice of the Project. The decree defines its composition and responsibilities and authorizes ministries and government institutions with legal authorizations to do so, to collaborate with technical, administrative and financial resources so that the PNH can execute the CONAHU agreements and guidelines.

The network of wetland liaisons at the CA level is the result of a major Project effort that included training and development of skills in many staff members. There is a risk that these liaisons do not continue with their responsibilities when the budget for the implementation of Project activities is over and that the CA directors decide to redirect that staff to other tasks. Therefore, the sustainability of Project outcomes at the regional level requires a great deal of formal institutional support for the strengthening and continuity of these liaisons.

While it is true that SINAC is clear about the importance of disseminating Project outcomes among users, the evaluation considers as a risk to sustainability the potential discretionary management of information such as the INH. This product must be publicly available to all and this is possible through the SNIT and other platforms. In addition to users from public institutions, the INH must also be accessible to NGOs, the academic sector and stakeholders in the productive sector. Users could compare the data from the INH with other layers of information to analyze the condition of wetlands, understand their vulnerability, identify opportunities for conservation activities, promote projects for sustainable use, and others.

#### ***3.3.7.4 Environmental***

**Rating:** Sustainability Moderately Likely (ML)

Environmental risks are largely associated with the development of non-sustainable activities such as fishing, tourism, urbanization and agriculture. A significant impact comes from plantation agriculture (pineapple, palm, banana, sugarcane, others) related to intensive use of agrochemicals, excessive use of water for irrigation and the filling or modification of wetlands. At the CA level there is a risk that understaffing or insufficient budget could limit the use of tools such as the INH. The INH in particular could allow CA staff members to effectively respond to legal actions or permit

requests, thus reducing threats from land use changes. A greater risk may be that other institutions linked to wetlands do not make use of the inventory information.

#### **3.3.7.5 Overall likelihood of sustainability**

**Rating:** Sustainability Moderately Likely (ML)

All risks mentioned interact with each other: For example, without institutional strengthening for wetland management and with insufficient human, material and financial resources, it would be difficult to implement local management plans and educational tools. Therefore, there would be no progress in generating awareness regarding the importance of wetlands and their ecosystem services, which in turn would make it difficult to reduce threats from productive activities.

#### **3.3.8 Impact**

The Project contributed to reducing environmental stress on wetlands. The implementation of Local Management Plans, which involved community members and people representing productive activities, had a positive impact by changing people's attitudes and behaviors, thus reducing threats on wetland ecosystems. The Project also improved the ecological status of wetlands during its lifetime. An example is Mata Redonda Wetland where several activities were carried out such as purchase of equipment, control of the invasive species *Typha dominguensis*, construction of sediment traps, reforestation of the lagoon's shores and others that contributed to a progressive clearing of the water mirror. Overall, the implementation of the Wetland Project made it possible for the topic of wetlands to become more visible within the institutional framework, among stakeholders and in the general population.

As long as they are used on wetland management, outcomes such as the INH, the Nature Index, the improved institutional capacities, the governance models, the valuation studies of wetland ecosystem services, the proposed legal tools and others can have a positive impact in the health of wetland ecosystems in the long term.

## 4. Conclusions, Lessons & Recommendations

### 4.1 Conclusions

1. A correct diagnosis of the threats faced by wetlands, as well as their direct and underlying causes, contributed to define outcomes, indicators and relevant outputs for the Wetland Project.
2. The Project contributed to show an additional underlying cause of threats to wetlands, which is the invisibility of these ecosystems among stakeholders, staff members from public institutions and the general public.
3. The ProDoc lacked clarity about some stakeholders particularly those associated with threats, including producers linked to unsustainable activities and land use changes.
4. The governance of the Project responded to its needs in terms of guidance, teamwork, management, planning, use of resources, control, and communication, with a flexible and adaptive structure.
5. The Project was highly favored by the accumulated experience of UNDP as the implementing agency and SINAC as the executing agency for other capacity building projects in SINAC, which placed them in an ideal position to take advantage of their lessons learned.
6. The Wetland Project implemented actions that integrated the SDG, particularly 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14, and 15.
7. The PMU operated as an integral part of SINAC, following institutional norms and guidelines, working in coordination with the technical and administrative staff members of the SE and the CAs, executing the Project effectively and efficiently, with products that were reviewed, received feedback and were approved to the satisfaction of SINAC.
8. Despite the limited human, material and financial resources, the National Wetlands Program played a strategic role in the implementation of the Project, both at the strategic and operational levels, from the SE and with the CAs. Its strengthening will be key to the sustainability of the Project outcomes.
9. The Project provided an ideal framework for SINAC to fulfil pending international commitments with the Ramsar Strategic Plan and with the Montreux Record, as well as with provisions of the CGR.
10. The articulation of the Wetland Project with other past and present initiatives, their outcomes, actions and outputs, contributed to mutually strengthen their respective objectives, avoided duplicating efforts, and maximized resources.
11. The Project's M&E plan and its tools allowed results-based management and the efficient, transparent and up-to-date monitoring of activity progress, as well as the appropriate use of financial resources.
12. The Project's adaptive management allowed to identify what was working well, what had to be changed, and which opportunities could be used to maintain relevance and effectiveness; it also supported the efficient use of resources.
13. With the implementation of the Project, SINAC was strengthened on wetland management with trained and aware staff members, practical experience, technical

products, management tools and strategic alliances. All this increased its capacity to work not only on wetland conservation but also on sustainable uses.

14. Costa Rica achieved an important Project appropriation through several macro instruments of national planning, as well as through policy instruments and regulations, which positioned the topic of wetlands in the country's environmental agenda.
15. Although there were some specific co-financing experiences not included in the design of the Project, co-financing could have been approached more proactively through negotiations and strategic alliances.
16. The Project's outputs and tools become useful not only for wetland conservation, but also for sustainable productive uses.
17. The Project had direct and indirect influence on stakeholders and citizens in general on the topic of wetlands. This was accomplished through communication, information and awareness-raising actions and products.
18. Although the topic of gender was not included in the design of the Project, during implementation, efforts were made to improve the approach to gender in SINAC and to contribute to other projects in this field.
19. The sustainability of the Project outcomes is moderately likely due to the existence of financial, socioeconomic, political, institutional and environmental risks that hinder the conservation and sustainable use of wetlands.

## **4.2 Lessons**

1. Making stakeholders that cause threats to biodiversity more visible from the design of the project would allow proposing products to add them as beneficiaries and allies during implementation.
2. During the design of a project, it is important to identify those indicators and goals that, besides a macro technical justification, require an additional contextual analysis of the institutional, legal and socio-cultural feasibility.
3. Making the topic of gender visible at a political-institutional level is essential to favor the efficient and effective development of programs and projects designed to improve the living conditions of the communities and to empower women in their leadership, technical roles within public institutions.
4. Combining and sequencing resources increases impact opportunities from the outcomes of a project through linking with outputs of other initiatives by UNDP or other cooperation entities. This promotes other strengths that the country already has.
5. Including the PMU in the DNA of the executing institution is essential to achieve a shared effort in terms of planning, coordination, execution, problem solving and monitoring.
6. Regional differences in leadership, administrative capacity, technical skills and previous experiences may generate inequalities between regions, putting some of them at disadvantage in terms of project opportunities.
7. Ecosystem and biodiversity conservation projects can be compatible with sustainable productive options for stakeholders, thus contributing to the fight against poverty and to responsible production.

8. Showing openness for the establishment of strategic alliances with national and regional allies and partners can allow a project to create synergies, strengthen specific actions and attract co-financing not originally planned.
9. Stakeholders from the productive sector often feel excluded from or alien to conservation processes and taking them into account contributes to increase their awareness, motivation and behavioral changes.
10. Replicating a project as a good practice in other Latin American and Caribbean countries requires careful contextual analysis of threats, stakeholders, legal and institutional framework and previous experience on similar topics.

### **4.3 Recommendations**

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

#### For UNDP:

1. In the design of future projects UNDP should focus on getting a clearer identification of other of its priorities, such as the SDGs, which should be articulated with different indicators, activities and outputs.
2. From the design of projects, with an early and specific identification of the stakeholders that cause threats to wetland ecosystems (or any other biodiversity element) UNDP may further enhance project beneficiaries and allies, as well as inclusion of relevant social groups on prioritized issues (gender, fight against poverty, others).
3. UNDP should position gender as a necessary and strategic topic from the formulation phases of the projects, with clear indicators.

#### For SINAC:

4. In the implementation of a project, SINAC should take into account regional differences in leadership, administrative capacity, technical skills and previous experiences to design a strategy for not leaving any conservation area behind.
5. SINAC should define a mandatory mechanism for the CAs and the institution as a whole to adequately and timely quantify and report their co-financing of projects, with a specific format and training of staff members on its use.
6. SINAC should proactively promote strategic alliances with partners and allies that can strengthen or complement specific project activities and outputs, and quantify their corresponding co-financing.
7. SINAC should integrate staff members as part of the full-time PMU technical team.

Follow-up actions and reinforcement of the initial benefits of the project:

For MINAE and SINAC Authorities:

8. MINAE should appoint the National Wetlands Program as the focal point of the Ramsar Convention in order to achieve an expeditious and timely follow-up of the compliance with the Ramsar Strategic Plan and with the Montreux Record.
9. MINAE and SINAC should strengthen the National Wetlands Program with human, material and financial resources, as a key player in the sustainability of processes associated with wetland management and in future projects.
10. SINAC should make the National Wetland Inventory publically available through the SNIT and other platforms, in a transparent and open manner.
11. SINAC should implement the financial mechanisms resulting from the Project to improve its resource gaps and optimize the income that can be contributed to wetland conservation.
12. SINAC should empower staff members involved in coordination, execution, administration and evaluation of projects with knowledge about gender, so that they understand social relationships between men and women and can implement affirmative actions aimed at achieving equity.
13. SINAC should update its Strategic Plan 2016-2026 in relation to wetlands and the PNH, given that those are almost absent from that important planning tool.
14. SINAC and the CAs should formalize the wetlands liaisons as part of the sustainability of wetland management, keeping in those positions staff members who have already developed capacities and accumulated experience through the Project.
15. The PNH and the CAs should actively disseminate project outputs such as the technical reports, valuation studies, educational fun games and others that contribute to promoting the value of wetlands and their ecosystem services among different sectors of the population.
16. The CAs should continue to strengthen the capacities of their staff members on the Project's outputs and tools through means such as regional workshops and others.

## 5. Annexes

### Annex No. 1: ToR

#### TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE PROJECT 88054

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Project Conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity and maintenance of ecosystem services of protected wetlands of international importance.

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

#### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity and maintenance of ecosystem services of protected wetlands of international importance			
GEF Project ID:	PIMS 4966		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	00088054	GEF financing:	3,705,873.00	
Country:	Costa Rica	IA/EA own:	N/A	N/A
Region:	LAC	SINAC:	15,288,318.00	
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	UNDP Other (Forever Costa Rica Program and GIZ BIOMARCC):	300,000.00 1,600,000.00	
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	17,188,318.00	
Executing Agency:	SINAC	Total Project Cost:	20,894,191	
Other Partners involved:	Vice minister of water, wetlands, coasts	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		<b>28/04/2104</b>
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: <u>March 2019</u>	Actual: August 2018

#### OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed to: *Improve the management of Internationally Important Protected Wetlands (IIPW) in Costa Rica in order to increase their conservation, sustainable use and maintenance of the ecosystem services they provide. Also, it aims to produce substantial global environmental benefits by*

*increasing the conservation and sustainable use of eleven (11) IIPWs; as well as increasing the representation of wetland ecosystems within the national Protected Areas (PA) system and improving the management effectiveness of seven (7) IIPW's.*

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects<sup>1</sup>. The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

---

An overall approach and method<sup>2</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (*fill in Annex C*). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator must be able to compile the findings of all the methodological sources of information and especially from the stakeholder interviews (including the Interviews and Summary results related to Annex C, without compromising the anonymity of informants). The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to *(SINAC, Project Unit)*, including the following project sites *(Huétar-Norte Conservation Area- Caño Negro, Maquenque)*. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Institutional Authorities (Vice minister MINAE, Executive Director SINAC), National Wetland Program Coordinator-National Technical, Wetland Program Liaisons from the Conservation Areas, SINAC, UNDP (ResRep, Deputy, Program Officer, Biodiversity Specialist), CUSBE-SINAC, International and Financial Cooperation Unit SINAC-MINAE.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/gef-guidelines-te-fsp-2017.pdf>  
<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

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

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

## PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		SINAC Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$) PROGRAM CR Forever		PROJECT GIZ/BIOMARCC		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants	300.000		8.062.710							
Loans/Concessions	N/A									
• In-kind support			7.225.608		1.000.000		600.000			
• Other										
Totals									20.894.191	

## MAINSTREAMING

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

## IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>3</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Costa Rica. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government and other project partners.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 22 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
<b>Preparation</b>	3 days	8/06/2018
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	9 days	11-22/06/2018 (first week San Jose; second week 18-22 field trip)
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	7 days	3/07/2018
<b>Final Report</b>	3 days	16/06/2018

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

<sup>3</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROTI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROTI Handbook 2009](#)

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Presentation	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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

\*\* Inception and Draft Report to be submitted in Spanish, Final Report must be written in English and Spanish

## TEAM COMPOSITION

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

The Team members must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum **7** years of relevant professional experience related to project implementation, results-based monitoring and **evaluation methodologies**.
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF.
- Knowledge of Environmental Sector in Costa Rica (preferably SINAC MINAE).
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s): Biodiversity
- Writing and reporting skills (present at least 3 references of documents prepared).
- Good communication skills and positive interrelation.

As specified in Spanish

## 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'](#)

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

---

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing and presentation of Mission Work-plan.
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

## APPLICATION PROCESS

---

Those interested in applying for this consultancy must submit the following documentation:

- a) Letter of interest (maximum 2 pages) duly signed.
- b) Note of interest (maximum 2 pages), indicating how your work and this consultancy will contribute to the achievement of the SDG and strengthen gender equality.
- c) Detailed economic offer (showing professional fees, airline tickets, travel expenses, workshops and logistics, support personnel if necessary) which must be presented in national currency (Costa Rican colones) for national consultants, and in US dollars for international consultants.
- d) Technical offer describing methodology to provide the requested results within the indicated period. NOTE: The technical offer must be written in English to allow evaluation of writing skills, since the final report must be written in both English and Spanish.
- e) Updated curriculum vitae in a maximum of four pages, clearly reflecting the criteria to be evaluated.
- f) **Form P-11** (available at [www.cr.undp.org](http://www.cr.undp.org) / Operaciones/ Centro de Servicios/Formularios P11). This is an essential requirement for accepting offers.
- g) In case of presenting a team, indicate clearly who will be the consultancy leader.

These documents (in separate electronic files) must be sent via email to the following address: [adquisiciones.cr@undp.org](mailto:adquisiciones.cr@undp.org), identifying the subject of the electronic message with “**Consultor Internacional Evaluación Final de Período Húmedales**” or “**Consultor Nacional Evaluación Final de Período Húmedales**”.

The deadline to apply is Sunday, May 27, 2018. E-mail: [adquisiciones.cr@undp.org](mailto:adquisiciones.cr@undp.org). If attachments exceed 6MB, please send the documents in several emails. For inquiries, please contact [adquisiciones.cr@undp.org](mailto:adquisiciones.cr@undp.org) no later than May 22, 2018.

## ANNEX A (TOR): PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Level at 30 June 2017 will be provided to FTE Evaluator at beginning of his/her assignment.

Objective/Outcome	Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2015	Level at 30 June 2016
Objective	To improve management in order to increase the conservation, sustainable use, and maintenance of the ecosystem services of internationally important wetlands.	Total area (in hectares [ha]) of IIPW within the SINAC	569,742 ha	589,742 ha (Terraba-Sierpe is expanded by 5,000 ha; and other protected areas are expanded by 15,000 and declared as RAMSAR sites)	A proposal of new Ramsar sites or expanded current ones are drafted and under way to be approve by each SINAC's Conservation Area, because: 1. The current politic instruction is not to create new protected Areas if there is not a participative process before hand with the population in the surroundings or directly affected by the wetland. With that being said in Terraba Sierpe Wetland it is only possible to add 5000 HA as a Ramsar Ecosystem because those are the only ones inhabited and since the other ones are occupied and it is a participative process they are not going to agree to the terms and conditions. 2. The project is looking to add approximately 15 000 ha as a wetland Ramsar that are currently wildlife-protected areas but that have not been yet acknowledged as Ramsar ecosystem.	Target met and surpassed. Total Area of IIPW within the SINAC will cover 20,000ha. Finalized technical studies, field delimitation and map drawings of 7.000 ha of wetlands in Caribe Noreste IIPW and in Terraba-Sierpe there are 4,000 ha identified and field delimitation and map drawings of 100ha.
		Change in the management effectiveness of seven (7) internationally important wetland PAs as measured through the METT scorecard	Palo Verde: 47.4% Terraba Sierpe: 63.5% Caño Negro WR: 57.5% Maquenque: 39.5% Caribe Noreste: 53.5% Gandoca Manzanillo NWR: 56.5% Tamarindo NWR: 56.5%	Palo Verde: 67.4% Terraba Sierpe: 83.5% Caño Negro WR: 77.5% Maquenque: 59.5% Caribe Noreste: 73.5% Gandoca Manzanillo NWR: 76.5% Tamarindo NWR: 76.5%	The METT evaluations and the business plans (done by Barreras project) were revised in order for them to improve and be applied. The scenarios have been analyzed in order to award non-essential	This indicator will be measured for the mid term evaluation in July 2017. Local management plans for Caribe Noreste and Palo Verde IIPW elaborated. For the remaining IIPW stakeholder maps were

Objective/Outcome	Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2015	Level at 30 June 2016
					services and business plans. METT evaluations were analyzed to know the indicators and to take into account in the planning process of the project. Regarding with the management, we are developing a framework which includes a national policy on wetlands, a national strategy on wetlands, regional wetlands plans, and specific wetlands management plans. At the moment, we have a conceptual and methodological scheme and a basic study on Costa Rica wetlands situation.	completed.
		Change in the financial capacity of the eleven (11) internationally important wetland PAs according to that established through the total average score in the UNDP/GEF Sustainability Scorecard	Legal, regulatory, and institutional framework: 31.1% Business planning and tools for cost-effective management: 18.6% Tools for generating income and its allocation: 22.5% Total: 25.0%	Legal, regulatory, and institutional framework: 51.1% Business planning and tools for cost-effective management: 38.6% Tools for generating income and its allocation: 42.5% Total: 45.0%	A conceptual and methodological framework of valuing the ecological services has been developed. Also a stakeholder analysis is underway. This will be the basis of the financial mechanisms that be propose in the future to help SINAC to improve its incomes on wetlands protected areas.	This indicator will be measured for the mid term evaluation in July 2017. Primary and secondary data for the evaluation of eco systems services on wetlands collected and systemized for the 7 IIPW prioritized in the PRODOC. Progress in the development of a Strategy to improve the collection, implementation and accountability of the Water Consumption Canon as a financial instrument to enhance financial capacities of the 11 IIPW.
		National policy for the protection of wetlands	0	1	This is a new project indicator. The project analyzed the current political framework for the conservation of wetlands and	A draft of the National Wetland Policy has been delivered. 14 regional workshops were delivered as part of the

Objective/Outcome	Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2015	Level at 30 June 2016
					identified the need for the development of a national policy to ensure the protection of this important ecosystem. The project is already working on the policy and it should be approved in early 2016.	participatory process in the formulation of the National Wetlands Policy. Indigenous groups have requested a specific sub-process to broaden their participation in the development of the National Wetland Policy.
Outcome 1	Protected area (PA) system representation and emplacement of institutional capacity for the sustainable management and conservation of wetlands	Change in ecological representativeness (ha) within eleven IIPW	Open water: 1,299 ha Shallow waters: 2,579 ha Swamp forest: 31,989 ha Palm forest: 61,582 ha Mixed wetlands: 809 ha Lagoons: 141ha Mangroves: 17,345 ha Herbaceous swamp: 19,535 ha	Open water: 2,069.91 ha Shallow waters: 2,579 ha Swamp forest: 31,989 ha Palm forest: 64,453.5 ha Mixed wetlands: 809 ha Lagoons: 146.63 ha Mangroves: 20,349.93 ha Herbaceous swamp: 19,535 ha Other wetlands: 3,844.57 ha None-wetland ecosystems (forested areas and islands): 1,565.46 ha	The project is developing the previous technical studies to: 1. To acknowledge as a new IIPW approximately 510 ha of open water, mangroves and mixed wetlands from Refugio Nacional de Vida Silvestre Ostional. 2. To acknowledge as a new IIPW, approximately 10,000 ha, of swamp forest from Japdeva in the Caribbean. 3. Add approximately 5,000 ha from palm forest and mixed wetlands to the Terraba Sierpe IIPW 4. Add approximately 9,000 ha from Herbaceous swamp Ecosystem to the CaÃ±o Negro IIPW. Potential Ramsar sites drafted and prioritized according to its ecological representatives, provided that it will not only include the Terraba-Sierpe expansion. As a baseline, a Ramsar wetlands? preliminary diagnosis and map was done, which will be discuss and validate in the SINAC's CA.	1. We continue to acknowledge as a new IIPW approximately 510 ha of open water, mangroves and mixed wetlands from Refugio Nacional de Vida Silvestre Ostional 2. We continue working to acknowledge as a new IIPW, approximately 10,000 ha, of swamp forest from Japdeva in the Caribbean; 3. We continue working to add approximately 5,000 ha from palm forest and mixed wetlands to the Terraba Sierpe IIPW 4. We continue working to add approximately 9,000 ha from Herbaceous swamp Ecosystem to the CaÃ±o Negro IIPW; 5. Open water: In the process of incorporating 720 ha to the marine area of Las Baulas IIPW; 6. Palm forest: In the process of incorporating 1800 ha in the Northeastern Caribbean Wetland. 7. Lagoons: In the process of incorporating 1.137ha to Laguna Corcovado (Corcovado Lagoon) as a

Objective/Outcome	Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2015	Level at 30 June 2016
						Ramsar site; 8. Mangroves: In the process of incorporating 2.400ha; Other wetlands: Developed proposal to add 3.000ha . 9. None-wetland ecosystems (forested areas and islands): In the process of incorporating Isla del Caño (300ha) and Isla Violin (1.000ha).
		Total area (ha) of IIPW area demarcated and legalized for conservation purposes, and recognized by stakeholders by year 3.	4,000 ha	Terraba-Sierpe is expanded by 5,000 ha; and other protected areas are expanded by 15,000 ha and declared as RAMSAR sites	The investment in equipment was necessary to achieve the demarcation and legalization of the IIPW. ARCGIS licenses for use in 11 SINACs CA were updated. Related to this, SINACs CA staff was trained in the use of a GIS tool (ABRE), as an instrument to improve management in the IIPW.	Technical proposal to incorporate 4.000 ha into Terraba Sierpe IIPW done. Additionally, 50 ha of this ecosystem has been topographically assessed.
		Change in the coverage of the invasive species Typha dominguensis in the Palo Verde IIPW	0%	10% decrease by project end	We are in the process of establishing the baseline of the invasive species Typha in the Palo Verde IIPW. The Project has invested resources in purchasing of technological equipment for the SINACs Tempisque Conservation Area (ACT) for controlling invasive species, including Typha.	A baseline map of Typha dominguensis coverage (2.724 ha*) developed for Palo Verde IIPW. A proposal to decrease 272ha of this coverage has been developed. * The 2.724 ha baseline for this indicator may be updated for next PIR
		Change in the density of the devil fish (Hypostomus plecostomus) invasive species per square meter in two IIPW	Caño Negro IIPW: 0 Caribe Noreste IIPW (Tortuguero National Park and Barra del Colorado National Wildlife Refuge):	20% reduction per square meter	We are in the process of establishing the baseline of the invasive species Devil Fish in the Caño Negro and the Caribe Noreste IIPW with a rapid ecological diagnosis.	A baseline map of Devil fish (Hypostomus plecostomus) in Caribe Noreste and Caño Negro is under development as well as the reduction . proposal for its control.
		Number of staff	SINAC: 12	SINAC: 33	The Project	45 officials of

Objective/Outcome	Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2015	Level at 30 June 2016
		(including women) from SINAC and other national and local agencies trained for the protection and management of IIPW	Municipalities: 3 Other: 1	Municipalities: 12 Other: 5	established a training plan on IIPW topics, it followed the General training Plan for the SINAC, elaborated by the Barreras Project. The first training took place in the Caribe Noreste IIPW in June 2015. 32 teachers from these regions were trained on the importance of wetlands. 17 women and 15 men participated.	SINAC (ACT, ACAT, ACOSA, ACCVC, ACAHN, ACOPAC, ACLAP) and 5 officials of other public institutions (SETENA, SENARA, MAG, OIJ, ICE) have been trained in wetland soil delimitation and soil use capacity. 671 private and public stakeholders were also trained in protection and rational use of wetlands.
Outcome 2	Resources for sustainable management of internationally important protected wetlands increased and diversified	Change in the financial gap (USD) to cover basic management costs of eleven (11) IIPW as a result of new financial mechanisms	\$65,487,762 USD (2013-2018) or \$10,914,627 USD annually	\$52,781,782 USD (2013-2018; reduction of 19.4% or \$2,541.196 USD annually)	The project staff determined that the financial mechanisms proposed by the project document are not viable due to the following reasons: a) PES incentive for ecosystem conservation is mainly targeted to private land and is not suitable for the project sites; and b) REDD+/ C-Neutrality and Environmental ? Social Responsibility is still completing a preliminary phase and will not deliver a financial incentive by project closure. This is why the project proposes the following measures to deliver financial incentives that are likely to decrease the financial gap of IIPWs by project closure: a) proposing a decree to ensure that vessels pay a toll when they enter the jurisdiction of protected wetlands; b) reforming the waste water and water consumption decrees to ensure	This indicator will be measured for the mid term evaluation in July 2017. The strategy to improve collection, implementation and accountability of the Water Consumption Canon as a financial mechanism is under development. This instrument will contribute to narrow the current and future financial gap of the 11 IIPW.

Objective/Outcome	Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2015	Level at 30 June 2016
					that a percentage of funds paid by consumers is allocated to the conservation of wetlands. In addition, the project is working on a conceptual and methodological framework for the valuation of the Eco systemic services that the IIPW offers to society.	
		Annual income (USD) for IIPW by type of financial mechanisms implemented	Vessel transit toll: 0; Water consumption contribution: TBD; Waste water contribution: 0 Tourism and other recreational fees: \$1,442,000 USD	Vessel transit toll: TBD; Water consumption contribution: TBD; Waste water contribution: 0; Tourism and other recreational fees: \$3,197,250 USD	Baseline and target values for this indicators will be determined during the next few months. The project will also be monitoring income derived from these incentives as soon as the proposed financial mechanisms are in place.	Water consumption Canon contribution strategy in process.

## ANNEX B (TOR): LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

- Project Document (PRODOC)
- Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
- Budgets
- Work plans / Annual Operating Plans
- Assessments of protected area management effectiveness (Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool, METT) and UNDP-GEF protected area Financial Sustainability
- Project products
- Communication materials about the project
- UNDP planning documents (UNDAF; Country Programme Action Plan, CPAP; Country Programme Document, CPD).
- National Development Strategy
- National legislation relevant to the project and any other material that may be considered useful
- List and contact information of project staff and other stakeholders related to the project
- Steering Committee Minutes
- Any additional documentation deemed necessary

## ANNEX C (TOR): EVALUATION QUESTIONS

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on the particulars of the project.*

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

<b><i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i></b> 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2: Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1: Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems	<b><i>Sustainability ratings:</i></b> 4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<b><i>Relevance ratings</i></b> 2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)  <b><i>Impact Ratings:</i></b> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<b><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></b> Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)		

## ANNEX E (TOR): EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

### Evaluators:

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

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>4</sup>

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

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

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

### ANNEX F (TOR): EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>5</sup>

- i. Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>6</sup>)
1. Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Structure of the evaluation report
2. Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address

---

<sup>4</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

<sup>5</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>6</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

- Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results
- 3. Findings**  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>7</sup>)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation**
- Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
  - Planned stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation**
- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
  - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
  - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
  - Project Finance:
  - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
  - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3 Project Results**
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
  - Relevance (\*)
  - Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
  - Country ownership
  - Mainstreaming
  - Sustainability (\*)
  - Impact
- 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons**
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
  - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
  - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
  - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5. Annexes**
- ToR
  - Itinerary
  - List of persons interviewed
  - Summary of field visits

---

<sup>7</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

## ANNEX G (TOR): 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: _____	
--	--

## UNDP-GEF MTE Report Audit Trail Template

*Note: The following is a template for the TE Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTE report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTE report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTE report. **To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP Project ID-PIMS #).** The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):*

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft TE report	TE team response and actions taken

## Annex No. 2: Work Plan

Phases	Weeks										
	June 4-10	June 11-17	June 18-24	June 25-July 01	July 2-8	July 9-15	July 16-22	July 23-29	July 30-Aug 5	Aug 6-12	Aug 13-19
Inception Report	June 8										
10% At contract signing and presentation of Mission Work plan	June 8										
Evaluation mission: Interviews in San José		June 11-17									
Evaluation mission: Fieldtrip			June 18-24								
Presentation Initial conclusions			June 22								
Draft of Final Term Evaluation (FTE) Report		June 11-17	June 18-24	June 25-July 01							
Submission of Draft of FTE Report					July 3						
40% Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft of FTE report					July 2-8						
Reception of comments to draft					July 6						
FTE Report and Translation						July 9-15					
Submission of FTE final versions Spanish, English							July 16				
50% Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report							July 16-22				

### Annex No. 3: List of key people interviewed

N°	Name	Position	Institution / Workplace
1.	Ana Lucía Orozco	Programs Assistant	UNDP
2.	Aurora Camacho	PMU Consultant	Wetland Project
3.	Carlos Álvarez	Caño Negro National Wildlife Refuge	ACHN
4.	Cristina Méndez	Wetlands Liaison ACHN	ACHN
5.	Fabio Arias	Del Agua Juan Castro Blanco National Park	ACHN
6.	Fernando Mora	Former Waters and Seas Vice Minister, MINAE	N/A
7.	Francini Acuña	PMU Consultant	Wetland Project
8.	Gilberto Chaves	Administrator, Maquenque National Wildlife Refuge	ACHN
9.	Jacklyn Rivera	Institutional Coordinator	PNH, SINAC
10.	Kifah Sasa	Chief Program Officer	UNDP
11.	Lesbia Sevilla	Head of Technical and Financial Cooperation Department	SINAC
12.	Luis Pérez	Caño Negro National Wildlife Refuge	ACHN
13.	Milena Obando	Administrative Assistant	Wetland Project
14.	Miriam Miranda	National Project Coordinator	Wetland Project
15.	Mario Coto	Executive Director	SINAC

Source: Compilation based on field mission.

# Annex No. 4: Interviews and field visits

June, 2018

MONDAY 11	TUESDAY 12	WEDNESDAY 13	THURDAY 14	FRIDAY 15
			2:00-5:00 pm Fernando Mora, Former Waters and Seas Vice Minister, MINAE	8:30-11:00 am Jacklyn Rivera, Institutional Coordinator  11:00-12:30 pm Lesbia Sevilla, Head of Technical and Financial Cooperation Department  2:30-5:00 pm Mario Coto, Executive Director, SINAC
MONDAY 18	TUESDAY 19	WEDNESDAY 20	THURDAY 21	FRIDAY 22
2:30-3:00 pm Kifah Sasa, Chief Program Officer, PNUD	Field visit to ACHN (Huetar Norte Conservation Area) and focus Group (all day)  Carlos Álvarez Cristina Méndez Fabio Arias Gilberto Chaves Luis Pérez		1:00-3:00 pm Ana Lucía Orozco, UNDP	9:00 am- 1:00 pm Miriam Miranda, Aurora Camacho, Francini Acuña (PMU)

## Annex No. 5: Questionnaire model used with key informants

Theme	Questionnaire
<b>Project design</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which was the role of UNDP during the design of the Project?</li> <li>• How was the relationship between UNDP and MINAE/SINAC during the design stage?</li> <li>• What role did each one play?</li> <li>• How was Project relevance sought during this phase?</li> </ul>
<b>Implementation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the role of UNDP in the changes made to the Project outcomes, indicators, and products?</li> <li>• During implementation, how have the coordination mechanisms between UNDP and the PMU worked? With SINAC? With the Viceministry of Water and Seas? With CRXS?</li> <li>• How does UNDP participate in the progress or monitoring of the Project? What is the role of adaptive management?</li> </ul>
<b>Risks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In relation to the four types of risks for the Project described in the ProDoc, how did they take place? How were they mitigated? What strategy was used? Did additional risks arise that needed attention?</li> </ul>
<b>Project Indicators</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent have Project indicators guided implementation?</li> <li>• Are they still relevant?</li> <li>• Which changes have been made? What is the formal procedure to propose changes? How is progress measured / monitored?</li> </ul>
<b>Management arrangements</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the Project organization structure functioned as planned?</li> <li>• Which measures have been taken to improve management capacity?</li> <li>• In what ways does the PMU make visible its role as an integral part of the SINAC?</li> <li>• How is decision-making and implementation coordinated with SINAC's Executive Secretariat? And with CAs?</li> <li>• How are actions/products prioritized within each CA?</li> <li>• Which arrangements have been made with other institutional actors (MAG, INDER, SENARA, others)?</li> </ul>
<b>Adaptive Management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which have been the most significant changes in the Project outcomes/products and how were they justified?</li> <li>• How easy / difficult was the negotiation? How were the changes seen by UNDP? SINAC? CAs?</li> <li>• Which M&amp;E tools supported adaptive management?</li> <li>• How did adaptive management support the efficient use of Project resources?</li> </ul>
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How was the performance of the Project Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Plan described in the ProDoc?</li> <li>• Which roles do different actors play during M&amp;E? The PMU? SINAC? OP UNDP?</li> <li>• Which positive results derived from the M&amp;E system? What was missing?</li> </ul>
<b>Financing / Co-financing</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has the Project financing structure worked?</li> <li>• How has co-financing worked? How have the partners and allies contributed?</li> <li>• Was there co-financing not included in the design that was added during implementation?</li> <li>• To what extent were financial resources used efficiently?</li> </ul>
<b>Relevance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the Project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area?</li> <li>• How does the Project relate to environmental and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</li> <li>• How does the Project support other international conventions?</li> <li>• What was the level of participation of beneficiaries and stakeholders during the</li> </ul>

Theme	Questionnaire
	<p>implementation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How did the Project support the needs of the stakeholders?</li> <li>• Has the Project provided relevant lessons for other future projects aimed at similar objectives?</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent have the Project's expected objective and outcomes been achieved?</li> <li>• To what extent was the increase in ecological representation of Ramsar wetlands achieved?</li> <li>• To what extent was the framework enabled to mitigate natural and anthropomorphic threats to diversity in HPIL?</li> <li>• To what extent did the HPIL management effectiveness increase?</li> <li>• To what extent did funding for protected areas of HPIL increase?</li> <li>• What lessons were learned regarding the accomplishment of outcomes?</li> <li>• What changes were made to the design of the project? To what extent did these changes improve the accomplishment of the Project's expected outcomes?</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Was the project implemented efficiently, in line with international and national standards?</li> <li>• Was adaptive management utilized to ensure efficient use of resources?</li> <li>• Were the accounting and financial systems adequate for the management of the Project and the accurate and timely generation of financial information?</li> <li>• To what extent were the financial resources used efficiently? How could resources have been used more efficiently?</li> <li>• To what extent did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?</li> <li>• To what extent was collaboration between institutions responsible for the implementation effective?</li> <li>• What lessons can we draw from the Project in terms of efficiency? How could the project have been more efficient in its implementation (Management, structure, procedures, alliances)?</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent are there financial, institutional, socioeconomic or environmental risks to keeping the Project outcomes in the long term?</li> <li>• Based on your experience with the Project and its lessons, how do you visualize the sustainability of outcomes in the long term?</li> </ul>
<b>Impact</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has the Project contributed to a reduction of environmental stress or to a better ecological status?</li> </ul>

## Annex No. 6: UNDP-GEF MTE Report Audit Trail

To the comments received on July 14, 2018 from the Terminal Evaluation of Project “Conservation, sustainable use of biodiversity and maintenance of ecosystem services of protected wetlands of international importance” (Wetlands Project No. 88054 PIMS 4966).

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Terminal Evaluation report; they are referenced by institution “Author” column and track change comment number (“Original page #” column; original paragraph #):

Autor	Página original	Párrafo original	Comentario/Aportación al borrador del informe MTR	Respuesta del equipo del MTR y medidas
PMU	25	1	Centro de Estudios Generales, y la Escuela de .....de la UNA, la UCR y	Se incorporó
PMU	25	1	Proyecto financiado por CONARE	Se incorporó
PMU	31	1	Son 12 Notihumedales	Se incorporó
PMU	31	1	Documento listo y hermoso	Se incorporó
PMU	34	2	Revisar, la información biológica si se incluyó, Estrategia de incendios y reglamentos de uso de Caño Negro esto no se terminó porque el AC entró en conflictos administrativos y no respondió al trabajo programado.	Se incorporó
PNUD	15	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>PNUD (Oficina de País en Costa Rica):</b> Es la Agencia Implementadora del Proyecto Humedales y responsable de su supervisión financiera y técnica.</li> </ul>	Se incorporó
PNUD	15	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>PNUD (Regional Panamá y Unidad PNUD-GEF Sede):</b> Asesoría Técnica Regional, responsables de dar el seguimiento y calidad técnica durante el ciclo de Proyecto.</li> </ul>	Se agregó
PNUD	16	10	Producto 1.2.2. Favor incluir la redacción original del Producto para evidenciar el cambio	Se incluyó
PNUD	21	6	Incluye un Oficial de Desarrollo Sostenible y Resiliencia (....)una Oficial de Biodiversidad y Adaptación basada en Ecosistemas (....) en etapas clave del ciclo de proyecto (diseño, seguimiento anual, evaluaciones y cierre).	Se hicieron los cambio
PNUD	26	2	FMAM	Se cambió
PNUD	29	11	FMAM	Se cambió
PNUD	30	1	FMAM	Se cambió
PNUD	32	1	3.3.1 Ya estamos revisando el último METT para incluir las cifras finales en un cuadro.	Las cifras se desglosaron en varios cuadros en la sección 3.3.1. Se utilizaron como fuentes: - GEF BD Tracking Tool PIMS 4966-IIPW Costa Rica 2018. - Reyes Gatjens. Junio 2018.
PNUD	37	5	El tema de género se puede desarrollar mas ampliamente porque es uno de los temas que PNUD requiere en el diseño de otros proyectos para lecciones aprendidas. Te vamos a compartir un análisis desde el Proyecto revisado por especialista género PNUD para desarrollar el tema acá y ampliarlo en las lecciones-conclusiones.	Se insertó el tema de género a nivel de conclusiones, lecciones y recomendaciones.
PNUD	38	3	Esto también se dio desde administración anterior donde hubo disposición de no	Se agregó el siguiente párrafo: “Tal y como quedó demostrado en el análisis de la

Autor	Página original	Párrafo original	Comentario/Aportación al borrador del informe MTR	Respuesta del equipo del MTR y medidas
			contratar mas personal, hay que ponerlo en función del "trend" más amplio, se ha recortado gastos desde todo el periodo de implementación del proyecto. Hay evidencia de esto en el FSS que te vamos a compartir cuando terminemos revisión.	información generada por la Financial Sustainability Scorecard, desde la administración Solís Rivera se viene reduciendo el presupuesto de operación asignado por el Gobierno Central al SINAC, a lo que se suma una disposición de no contratar más personal. Es así como durante todo el periodo de implementación del proyecto se han venido recortando los gastos.
PNUD	42	5	Me parece relevante evidenciar que no se hizo análisis de género para próximos proyectos. A pesar de ello hubo aportes en este sentido.	Se evidenció tanto en 3.3.6 como en conclusiones, lecciones y recomendaciones.
PNUD	44	4	...como género, y otras vinculaciones y articulaciones con los ODS.	Se cambió
SINAC	6	12	este dato no es el correcto. el cierre estaba para el año 2019. en el real se debe poner Julio 2019	Propuesto: Julio 2019 Real: Julio 2018
SINAC	8	4	Solo por medio del SNIT?	por medio del SNIT y de otras plataformas
SINAC	11	3	"conteo integral" Que significa?	Se sustituyó por: "un análisis integral y sistemático..."
SINAC	15	7	"...las AP públicas del país del país, así como de la gestión de los bosques y de la vida silvestre, tanto dentro como fuera de las AP".	Se sustituyó por: "todas las ASP (áreas silvestres protegidas) del país, de la gestión de los bosques y de la vida silvestre tanto dentro como fuera de las ASP, así como de la conservación y protección del uso de cuencas y sistemas hídricos".
SINAC	16	10	"....para las AC"	Se sustituyó por: "....para ASP".
SINAC	20	7	el avance y coordinación realmente fue con el INTA que es del MAG, pero en si alguien del MAG directamente no esta ni estuvo vinculado con el proyecto, o muy pobremente. esta en su lugar es una limitante.	Se insertaron dos párrafos: "con la colaboración del INTA-MAG el Proyecto implementó nueve cursos de caracterización y delimitación de suelos asociados a humedales"  "Si bien es cierto hubo participación puntual de funcionarios del MAG a nivel regional o local, con la excepción del aporte del INTA esa institución no estuvo directamente vinculada con la implementación del Proyecto, lo que puede considerarse como una limitante".
SINAC	21	8	No comparto mucho la redacción de este párrafo La participación de SINAC es relevante y necesaria en la formulación y diseño del proyecto porque el tema de humedales es parte de sus competencias dadas por ley y no porque ejerciera la dirección nacional del proyecto. La necesidad de este proyecto fue identificada por el Gobierno de CR a través del MINAE y el SINAC, como corresponde, y se coordinó con el PNUD en el tanto dichas instancias decidieron que la Agencia de implementación fuera el PNUD, éste jugó un rol importante en el rol de facilitador de la formulación y diseño del proyecto. Para el SINAC Y EL MINAE en su momento este proyecto representó una oportunidad de articularlo con otros esfuerzos de carácter estratégico que se venían gestando e implementando particularmente el Programa Costa Rica Por siempre, que es un esfuerzo a largo plazo para cumplir las metas de conservación país del Programa de Trabajo de AP del CDB (PoWPa) en la medida en que vino	Se cambió por: "La necesidad del Proyecto fue identificada por el Gobierno de Costa Rica a través del MINAE y del SINAC y estas instancias decidieron que el PNUD fuera la Agencia de implementación. El PNUD jugó un rol relevante como facilitador del diseño del proyecto, mientras que el SINAC tuvo un rol importante dado que el tema de humedales es parte de sus competencias legales. El trabajo entre ambas instituciones permitió identificar las necesidades del SINAC y comprender la relevancia de los objetivos y productos planteados".  Se agregó: "Para el SINAC y el MINAE el Proyecto representó una oportunidad de articulación con otros esfuerzos estratégicos, particularmente el Programa Costa Rica Por Siempre, que busca cumplir con las metas de conservación del país declaradas ante el CBD y con el Plan de Trabajo de Áreas Protegidas de dicha convención. Por esta razón CRXS se

Autor	Página original	Párrafo original	Comentario/Aportación al borrador del informe MTR	Respuesta del equipo del MTR y medidas
			a complementar dichos esfuerzos, de ahí inclusive se justifican los cofinanciadores que formaban parte del PCRXS.	incluyó en el cofinanciamiento".
SINAC	22	3	Esto no es correcto, el ejecutor fue SINAC y el PNUD fue la Agencia de implementación. PNUD administró los recursos donados por el GEF	Se cambió por: "Previo al Proyecto Humedales, la OP PNUD en Costa Rica fungió como agencia de implementación de otros dos proyectos con recursos aportados por el FMAM"
SINAC	22	6	Tampoco comparto esta redacción las lecciones aprendidas deben ser para ambos, al menos eso es lo que se espera, SINAC tuvo una participación muy activa en el diseño y ejecución de los proyectos indicados. Sobresaliente fue la gestión del proyecto consolidación de áreas marinas protegidas (conocido como Barreritas) dado el esquema de ejecución llevado a cabo por la coordinación del proyecto incluyendo la coordinación institucional del SINAC. Esto no fue igual en el caso del Proyecto Removiendo Barreras donde hubo muchos altos y bajos en la ejecución y muchos problemas de coordinación entre SINAC y PNUD. El proyecto barreritas fue concebido como parte del Programa CRxS y por ello su trabajo se desarrolló con base en los vacíos de conservación o Gruas II.	Se modificó por: "Previo al Proyecto Humedales, la OP PNUD en Costa Rica fungió como agencia de implementación de otros dos proyectos <i>del SINAC</i> con recursos aportados por el FMAM: 1. Removiendo Barreras para la Sostenibilidad del Sistema de Áreas Protegidas de Costa Rica 2009-2014 (Proyecto 56040): Promovió el desarrollo de capacidades institucionales y sistémicas para remover las barreras para la sostenibilidad del sistema de áreas protegidas de Costa Rica. <i>Fue un proyecto que tuvo muchos altos y bajos en la ejecución, incluyendo desafíos de coordinación entre SINAC y PNUD.</i> 2. Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica 2011-2014 (Proyecto 78129): Este proyecto, conocido como "Barreritas", se basó en los vacíos de conservación de GRUAS II. El mismo impulsó el aumento de la representatividad ecológica marina mediante la ampliación y creación de áreas marinas protegidas en los ecosistemas marinos insuficientemente representados y que son esenciales para mantener la biodiversidad. <i>Su gestión fue sobresaliente gracias el esquema de ejecución de la coordinación del proyecto, así como de la coordinación institucional del SINAC.</i> La incorporación del Coordinador de este proyecto como consultor del Proyecto Humedales permitió aprovechar los productos y lecciones aprendidas del mismo. <i>La participación del PNUD como agencia implementadora y del SINAC como entidad ejecutora en estos dos proyectos los colocó en una posición ideal para aprovechar sus lecciones aprendidas en cuanto a crear capacidades en SINAC.</i>
SINAC	23	4	Tal como lo expliqué antes el Programa CRXS incluye las metas de conservación país para implementar el Programa de trabajo de AP del CDB y tiene un mecanismo financiero constituido por el Segundo canje y el fideicomiso con fondos privados, es decir, el segundo Canje por Naturaleza EE.UU también es parte del Programa CRXS. Dado que es un canje entre el gobierno de CR y USA y por la temática la participación de SINAC fue muy activa y protagónica en el proceso de negociación y ahora en la ejecución.	Se modificó por: "El Canje de Deuda por Naturaleza EEUU-CR, firmado en el 2010 <i>entre el gobierno de Costa Rica y de los estados Unidos</i> e implementado por el Programa Costa Rica Por Siempre, destinado para financiar la consolidación de las AP priorizadas del SINAC. <i>La participación de SINAC fue muy activa y protagónica tanto en el proceso de negociación como en la ejecución</i> ".
SINAC	23	7	No comparto este párrafo primero porque no	Se procedió a eliminar el párrafo.

<b>Autor</b>	<b>Página original</b>	<b>Párrafo original</b>	<b>Comentario/Aportación al borrador del informe MTR</b>	<b>Respuesta del equipo del MTR y medidas</b>
			era el fin de esos proyectos por eso se incluyeron mecanismos financieros para humedales es en el proyecto humedales donde correspondía incluir mecanismos para humedales y después porque si realizaron esfuerzos para mejorar la capacidad de gestión en distintos ámbitos de acción del SINAC. Por cierto el proyecto BID-turismo colaboró en cuanto a algunos elementos para establecer el cobro electrónico de ingreso a AP en SINAC. De todas formas este párrafo me parece que esta fuera de lugar no está vinculado con el título de esa sección.	
SINAC	27	1	No estoy tan clara que esto sea así. Propuesta de redacción: "El SINAC procuró la integración del proyecto a su planificación y gestión en línea con la normativa vigente".	Se eliminó el párrafo cuestionado y se integró la propuesta de redacción.
SINAC	28	11	El papel del CONAC es mas relevante que esto por ley le corresponde la aprobación de estrategias y políticas para la consolidación y desarrollo del SINAC, ENTRE OTRAS.	Se agregó: "Además, por ley le corresponde la aprobación de estrategias y políticas para la consolidación y desarrollo del SINAC".
SINAC	31	1	¿Con base en que elementos se afirma esto?	Se amplió la explicación: "...se lograron productos pertinentes y de calidad, puesto que responden a los resultados del Proyecto y además fueron revisados, realimentados y aprobados por el SINAC".
SINAC	32	4	Me parece que faltan elementos en este tema de relevancia del proyecto en términos de la complementariedad con estrategias y políticas en el momento de su concepción y diseño tal como lo expliqué antes sobre su altísima relación con el Programa CRXS, por ser un proyecto que venía a fortalecer una debilidad institucional y de país, porque contribuye a cumplir esas metas de conservación país, contribuye al PND, y en su momento al anterior plan estratégico institucional del SINAC. Entre otros.	Se agregó el siguiente párrafo: "Hubo relevancia desde el diseño del Proyecto debido a su altísima relación con las metas de conservación del país apoyadas por el Programa CRXS, por su enfoque en el fortalecimiento institucional y por su contribución al Plan Nacional de Desarrollo y al Plan Estratégico Institucional del SINAC vigentes al momento de la formulación".
SINAC	33	6	¿Como se identificó este aumento?	Esos datos corresponden a las estimaciones que realiza la Unidad Técnica del Proyecto.
SINAC	35	3	para maquenque NO se logro elaborar el plan de manejo.	Se agregó el siguiente párrafo: "Por último, como conclusión general del proceso de sensibilización en Maquenque, al momento de la finalización de la experiencia no se consideró socialmente viable para el SINAC iniciar la elaboración de un nuevo plan general de manejo para dicho refugio".
SINAC	36	2	"La Coordinación de El Programa Nacional de Humedales fue designada por el Director Ejecutivo del SINAC como el enlace con la PMU en calidad de Coordinadora institucional del proyecto". "Por su parte, El Departamento de Cooperación Técnica y Financiera del SINAC también contribuyó en el seguimiento del Proyecto Humedales".	Se incluyeron ambas propuestas de cambio en el texto.
SINAC	40	3	No creo que esto sea así al menos no de parte de SINAC, creo que SINAC tiene muy claro la importancia de divulgar los resultados y que estén disponible a los usuarios.	Se cambió por: "Si bien es cierto el SINAC tiene clara la importancia de divulgar los resultados entre los usuarios, la evaluación considera que un riesgo para la sostenibilidad es que información como la del INH se maneje

Autor	Página original	Párrafo original	Comentario/Aportación al borrador del informe MTR	Respuesta del equipo del MTR y medidas
				discrecionalmente”.
SINAC	40	3	Debería ir mas allá del SNIT.	Se cambió el párrafo: “El INH debe estar disponible para todo público y esto es posible por medio del SNIT y de otras plataformas”.
S	40	6	Tampoco creo que esto sea un riesgo muy alto sobre todo si el proyecto deja instaladas las bases de datos en SINAC para su utilización, Me parece que un riesgo mayor puede ser que otras instituciones vinculadas al tema de humedales no hagan uso de la información del inventario.	Se modificó por: “A nivel de las AC existe el riesgo de que por falta de presupuesto o de personal no se aprovechen herramientas como el INH, con el que los funcionarios podrían atender denuncias o responder adecuadamente a la solicitud de permisos, reduciendo así las amenazas por el cambio en el uso del suelo. Un riesgo mayor puede ser que otras instituciones vinculadas al tema de humedales no hagan uso de la información del inventario.”.
SINAC	42	7	Ver comentario 3.15. Esto no es correcto, el ejecutor fue SINAC y el PNUD fue la Agencia de implementación. PNUD administró los recursos donados por el GEF.	Se sustituyó por: “El Proyecto se vio altamente favorecido por la experiencia acumulada del PNUD como agencia implementadora y del SINAC como entidad ejecutora de otros proyectos de creación de capacidades en SINAC, lo que los colocó en una posición ideal para aprovechar sus lecciones aprendidas”.
SINAC	42	8	¿Como se mide esto?	Se cambió por: “...con productos que fueron revisados, realimentados y aprobados a satisfacción del SINAC”.
SINAC	43	8	Esto se hace y se hizo para este proyecto, en la fase de PPG (Project Preparation Grant) mediante la cual en esta fase se hacen todos los estudios y análisis que se requieran para que provean los insumos para la formulación del ProDoc. Lamentablemente en el caso de los mecanismos financieros la consultoría que se contrató para este análisis hizo propuestas poco viables de implementar y ya no había tiempo ni recursos para efectuar otra por eso a propuesta del PNUD y con la venia de la Dirección del SINAC se optó por incluir lo que se incluyó como propuesta de mecanismos financieros, en el entendido que había que incluirlo y que en la ejecución del proyecto se intentaría la posibilidad de llevarlos a cabo o en su defecto se identificarían otros.	En el apartado 3.1.1 se incluyó lo siguiente: “En relación a los mecanismos financieros, el SINAC reporta que se contrató una consultoría que hizo propuestas poco viables (Incentivos PES para la conservación de los ecosistemas y de REDD+ / C-Neutralidad). Debido a la falta de tiempo y de recursos para efectuar otro estudio, por recomendación del PNUD y con la venia de la Dirección del SINAC se incluyeron los mecanismos propuestos, en el entendido de que en la implementación del Proyecto se haría un esfuerzo por llevarlos a cabo”.  Se mantiene la Lección No. 2 tal cual, puesto que no se considera que esté en conflicto con la situación planteada.
SINAC	44	12	¿Solo del timbre de parques?	Se amplió la recomendación a los mecanismos en general

## Second round of revisions

Autor	Página versión semi-final	Párrafo original	Comentario/Aportación al borrador del informe MTR	Respuesta del equipo del MTR y medidas
PNUD	10	15	Comentario 1: Para comprensión del lector favor incluir descripción de siglas porque será lo primero que se lee, por ejemplo National System of Conservation Areas, SINAC, etc con PMU, SE, CA, CGR	La página de Acrónimos se movió más adelante para que el lector tenga acceso desde que inicia su lectura del documento. Adicionalmente en el Summary of Conclusions se agregaron los nombres completos junto a los acrónimos citados.

<b>Autor</b>	<b>Página versión semi- final</b>	<b>Párrafo original</b>	<b>Comentario/Aportación al borrador del informe MTR</b>	<b>Respuesta del equipo del MTR y medidas</b>
PNUD	11	1	Comentario 2: Esto es una conclusión de la situación de género del país (no es el propósito de la evaluación), pero no de la intervención o contribución del proyecto en el tema. Se debe considerar para este análisis que el tema de género no se incluyó en diseño análisis pero se dieron esfuerzos y análisis para contribuir en otros proyectos y mejorar el enfoque de género en otros proyectos y en las misma institucionalidad de SINAC.	La conclusión se modificó así: “Aunque el tema de género no se incluyó en diseño del Proyecto, en la implementación sí se hicieron esfuerzos para mejorar el enfoque de género en la institucionalidad de SINAC y contribuir con otros proyectos en ese campo”.
PNUD	11	1	Comentario 3: Me falta leer también en el resumen contribución a planificación nacional e internacional ODS.	Se agregó una conclusión #6 en referencia a los ODS. La conclusión #14 hace referencia a la planificación nacional.
PNUD	11	4	Comentario 4: Para quién es esta acción, el PNH? Creo que queda más clara una redacción que enfatice responsabilidades. Ej. The National Wetland Program and Wetland Focal Points should promote and actively disseminate .....etc	Se clarificó el destinatario de cada recomendación.
PNUD	11	4	Comentario 5: Quién?	Se clarificó el destinatario de cada recomendación.
PNUD	12	1	Comentario 6: Sugerir el responsable de cada acción ayudara al seguimiento y apropiación de las recomendaciones. Usualmente cuando hay una MTE se coloca por actor las acciones que corresponde ej. SINAC Secretariat should: A B C The National Wetland Program: UNDP Conservation Areas Etc Favor incluir la misma observación en la sección correspondiente del informe.	Se estructuró en forma más explícita para que sea fácil de identificar a quién va dirigida cada recomendación. Se incluyó en las secciones correspondientes.
PNUD	13	1	Comentario 7: Incluir las citas de la orientación metodológica de la evaluación	Las citas se incluyeron en el texto.
PNUD	18	9	Comentario 8: Falta poner la razón...porque había financiamiento de otra fuente para este rubro...ACRXS	Se explicó la razón.
PNUD	19	9	Comentario 9: No veo otra parte del texto donde se explica porque se hizo el cambio que tiene suficiente fundamento por ser área habitada y el conflicto social que puede derivarse del mismo.	Se explicó la razón.
PNUD	27	7	Comentario 10: No hubo reporte de nada?	El consultor hizo la solicitud en varias ocasiones y la respuesta fue que esa información no se había actualizado porque las AC no habían pasado sus datos.
PNUD	27	10	Comentario 11: Hay datos de estas contribuciones?	No se ofrecieron montos de estas contribuciones por parte de la Unidad Ejecutora. Simplemente se señaló que se habían dado.
PNUD	36	13	Comentario 12: Me parece que hace falta una mención para contestar esta pregunta de los TDR: How does the project relate to the main	Se ofreció la siguiente respuesta: “The Wetland Project relates to the main objectives of the GEF focal area: It has contributed to

Autor	Página versión semi- final	Párrafo original	Comentario/Aportación al borrador del informe MTR	Respuesta del equipo del MTR y medidas
			objectives of the GEF focal area?	improving the sustainability of Costa Rica's protected areas, specifically those related to wetlands; it has mainstreamed biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, particularly in those wetlands that play a role in the livelihood of local communities; it has safeguarded biodiversity through the control and management of invasive alien species (Typha, pleco fish)".
PNUD	41	3	Comentario 13: Para su consideración una adición.	Se acoge la propuesta con algunas modificaciones.
PNUD	45	3	Comentario 14: Respecto a la pregunta planteada en TDR para responder sobre Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? Creo que es importante establecer que en la medida que se usen los instrumentos INH, Indice Humedales, Planes etc se espera que si se logren conservar, rehabilitar y usar sosteniblemente los recursos. El caso de recuperación de Mata Redonda es muy útil para ilustrar el proceso de recuperación e impacto del humedal durante la vida del proyecto.	Se modificó toda la sección para dar mayor énfasis a responder a la pregunta planteada.

## Annex No. 7: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

### Evaluators:

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

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

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

**Name of Consultant:** Erick Manuel Vargas Campos

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

Signed in *San José, Costa Rica, June 8th, 2018*



## Annex No. 8: 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: _____