# **Final Evaluation**

Project "Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Diversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources"

**Deliverable 3** 

**Final Evaluation Report** 

December 24, 2020

**Evaluator:** 

José Galindo Internacional Evaluator jose@mentefactura.com

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS					
E	XECU	ΓIVE	SUMMARY	8	
1	INTRODUCTION		12		
	1.1	Pur	pose of the Evaluation	12	
	1.2	Sco	pe and Evaluation Methodology	12	
	1.2.	1	Documentation Review		13
	1.2.	2	Collection of Primary Information		14
	1.1.	2	Draft Final Report		14
	1.2.	3	Final Report		15
	1.3	Eva	luation report outline	15	
2	PRO	OJE	CT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	18	
	2.1	Pro	ject start and duration	18	
	2.2	Pro	blems that the project sought to address	18	
	2.3	Are	as of implementation	20	
	2.4	Imn	nediate and development objectives of the Project	21	
	2.5	Bas	eline Indicators established	21	
	2.6	Mai	n stakeholders	23	
	2.7	Exp	pected Results	24	
3	FIN	DIN	GS	26	
	3.1	Pro	ject Design / Formulation	26	
	3.1.	1	Analysis Results Framework		26
	3.1.	2	Assumptions and Risks		27
	3.1.	3	Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design		28
	3.1.	4	Planned stakeholder participation		28
	3.1.	5	Replication approach		29
	3.1.	6	UNDP comparative advantage		30
	3.1.	7	Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector		30
	3.1.	8	Management arrangements		30
	3.2	Pro	ject Implementation	31	

	3.2	1 Adaptive management	31
	3.2	2 Partnership arrangements	34
	3.2	3 Project Finance	35
	3.2	4 Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation	39
	3.2. ope	5 UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution coord rational issues	lination, and 41
	3.3	Project Results	43
	3.3	1 Overall results	43
	3.3	2 Relevance	52
	3.3	3 Effectiveness & Efficiency	53
	3.3	4 Country ownership	55
	3.3	5 Mainstreaming	55
	3.3	6 Sustainability	56
	3.3	7 Impact	58
4	Cor	clusions, Recommendations & Lessons	60
	4.1	Recomendation	62
	4.2	Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, perfo	ormance and
	succe	SS	64
5	AN	NEXES	66
	5.1	Annex 1: ToR	66
	5.2	Annex 2: List of persons interviewed	96
	5.3	Annex 3: List of documents reviewed	98
	5.4	Annex 4: Evaluation Question Matrix – Annex C	99
	5.5	Annex 5: Comparative Matrix of Findings, Conclusions and Recon 105	nmendations
	5.6	Annex 6: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form	116
	5.7	Annex 7: Evaluation report reviewed and approved	117

# Table index

Table 1 Progress towards achieving Outcome 1	45
Table 2 Dragnage towards ashieving Outcome 2	40
Table 2 Progress lowards achieving Outcome 2	48
Table 3 Progress towards achieving Outcome 3	51

# **Graphics Index**

Graphic 1 Organizational structure of the PARG project	31
Graphic 2 Budgetary Execution by Outcome	36
Graphic 3 Budget implementation by type of expenditure	37
Graphic 4 Timeline of the budget execution by type of expenditure	38
Graphic 5 Co-financing executed by the project	39
Graphic 6 Progress of the 3 Outcomes and indicators of the project	44
Graphic 7 Progress of impact indicators	53
Graphic 8 Budget Execution vs.% of Implementation by Component	54

# ACRONYMS

ACUS	Conservation and Sustainable Use Area
ADB	Access and Benefits Sharing
AI	Implementing Agency
AME	Association of Municipalities of Ecuador
AP	Protected Area
APPC	Productivity and Conservation Provincial Area
BD	Biodiversity
BGAE	Amphibians Genome Bank of Ecuador
CC	Climate Change
CDB	Convention on Biological Diversity
CJ	Jambutu Center
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild
	Fauna and Flora
COA	Environmental Organic Code
CONGOPE	Consortium of Decentralized Autonomous Provincial Governments of
Ecuador	
EE	Executing Agency
EF	Final Assessment
EPANB	National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plan
ETAPA	Telecom, water and sewerage Public Company
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GAD	Decentralized Autonomous Government
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GIZ	German Technical Cooperation agency (by its german initials)
HATC	Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer
IEPI	Ecuadorian Institute of Intellectual Property
INABIO	National Institute of Biodiversity
INIAP	National Agricultural Research Institute
INOCAR	Naval Oceanographic Institute
INP	National Fishery Institute
MAAE	Ministry of Environment and Water
MAG	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
MANUD	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
NIM	National Implementation Modality

ODS	Sustainable Development Goals
ONG	Non-governmental organization
PACAE	Amphibian Conservation Action Plan of Ecuador
PARG	Amphibian and Genetic Resources Conservation Project
PANE	Natural Areas State Heritage
PIR	Reportes de Implementación del Proyecto
PN	National Park
PNC	Cajas National Park
PNUMA	United Nations Environment Programme
PNUD	United Nations Development Programme
ProDoc	Project Document
PUCE	Pontifical Catholic University of Ecuador
Senescyt	National Secretariat of Higher Education, Science, Technology and
	Innovation
Senadi	National Service of Intellectual Property Rights
SNAP	National System of Protected Areas
SNGP	National Secretariat of Policy Management
TdR	Terms of Reference
RCU	Regional Coordination Unit
PMU	Project Management Unit
UICN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
USD	US Dollars
VUE	Ecuadorian Virtual Plaform

Project Title	Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Diversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources			
GEF Project ID:	PIMS 5314	PIF approval date	November 6, 2013	
UNDP Project ID:	00094106	CEO authorization date	May 20, 2015	
Term of the evaluation		Date of the evaluation report	November 26, 2020	
Agency (es) GEF:	UNDP	ProDoc Signature Date/ Actual Project Start Date:	July 10, 2015	
Country (es)	Ecuador	Operational Closing Date:	December 31, 2020	
Other Partners Involved:	Latin America	Fun	ding	
Other Partners Involved:	Socio Implementador: MAAE; Local Strategic Partner: Otonga Foundation	GEF Funding: (USD)	2.726.908	
	through the Jambatu Center	Total Co- Financing: (USD)	14,216,124	
		Total Project Cost: (USD):	16.943.032	
Evaluator	José Galindo			
Acknowledgment The evaluator appreciates the information and comments provided by project stakeholders, as well as their participation in interviews, including institutions such as MAAE, UNDP, Fundación Otonga - Centro Jambatu, Universidad Regional Amazónica Ikiam. As well as key actors representing ETAPA EP, Bioparque Amaru, Provincial GADs, ProAmazonía.				

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

#### **Project Description**

The project was designed to safeguard global importance biodiversity in Ecuador through creating capacities for genetic resources access and benefit sharing, as well as generating and strengthening new protected areas. The long-term goal for Ecuador is to implement comprehensive emergency actions to conserve amphibian diversity and use their genetic resources in a sustainable way. To achieve this, an intervention strategy that addressed the following five axes, was proposed: i) in situ conservation actions; ii) ex situ conservation actions; iii) multidisciplinary and cooperative research to find out active compounds derived from the cutaneous secretions with potential applications in biomedicine in Ecuadorian amphibians; iv) monitoring of high risk of extinction species; v) institutional strengthening to implement biodiversity conservation measures and genetic resources sustainable use in Ecuador, using amphibians as a pilot study case.

#### **Evaluation Rating Table**

Project performance rating		
Criteria	Score	
Monitoring and Evaluation		
M&E design at project start up	4 (MS)	
M&E Plan Implementation	4 (MS)	
Overall quality of M&E	4 (MS)	
IA & EA Execution		
Implementing Agency Execution	5 (S)	
Execution Agency Execution	5 (S)	
Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution	5 (S)	
Outcomes		
Relevance	2 (R)	
Efectiveness	5 S)	
Efficiency	5 (S)	
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	5 (S)	
Sustainability		
Financial resources 2 (MU)		
Socio-economic	3 (ML)	
Institutional framework and governance	3 (ML)	
Environmental	3 (ML)	
Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability	3 (ML)	
Impact		
Environmental Status Improvement 3 (S)		
Environmental Stress Reduction 2 (M)		
Progress towards stress/status change 3 (S)		
Overall Project Results	3 (S)	

#### **Table Assessment Rating**

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings	Impact Ratings:
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	4: Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3: Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2: Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1: Unlikely (U): severe risks	2: Relevant (R) 1: Not relevant (NR)	3: Significant (S) 2: Minimal (M) 1: Negligible (N)

#### Main conclusions, recommendations and learned lessons

#### **Conclusions**

- The project is highly relevant for the country, as it is a pioneering experience in the practical implementation of Nagoya Protocol, which has been recognized by those interviewed as the most ambitious intervention, which marks a milestone in conservation and research of amphibians in Ecuador.
- 2. The project design is clear, specific and addresses the relevant and necessary aspects for a comprehensive intervention. Among the innovative design elements, the commitment to position and strengthen *ex situ* conservation, stands out, in addition to *in situ* conservation approaches, which have traditionally been more attended by international cooperation projects. Likewise, it proposes a modality of NIM implementation for the first time in Ecuador.
- 3. The project was implemented in a very dynamic institutional, political and economic context, which registered important changes in relation to the initial assumptions with which it was designed, highlighting the following: 1) Validity of Social Economy Knowledge, Creativity and Innovation Organic Code or Ingenios Code; 2) MAAE Institutional reform; 3) Economic crisis and fiscal austerity policies; 4) Institutional capacity to fulfill implementation arrangements; 5) COVID 19. Flexibility to make changes and adjustments both at a strategic and operational level, stands out. Likewise, the ability to solve challenges and difficulties that, in some cases, exceed the project team capacity and scope.

- 4. Regarding the achievement of project's goals, in general terms it can be considered that they have been fulfilled, but not in the magnitude and accordance with the originally established expectations. Although the highest performance was demonstrated in the first two project outcomes, there is a record of unmet goals that are associated with factors outside the project's management and scope, as well as the uncertainty that exists at the time of formulating goals.
- 5. Perspective of interventions sustainability presents important risks, fundamentally from the financial perspective, considering fiscal adjustment measures and budget cut at institutions involved in monitoring the project. From the institutional perspective, the project has laid the foundations to generate a response capacity and inter-institutional coordination in these issues, however, short- and medium-term sustainability will depend on MAAE leadership and ability to maintain others actors' commitment and involvement.

### Recommendations

- Future projects design should consider with greater priority and detail the political, economic and financial risks treatment, since they end up being decisive for the success or failure of a project; it is recommended to explicitly incorporate concrete strategies and tools to mitigate them.
- 2. It is essential that during the start-up phase a specific planning is generated to clearly define and interpret the project indicators. Indicators monitoring and follow-up require specifying their interpretation, baseline, proposing their measurement methodology, timing, means of verification and responsible person or institution.
- It is essential to uphold concatenation and logical order in the intervention. While certain actions can be carried out later than planned, others such as the Amphibian Action Plan, are neuralgic and their delay affects the entire chain of results.
- 4. In the short term, it is necessary to provide technical support to Carchi and Guayas GADP, so that they include within their 2021 operating budgets, resources to support the implementation of Management Plans first activities, generated for the new conservation areas.
- 5. It is essential that the exit strategy document is shared with the different project partners so that they can take action on time.

#### Lessons learned

1. Projects that intend to create new conservation areas must consider technical and specialized support for social issues, within their budget. The ability to generate trusting relationships, design mechanisms for benefit access, conflict resolution and, in general,

relationship with the community, cannot be responsibility of biologists and technicians with training in science exclusively.

2. Adaptive capacity and team project flexibility to lead the process of competencies change, that the Ingenios Code brought, is valued. In contexts of high uncertainty and institutional reform, these projects can play a key role in convening stakeholders and facilitating the process of inter-institutional dialogue and coordination. For this reason, the PMU must seek a balanced relationship between the different partners and project actors, avoiding bias and maintaining impartiality.

# **1** INTRODUCTION

# 1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

The Final Evaluation (FE) will evaluate the achievement of the project results and will allow to draw lessons that can improve the sustainability of the benefits of this project and help in the general improvement of UNDP programming.

The specific objectives of the evaluation were:

- a) Examine the effectiveness and effectiveness with which the project achieved the expected results.
- b) Evaluate the relevance and sustainability of benefits as contributions to outcomes in the medium and long term.
- c) Present a comprehensive and systematic description of performance at the end of the Project cycle.
- d) Document the impacts, lessons learned, best practices and products generated in the project design, execution and management, which may be of interest for replication in other country projects and in other parts of the world.
- e) Provide specific recommendations to make the necessary adjustments in the closing of the Project and during the remaining time, in order to improve the results and the positive impacts.

# **1.2 Scope and Evaluation Methodology**

The proposed methodology sought an active interaction between the evaluator, the UNDP Country Office, the project team, and other stakeholders, in order to enrich the evaluation process and allow timely feedback on the findings.



#### Source: UNDP Guide for Assessments

At all times, the consultancy used a participatory and inclusive approach, based on data derived from programmatic, financial and monitoring documents, and a reasonable level of direct participation of interested parties. As a result of the evaluation process, conclusions have been reached on the different aspects of the project, the activities carried out, their contribution to the central objective and the three project Outcomes.

Initially, on July 16, 2020, a first Skype meeting was held between representatives of UNDP, Project team and the evaluator. The objective was the presentation of the evaluators, as well as the definition of delivery times and coordination mechanisms between the evaluation team and the designated counterparts.

It should be noted that during the final evaluation there were certain limitations regarding the collection of primary information due to the new normal that exists due to the COVID-19 pandemic. In this sense and in order for the evaluation to be feasible, credible and useful, special care was taken with the different methods applied, in order to reduce the information gaps.

# 1.2.1 Documentation Review

As the first key task of the evaluation and to ensure the correct transfer of information, after the first meeting, a list of information necessary for the evaluation was sent (Annex 1), which includes but is not limited to the following:

- Project Document (ProDoc)
- Project Identification Form (PIF)
- Project Implementation Review (PIR)
- Annual Progress Reports
- Quarterly Report on Progress and Project Achievements
- Combined Delivery Reports (CDR)
- Summary of the METT Sheet
- Audit Report
- Minutes of the Meeting of the Project Board
- Project intervention maps.
- Contract Products of Components 1 and 2.
- Document of adjustment to the Logical Framework of the Project.
- Inception Workshop Report.

The information was received by email, in cases where the size was greater than 7 MB, the documentation was sent through the WeTransfer platform. Based on the review, a detailed description of the Project was carried out covering the problem identified, the established objectives, outcomes, outputs and their respective activities. Subsequently, an evaluation framework was established that combines the guidance questions for the five key criteria and categories of Project performance evaluation (formulation and design, execution, results, monitoring and evaluation).

This initial exercise defined the scope and qualitative and quantitative indicators, which are essential to evaluate the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and impact of the interventions

carried out to achieve the objectives proposed in the project's logical framework and its sustainability.

# 1.2.2 Collection of Primary Information

Due to the current context, it was not possible to carry out field visits or work with focus groups, which is why special emphasis was placed on remote interviews. Especially the Zoom platform was used in most of the cases; To a lesser extent, WhatsApp and telephone calls were also used to attend to the interviewees who participated from the rural sector. The support of the team and the personnel deployed in the field was essential to coordinate and engage the interviewees, even so, the agreed term for the interview period had to be made more flexible, due to the difficulty in setting up some interviews.

# 1.1.1.1 Semi-structured interviews

The consultative approach of the evaluation contemplated conducting interviews with representatives of various sectors (governmental, non-governmental, cooperation agencies, beneficiaries, other actors). This allowed generating reflections, and first-hand information about the different stages of the project's life cycle.

In the context of the new normal to ensure the quality of the remote assessment and its findings, the list of potential key actors to be interviewed was expanded. Previously, the project team identified a universe of 43 potential interviewees, who have participated in the different phases of the project (design, execution and closure). Of this group, 37 people were interviewed. The interviews were individual with an approximate duration of 50 minutes. The interviewees were informed at all times about the confidentiality of their responses.

For the interviews, a questionnaire focused on the participation of the different actors according to their role in the implementation of the project was used. The questions for the evaluation follow the five criteria indicated in Annex C of the Terms of Reference (ToRs), as well as other proposals by the evaluator based on the project information (Annex 2).

The interviews were formally requested by the Project Coordinator and once the invitations had been sent, the evaluator coordinated with the interviewees the day, hour and a half to use for each interview. For all interviews, the evaluator sent the meeting link in advance.

# 1.1.2 Draft Final Report

With the information collected, both in interviews and the documentation collected was transcribed and ordered. Subsequently, it was grouped into several categories that concentrate the ideas, concepts or similar themes found in the evaluation. This made it

possible to identify the emerging trends and patterns (as well as divergent perspectives) of the project, seen by different actors involved in its implementation.

Triangulation techniques were used to prepare the draft evaluation report, in order to reinforce the credibility and validity of the findings, judgments and conclusions obtained. The triangulation involved a double or triple check of the results of the data analysis by cross-comparing the information obtained through each data collection method (desk study, semi-structured interviews).

The evaluation was carried out on the four categories of project progress established by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP):

- 1. **Project strategy:** The extent to which the project intervention objectives contributed to Ecuador being able to implement comprehensive emergency actions to conserve amphibian diversity and use their genetic resources in a sustainable way was evaluated. In addition, the capacity of the project to cover the problems and needs encountered was analyzed, as well as the extent to which environmental sustainability, rights, gender and intercultural approaches were taken into account, and the flexibility of the design in the face of changes in the context. political and institutional.
- 2. **Progress and Achievement of Outcomes:** The indicators of the Strategic Outcomes Framework were used as the basis for the evaluation and for the analysis of progress towards the expected results.
- 3. **Project execution and Adaptive Management:** The effectiveness and efficiency of the process was evaluated, that is, the extent to which economic, human and technical resources and inputs have been converted into results.
- 4. **Sustainability:** The probability of sustainability of the Project Outcomes, once the project ends, was examined. For this analysis, financial, socioeconomic, governance and environmental risks that could affect the sustainability of the project were evaluated.

All this analysis made possible the formulation and justification of conclusions that in turn fed the formulation of a number of recommendations that have a technical and practical nature, and reflect a realistic understanding of the project's achievements.

# 1.2.3 Final Report

The final evaluation report will incorporate comments, clarifications, suggestions and recommendations received from UNDP and the project team and other reviewers on the draft report. Once this version has been submitted, the reviewers should send additional comments or a note of approval of the FE report.

# 1.3 Evaluation report outline

(I) EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Project Summary Table
- Project Description (brief)

- Evaluation Rating Table
- Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons

#### (II) INTRODUCTION

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Scope & Methodology
- Structure of the evaluation report

#### (III) PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

- Project start and duration
- Problems that the project sought to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Baseline Indicators established
- Main stakeholders
- Expected Results

### (IV) FINDINGS

- 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
- 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
- Project Results
  - ✓ Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
  - ✓ Relevance (\*)
  - ✓ Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
  - ✓ Country ownership
  - ✓ Mainstreaming
  - ✓ Sustainability (\*)
  - ✓ Impact

#### (V) 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

# (VI) ANNEXES

- ToR •

- Itinerary
  List of persons interviewed
  Summary of field visits
  List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of resultsEvaluation Consultant Agreement Form

## 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

#### 2.1 Project start and duration

On November 6, 2013, the project concept note is approved by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF), and subsequently, on May 19, 2015, the project receives approval for its implementation for a period of 5 years (June 2015 - May 2020). The project began operations in October 2015, once the Project Management Unit (PMU) was formed, and it carried out the inception workshop on February 17, 2016. The new project closing date is December 31, 2020, prior approval by UNDP / GEF Regional.

#### 2.2 Problems that the project sought to address

Limited capacity to deliver the extreme measures for the conservation of amphibians During the design of the project, it was identified that the granting of permits to extract individuals from their habitat for ex situ conservation did not have legal permits issued by the MAAE, thus the efforts to rescue and study populations in danger of extinction they had stopped. ProDoc argues that the nature of the requirements and procedures for obtaining institutional and collection permits for ex situ conservation of genetic resources were ambiguous, as was the ability to receive, review and approve these permits.

In relation to in situ conservation, according to the latest report from the Red List of Amphibians, 10% of the species are outside the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP by its acronym in Spanish). Although there was an Ecuadorian legal framework that grants GADs the authority to establish and manage protected areas, their contribution was still limited by information gaps and accessibility in priority habitats, for critically endangered species, and the lack of technical support and guidance on how to create and maintain these reserves.

# Insufficient technology and local capacity for research and genetic resource conservation of amphibians

There was a clear need for collaboration with international institutions with the required expertise and technical knowledge in this field. In past years there has been a significant

increase in the Ecuadorian pharmaceutical industry, but its importance as a supplier and as a research promoter is still incipient

Biotechnology and biomedicine sectors are characterized by a multidisciplinary membership and a high level of training in terms of human resources. Strong research programmes in country backed by academia, private sector and government in which their talent can be used are limited. While several universities have laboratories that can perform some basic analyses, there was no fully-functional laboratory in Ecuador that has the capacity to do indepth bioprospecting and/or cryopreservation for the establishment of a Genome Bank.

Ecuador's achievements in amphibian research and conservation, until the project was designed, were mostly the result of personal efforts, motivated by research interests and individual leadership. National or institutional policies to foster research were limited and were not enough given time frames.

# Weak institutional and regulatory capacity for conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources

In the legal and regulatory sphere, the project encountered weaknesses and shortcomings that prevented the implementation of Access to Benefit Sharing (ABS) and scientific research agreements. In addition, Executive Decree 905 on access to genetic resources was still in the process of formalizing, regarding the fair and equitable distribution of benefits and free, prior and informed consent (FPIC), which was considered too general. To reflect the diversity of situations that surround it and characterize the different groups of living organisms. In addition, although there was a strategic plan for amphibian conservation, it still needed official recognition from the MAAE to channel sufficient resources for its implementation. In addition, specific and proactive legal frameworks were still necessary to respond to new challenges and threats faced by amphibians, including the appearance of new policies to promote mining, oil extraction and the construction of mega infrastructures that would put them at greater risk of extinction of many populations of endemic amphibians that live outside of Protected Areas (PA).

At the institutional level, Ecuador did not have an established protocol to guide the process, define the times and criteria to guarantee an effective and efficient evaluation of requests related to access to genetic resources for economic and / or commercial purposes, and in order to investigation. In addition, when the project was designed, the Genetic Resources

Unit of the MAAE had limited personnel (three technicians) who are in charge of all ABS processes, and did not coordinate with the personnel of national institutions with advice from ABS (Ecuadorian Institute Ecuatoriano of Intellectual Property - IEPI, National Institute of Agricultural Research - INIAP, Senecyt, National Fisheries Institute - INP, Secretariat for Policy Management).

Regarding decision-making, information gaps and limited access to existing data impeded successful decision-making processes of national authorities with some main actors, still uninformed about the crisis faced by amphibians and potential new strategies for the development.

#### 2.3 Areas of implementation

*Ex situ:* the project carried out the search and collection of individuals of parental species for ex situ conservation, throughout several provinces of the country (Zamora Chinchipe and Azuay) and in the Amphibian Genome Bank, in areas where they existed Latest reports / sightings of the 10 target species (originally there were 9, but the recently rediscovered Atelopus ignescens was included. This geographic area was chosen because of the imminent threats of habitat destruction and fragmentation of the target species, and contamination caused by the agricultural, livestock, forestry and mining activities in the area. On the other hand, preliminary research in the area suggested a high level of endemism and biodiversity, with a high probability of new species. The areas where the target species for this project were found were located outside the protected areas of the Cordillera del Cóndor which, combined with the pressure of mining operations s on a large scale, they were less likely to be targeted by in situ conservation activities to protect them.

*In situ:* the project carried out in situ conservation through the creation of two new provincial reserves Decentralized Autonomous Governments (GAD by its acronymus in spanish) of Carchi and Guayas and the strengthening of the management efficiency through amphibian conservation measures in the National Park El Cajas (Heritage of Natural Areas of the State - PANE-Azuay). In Carchi, the project supported the establishment of a GAD provincial reserve along the Chico Chinambí river in the Jijón and Caamaño parish, in the Mira canton; in Guayas, the creation of a GAD provincial reserve in the Naranjal canton, on the border with Azuay. These provincial GADs were chosen for their commitment to conservation and their interest in conserving the critical habitat of the endangered amphibian species prioritized by the project. These GADs already had established conservation units and

technical capacities and, as such, offered greater chances of post-project sustainability, as well as their replication in other areas within the provinces. Additionally, the project supported the incorporation of the first private protected area to the SNAP, it is Bellavista in the Chocó Andino Biosphere Reserve.

# 2.4 Immediate and development objectives of the Project

The project objective is Ecuador implements integrated emergency actions to conserve the diversity of amphibians of Ecuador and use its genetic resources in a sustainable way. This will be achieved by 3 interrelated outcomes (1. Emergency actions to ensure the survival of highly endangered amphibian species of Ecuador for conservation and bio-prospecting purposes; 2. Discovery of active compounds derived from the skin secretion of Ecuadorian amphibians with potential applications in biomedicine; and 3. Institutional strengthening for the implementation of biodiversity conservation measures and sustainable use of its genetic resources in Ecuador, using amphibians as a pilot case study) and an international strategy that includes national and local actions. The overall results of the Objective will enable the conservation in situ and ex situ of highly endangered amphibian species; close amphibian conservation gaps by increasing the hectares of critical habitat subject to amphibian conservation measures; increase the flow of resources to amphibian conservation/ABS; and provide the basis for strengthening public policy regarding official guidelines on amphibian requirements for environmental licensing of development and/or conservation and extractive activities that impact on key habitat.

#### 2.5 Baseline Indicators established

- 1. Increase in additional hectares of habitat critical for conservation of target amphibian species that is under legal protection thereby closing conservation gaps.
- 2. Replication of in situ amphibian conservation measures tested by project further reducing conservation gaps.
- 3. Number of amphibian species on updated IUCN red list
  - under successful captive breeding
  - with cryopreserved sperm samples viable for reproductive
  - with skins or secretions preserved in the Ecuadorian Amphibian Genome Bank (EAGB)
- 4. Increase in the flow of resources to amphibian conservation/ABS
- 5. Degree of compliance in environmental licensing with regards to official guidelines on amphibian conservation in sites prioritized in the National Strategic Plan

- 6. % Reduction in processing times for Collection Permits, Framework Contracts, and Access Contracts
- 7. # of protected areas and hectares of habitat critical for amphibians with specific conservation measures for highly endangered amphibian species legally-recognized and integrated in the SNAP.
- 8. Increase in management effectiveness of 3 legally-recognized PAs with conservation measures for highly endangered amphibian species (METT)
- 9. Successful captive breeding programmes measured by:
  - # of reproductive events (egg mass) of target species
  - % survival of rescued individuals in captivity
- 10. Active compounds1 isolated and structurally characterized (peptides and natural proteins sequenced) from the skin secretions of 4 amphibians:
  - 1= Agalychnis spurelli
  - 2= Cruziohyla calcarifer
  - 3= Hypsiboas picturatus
  - 4= Atelopus nanay
- 11. *#* of new peptides synthesized and pharmacologically tested from the skin secretions of 4 amphibian species
- 12. # of students with Senescyt scholarships pursuing graduate studies in amphibian bio-prospecting
- 13. Ecuadorian bio-prospecting laboratory equipped with appropriate technology and conducting research on amphibian bio-prospecting
- 14. # of publications in peer review scientific journals on bio-prospecting research on amphibian skin secretions by Ecuadorian Institutions
- 15. % Ecuadorian amphibian species with tissues preserved in the Ecuadorian Amphibian Genome Bank (EAGB)
- 16. Strengthened policy and regulations measured by:
  - % implementation of the Strategic Action Plan for Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibians
  - Nagoya Protocol ratified
  - Regulation 905 aligned with national, sub-regional and international legislation
- 17. Improved capacities of national ABS implementing agencies, measured by the ABS Capacity Development Scorecard
- 18. % Reduction in processing times for Collection Permits, Framework Contracts, and Access Contracts
- 19. Increase in awareness on amphibian conservation as measured by
  - Increase in users accessing ABS-CH Platform
  - Increase in records of amphibians from unofficial sources

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In this context an active compound is synonymous with peptide or protein.

# 2.6 Main stakeholders

Stakeholder s	Implementation role
Ministerio del Ambiente y Agua de Ecuador	The MAE is the National Environmental Authority of Ecuador, and plays a crucial role in ensuring the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. Thus, it will be the primary coordinator of activities within and between the three proposed components. In addition, it will be the agency responsible for implementing the institutional strengthening component. Therefore, as a national beneficiary and funding agency, it must be involved in all of the phases of the project, from design and implementation to monitoring and closure.
Secretaría Técnica Planifica Ecuador	Plays an important technical and coordinating role in bringing together the different levels of government, since it is involved in approving and allocating the resources of the national government and GADs which are co-financing the project. This Secretariat will provide technical assistance and oversight for the planning and implementation processes of the project, in order to guarantee its sustainability in all phases.
National Higher Education, Science and Technology Secretariat (Senecyt)	Senecyt will provide fundamental support in strengthening local technical and scientific capacity, promoting the opportunity to bring professional experts in fields related to bioprospecting, to help design, develop and consolidate the country's flagship education projects. In addition, young professionals can benefit from graduate research scholarships to carry out bioprospecting. As an ABS evaluating entity, it will be responsible for guaranteeing that the specific frameworks for access to genetic resources are in line with the parameters of related public policies.
ABS Assessing bodies	Some Government institutions and national research institutes are assessing bodies, responsible for developing evaluation reports on research and development proposals on Ecuadorian genetic resources. These reports help the MAAE granting or denying access permissions. They include the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG), The National Institute of Agricultural Research (INIAP), the National Fisheries Institute (INP), the Naval Oceanographic Institute (INOCAR), the newly created National Institute of Biodiversity, among others. They will benefit from training and information exchange and will coordinate with sectorial programs of relevance.
IKIAM Amazonic Regional University	One of the lines of research of the IKIAM is the bioprospecting of amphibians, and therefore it plays an important role in supporting implementation, especially in component two of the project, although its will also be involved through its qualified scientists who will support the implementation of a number of lines of action. Furthermore, the university will be one of the national institutions to benefit from the exchange and transfer of technology.
Decentralized	There are three types of GADs: (1) Provincial: the exclusive mandates of
Autonomous	provincial governments include guaranteeing the provision of public services, fostering provincial economic activities, and environmental management, and they can also designate provincial conservation areas and as such will be key
(GAD)	partners in Output 1.2. (2) Municipal: municipal GADs are legally authorized to maintain and preserve the natural heritage within their jurisdictions. (3) Rural Parish governments: Parish GADs are strategic partners because of their
	closeness to the population, and their potential to help generate associative

Stakeholder s	Implementation role
	processes related to the proper management of possible <i>in situ</i> conservation zones.
International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	The IUCN will provide technical support in updating the red list of endangered species of amphibians in Ecuador.
Jambatu Center Amphibian Research and Conservation (Otonga Foundation)	The Jambatu Center will implement the <i>ex situ</i> conservation components of Outcome 1; it will provide support to the activities of the MAE as a scientific advisor for institutional strengthening efforts, and will be a local scientific partner for the research and bioprospecting components of Outcome 2.
Amaru Amphibian Rescue Center (Cuenca)	The Amaru Rescue Center will work with the Jambatu Center to co-implement the <i>ex situ</i> conservation component, to rescue and breed one of the target species in captivity ( <i>Atelopus nanay</i> ). In addition, it will help with searching for and gathering species in the southern part of the country to use in the Genome Bank.
ETAPA	La Empresa de Telecomunicaciones, Agua Potable y Alcantarillado (ETAPA EP) es un socio estratégico para la conservación <i>in situ</i> de A. nanay debido a que en el año 2010 firmó el "Acuerdo entre el Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y el Municipio de Cuenca, para la gestión del Parque Nacional Cajas", lo que puso a ETAPA EP al frente del Parque Nacional del Cajas a través de su Departamento de Gestión Ambiental.
Indigenous Peoples and Nationalities of Ecuador	There are no known traditional uses by the indigenous nationalities and peoples of Ecuador of the frog species subject to this project's studies. If new peptides are discovered and new products with commercial value are likely to be produced indigenous nationalities such as Awa and Tsáchilas as stakeholders would receive benefits when the distribution of the species subject to bioprospecting analysis overlaps with the territories of these nationalities.
Molecular Therapeutics Laboratory of Queen's University	The Queen's University of Belfast will be in charge of carrying out research on the skin secretions of amphibians in order to synthesize chemical compounds to be analyzed by bio-medicine professionals, and will play a decisive role in transferring technologies and building research capacities in the field of amphibian bioprospecting.

# 2.7 Expected Results

According to the project document (ProDoc) the following Outcomes and Output were established:

# Outcome 1 – Emergency actions to ensure the survival of highly endangered amphibian species of Ecuador for conservation and bio-prospecting purposes

*Output 1.1:* Ex situ conservation through breeding actions to protect highly endangered amphibian species

*Output 1.2* In situ conservation of critical habitats of unique species at high risk of extinction in Decentralized Autonomous Government (GAD) reserves and PANE

Outcome 2 – Discovery of active compounds derived from the skin secretion of Ecuadorian amphibians with potential applications in biomedicine

*Output 2.1* Institutional procedures completed to foster amphibian bio-prospecting research

*Output 2.2* Research on skin secretions for new peptides with bioactive properties from four species of Ecuadorian amphibians

*Output 2.3* Technical and scientific capabilities for bio-prospecting improved

Output 2.4 BioBanking of genetic resources of Ecuadorian amphibians strengthened

Outcome 3: Institutional strengthening for the implementation of biodiversity conservation measures and sustainable use of its genetic resources in Ecuador, using amphibians as a pilot case study

*Output 3.1* National and local frameworks aligned for conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources of amphibians

*Output 3.2* Improved capacities of National Competent Authority and related agencies on ABS, including procedures and Prior Informed Consent & Mutually Agreed Terms

*Output 3.3* National information improved and available for effective decision making on protection and sustainable use of genetic resources of endangered amphibians

#### 3 FINDINGS

#### 3.1 Project Design / Formulation

#### 3.1.1 Analysis Results Framework

In general terms, the interviewees emphasize that it is a balanced project, which encompasses *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation approaches, research, and institutional strengthening. The project design is considered as a clear, specific one that addresses the relevant and necessary aspects for a comprehensive intervention.

Among the innovative elements of the design the commitment to position and strengthen *ex situ* conservation is mentioned, in addition to *in situ* conservation approaches, which have traditionally been more attended by international cooperation projects. Likewise, an innovation in terms of implementation modality is mentioned, which considered a mixed approach that combines direct national execution with assisted execution by UNDP.

Even though the design shows quality in the proposal and is not short on details, complying with GEF requirements, there are inconsistencies between objective and Outcomes that were expected to be achieved in the five-year implementation, particularly because some of the goals are subject to factors that are beyond the project team's scope, such as necessary reforms to reduce time to obtain permits and paperwork related to researching. Likewise, in relation to Outcome 3, the interviewees mention that it is not clear enough how the two outputs and their activities are going to achieve the established goals, considering the instability and the changes experienced in the national institutional framework, as well as the actual extent of a project that develops change and reform proposals may have, but at the same time it does not have a real chance of influencing its adoption.

Definition of indicators and goals for the objective and outputs, responds to SMART criteria (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Temporary), despite the uncertainty at the time of designing, due to the lack of enough information on prioritized species. It was mentioned, for example, that the number of molecules that could discovered in each species was unknown. According to several interviewees, proposed values were ambitious, especially with species *Boana picturata* and *Atelopus nanay* for which it had been considered that it would be more difficult to reach the goal due to the few investigations since they belong to a different taxonomic group.

According to amphibian specialists, there is a weakness respect to the terminology used to determinate goals, that in certain cases was not totally clear. An example of this is the term "pharmacologically proven".

In addition, it is evident that the design of the Project Document (ProDoc) and its indicators do not have mid-term goals, which responds to the ProDoc format that was in force at the time of designing the project. However, interviewees coincide in mentioning that the progress measurement in the medium term, in some indicators, had allowed to take corrective actions earlier.

Along with indicators line, there are no indicators related to gender and indigenous community's participation or the creation of networks, but it is due to for the GEF fifth replenishment, their inclusion was not a requirement. In general, the design does not consider an explicit gender approach.

The budget limitation and distribution of resources in the different outcomes were mentioned as a key aspect of the design. On the one hand, allocation of GEF resources to *ex situ* conservation activities was prioritized, keeping the spirit of addressing critical aspects that are less developed in the country. However, important gaps are mentioned, such as the absence of social profiles to accompany the process of declaring protected areas, resources for environmental education or to implement productive activities that accompany and complement the community commitment to territory conservation, were not considered. Consequently, the design put a strong pressure on the PMU to raise counterpart financing and manage the necessary financing to meet the outcomes.

#### 3.1.2 Assumptions and Risks

The interviewees coincide in mentioning that the design was very ambitious, considering the starting point and the available budget. Interviewees' opinion was that the initial design assumptions turned out to be too optimistic, which is attributed to the fact that the project was conceived in a different political and economic context. For example, expectation of co-financing was not consistent with an implementation context characterized by fiscal austerity and reform of the state apparatus. By changing authorities, the priority given to scientific research changed, as example, it is mentioned that at the time of starting the implementation, one of the key partners - Amazon Regional University Ikiam-, did not have the physical infrastructure or the necessary equipment to achieve the results.

None of the identified risks were classified as a high one; most of them mainly correspond to intervention technical aspects, but institutional, political and financial aspects are not mention and that ended up being decisive for the project development. Change of government, inherent rotation of key positions in the public sector, as well as the complexity related to inter-institutional coordination were not considered in the risk analysis. Even though the project proposes a novel implementation modality that involves shared execution with the MAAE, no assumption or risk associated with the capacity and conditions necessary to achieve it, is mentioned, which, in a long term. proved to be an unviable option.

#### 3.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design

The project design was benefited from a long tradition of GEF-funded projects in Ecuador, which have left a series of learned lessons over the years, which translate into a national capacity to design and implement this kind of projects. As it is a pioneering project in the country, in relation to amphibians, and given the fact that there are few related projects in the region, the design does not explicitly collect lessons from similar projects comparable to this intervention.

The ProDoc mentions that learned lessons have been considered on issues related to environmental and social risks, as well as the appropriate mitigation and management measures of the following projects: i) Strengthening the Implementation of Genetic Resources Access and Benefit Sharing schemes in Latin America and Caribbean (GEF-United Nations Environment Program - UNEP); ii) Mainstreaming agrobiodiversity use and conservation in public policies in three Andean provinces (GEF - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations - FAO); iii) Advanced approaches of GEF-UNDP in the Ecuador SNAP to improve global conservation of threatened flora and fauna.

#### 3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation

The design promotes a different scales intervention that go from territorial to national scope, involving the participation of a wide group of institutions and actors. Under MAAE leadership, the design involved institutions such as Senescyt, Amazon Regional University Ikiam, National Service of Intellectual Property Rights (Senadi), INABIO, ETAPA, as well as Carchi and Guayas provincial governments.

The proposed local strategic partner was the Otonga Foundation through the Jambatu Center for Amphibian Research and Conservation, based on trajectory and technical capacity related to amphibians. The Center collaborated in the project design.

The project proposed an organizational structure that includes a Board of Directors made up of MAAE, UNDP, and Amazon Regional University Ikiam; a Technical Committee that comprised the National Director of Biodiversity, UNDP, ETAPA, Amazon Regional University Ikiam and Otonga Foundation. This structure was changed during the execution of the project due to the Ingenios Code came into force, which reconfigured MAAE competences and assigned others to Senescyt, Senadi and INABIO. The Board of Directors subsequently incorporated Senescyt and the Technical Committee invited the German Technical Cooperation (GIZ), Senadi and INABIO.

The interviewees value the early incorporation in the design of academic actors, private sector institutions and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO), that mobilized participation of institutions such as Queen's University and different researchers with a recognized working with amphibians in the country. Communities were represented through their leaders and participated directly in the implementation, particularly in the conservation areas declaration.

Other actors that were identified during the design of the ProDoc did not participate during the project execution. This is the case of Pontifical Catholic University of Ecuador (PUCE), whose Museum of Zoology had launched tissue preservation in 95% ethanol at -20°C or - 80°C for its zoological collections, including amphibians. Furthermore, MAAE had signed one of the first framework contracts for research purposes in the country with PUCE. Considering that scientific community and resources to carry out research are limited in the country, it is regrettable that differences of personal or professional nature have not allowed that design and implementation to have an active participation of this important actor.

#### 3.1.5 Replication approach

The project design identified at least three concrete replication opportunities, two of which refer to the possibility of implementing conservation measures focusing on amphibians and their critical habitats, both in the SNAP and in the Socio Bosque areas. The third one is related to potential replication of scientific research activities, since the methodologies for research on frog peptides are used to study other species of amphibians and other poisons derived from reptiles, scorpions and insects.

### 3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage

UNDP's comparative advantage lies in its projects global network, has wide experience in formulation and implementation of biodiversity conservation projects, and it is the implementing agency with the most GEF-funded projects. It adds value to the interventions from a comprehensive perspective that links the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and it is articulated with national development policies. The project is aligned with the action framework for the development of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Ecuador.

In Ecuador, UNDP has a long tradition of collaboration with MAAE at the implementation of projects with GEF, for which, over the years, it has maintained a portfolio of environmental projects that allows it to benefit of synergies and articulate different interventions in territory.

### 3.1.7 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

The design describes the following projects that are developed simultaneously at different scales, offering the potential to maximize the project impact: i) Updating of National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAP); ii) Sustainable financing of SNAP; iii) Advanced approaches to improve global conservation of threatened flora and fauna; iv) Small Grants Program; v) Strengthening the implementation of access to genetic resources and fair and equitable benefits sharing in Latin America; vi) ABS global project.

#### 3.1.8 Management arrangements

The project was executed under the National Implementation Modality (NIM) with UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency (AI) and Ministry of the Environment and Water as the Implementing Partner. In this role, MAAE assumed the responsibility for the project implementation at programmatic, administrative and financial levels, and was responsible for the approval of the project's outcomes.

The Ministry of the Environment and Water as Implementing Partner at the beginning, as established in the Project Document, was in charge of executing the funds through the Harmonized Method for Cash Transfer (HATC), making direct money transfers by UNDP. Given the delay in the process to enable GEF resources to be administered by MAAE in 2016, the National Director of Biodiversity, in his capacity as Project National Director, through Official Letter No. MAAE-DNB-2016-0375, requested UNDP support to manage these resources under the modality of support to national implementation.

The Jambatu Center of the Otonga Foundation was a project strategic partner for the development of certain Outputs established in the ProDoc. The mechanism to effectively operate was defined through the Decision-Making Committees established in the ProDoc. The project organizational structure followed the scheme presented in Figure 1 bellow:



Graphic 1 Organizational structure of the PARG project

Source and Elaboration: Prodoc, 2014

# 3.2 Project Implementation

#### 3.2.1 Adaptive management

The project was implemented in a very dynamic institutional, political, and economic context, which registered important changes in relation to the initial assumptions with which it was designed. It influenced the development of the project and generated challenges to the adaptive management. The interviewees highlighted the flexibility to make changes and adjustments both at a strategic and operational level. They also mention that some of the challenges and difficulties exceed the project team's scope and capacity.

Project implementation was affected by a transformation at institutional and political level, linked to the issuance and validity of Ingenios Code in 2016. This Code redesigned the intellectual property regime operation in Ecuador in several aspects, including biodiversity scientific research and access to genetic resources. Several of MAAE's remits passed to Senescyt, new institutions such as Senadi and INABIO were incorporated. According to the interviewees, the project played a key role in this context, facilitating dialogue and coordination within the framework of this new institutional architecture, as well as supporting new counterparts institutional strengthening to carry out the activities planned within the project, and invited Senescyt to be part of the project's Board of Directors, while GIZ, Senadi and INABIO were incorporated into the Technical Committee.

Subsequently, since May 2017, due to government change, the project met challenges derived from new public policy priorities and a deep institutional reform, which led to merging of two institutions that gave rise to MAAE. The interviewees also note a high authorities' rotation, particularly in MAAE, which has been the institution that registers the highest ministers' rotation during this government. Faced with this, articulated job and high appropriation by MAAE at a technical level, are mentioned, which throughout the implementation accompanies and endorses the project validity in all the processes of authorities' transition.

On the other hand, the economic crisis that the country had been facing, triggered fiscal austerity policies and cuts in public spending, affecting the availability of counterpart resources that the project counted on to meet its goals. The interviews confirm its impact on activities such as scientific research, scholarships, and availability of resources to accompany declaration and management of conservation areas with communities. However, the interviewees highlight the team's ability to commit counterpart funds from fiscal sources.

During the project execution, some changes to the implementation arrangements outlined in ProDoc were made. For the first 8 months, the project was unable to advance in its execution, so the Board of Directors decided to modify the NIM implementation modality (MAAE would take over 60% and UNDP would implement 40%), to a Support modality to NIM (MAAE has destined 15% to pay technicians and UNDP 85%). The NIM implementation modality had many barriers because it implied transferring of funds to a fiscal account to be implemented under state policies and procedures. For eight months, an attempt was made to test this modality, the team worked with the National Planning Secretariat (Senplades) in designing the requested project format to create an account, however, MAAE did not show any guarantee in its structure to respond to the commitments assumed, therefore, under its own consideration, the best option was to focus on providing technical support and verifying that the goals set in the ProDoc are met. Currently, it is considered that management stability has been achieved under the Support to NIM modality.

Another change that arose is related to the administrative weakness identified in the Jambatu Center during 2016, which in the opinion of the interviewees, risk the fulfillment of project important activities. For this reason, in 2017 the Board of Directors decided to entrust the PMU the execution of certain outcomes that originally had to have the FO/ CJ technical support, such as the Ecuadorian Amphibian Research and Conservation Plan and its Action Plan, the interconnection of MAAE and FO / CJ virtual platforms, and the Amphibians Red List. While some interviewees state that this change has made it possible to accelerate processes and expand the participation of strategic partners such as PUCE, other interviewees agree that the decision negatively affected the execution in terms of technical and scientific quality.

The Amazon Regional University Ikiam participated as a partner to implement Outcome 2, its co-financing commitment included, among others, construction of laboratory infrastructure, a teacher assignment and hiring of an external researcher (Jambatu Center) who would work exclusively in the project. However, in 2017 there was a change of authorities, policies and management, added to a budget cut that forced the researcher's firing, whose role was fundamental for the project scientific assurance. Although the researcher continued being part of the Jambatu Center, his participation in the project was diminished and directed to the development of files for the Ecuadorian amphibian encyclopedia, *ex situ* and life bank management, leaving a gap in technical advice of the project.

During the project execution, PUCE began to participate due to an approach to the project made by a researcher from the Amazon Regional University Ikiam, who was in charge of executing the second output of Outcome 2. This is because, in the University, in 2016, there was no laboratory to process the samples, while PUCE had the equipment and, above all, has the study of peptides and amphibians in its researching lines, which is why it became an important partner. For a year, the research was carried out in PUCE laboratories, both the project and the universities benefited, because resources and equipment were directed towards the project needs, and knowledge about cloning was transferred to PUCE.

The start of the project execution presented logistical and resource challenges that were solved during the project implementation. It is mentioned that during the start-up there was

no clear definition on the team's structure, which together with scarce communication had an impact on the execution of some activities being carried out detachedly. Some of the corrective recommendations came from the key partners, for example, ETAPA proposed to standardize certain activities such as a common protocol for taking and transferring samples. To fill the lack of coordination at technical and operational level, Amaru Biopark and ETAPA proposed to work with strategic partners, such as MAAE, in joint workshops to define actions like designing protocols for animal collection, a technical procedure for the delivery of animals' preparation (design of delivery - reception minutes). Likewise, to solve project coordination in city and field, in 2018 the project incorporated a technician who gave support to monitoring activities, this allowed to have a better coordination and improved the communication quality between different actors.

In relation to changes at the project's conservation objectives level, at the beginning of 2017, the Board of Directors made the decision to include a new species, the outcomes should therefore consider, from that date, a total of 10 species with *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation processes, and bioprospecting The decision comes from the re-discovery of a species that was estimated to be in extinction, called Jambato negro (*Atelopus ignescens*). Likewise, after 2 years of implementation, the need to include monitoring was identified; in this sense, the processes to develop monitoring activities in field are established and standardized.

Towards the end of the project, implementation was severely limited by mobility restrictions and shutdowns due to COVID-19, which affected the development of all project activities and made it difficult to meet goals. This mainly affected the possibility of maintaining field work, so it was not possible to have contact or an adequate follow-up with provincial authorities, as well as with the communities that participated in the creation of new PAs, which generates uncertainty in these actors in relation to the current and future status of the activities that were being implemented by the project.

#### 3.2.2 Partnership arrangements

The project presents two partnership schemes during its implementation, which provide opportunities to maximize its impact, improve coherence in interventions, and enhance synergies. However, it is also mentioned that these two schemes could have affected the project positioning and identity. Since 2017, the PARG project has been managed in conjunction with the "Genetic Resources for Sustainable Development" - ABS project, because of the theme and complementarity between both projects. Thus, since 2018, both

the Board of Directors and the PMU have been in charge of both projects. In addition, since 2018, the Amphibian and Genetic Resources Conservation Project (PARG) assumed various administrative procedures to support the Wildlife Landscapes project in terms of monitoring, follow-up and reports, assistance at applying for 2019 projects. Likewise, the project benefited from the implementation of some activities under the fiscal outcome of the Wildlife Landscapes project.

In terms of implementation partners, the project had the support of academic institutions and research centers such as the Regional Amazon University Ikiam, the Otonga Foundation and the Jambatu Center, who add value from their specific experience in amphibian scientific research. Other implementation partners such as Amaru Biopark and ETAPA also contributed with their experience in amphibian monitoring and research, becoming key partners to the implementation in territory. ETAPA, together with the Jambatu Center, and with contributions from Amaru Biopark, INABIO and the Amazon Regional University Ikiam, developed the national sampling protocol that allows standardizing of taking samples procedures. In addition, the interviewees value their contribution on the red list workshops due to their extensive knowledge about Cajas area, and, in general, the southern part of the country.

# 3.2.3 Project Finance

According to ProDoc, the budget financed by the GEF amounts to USD 2.72 million for the 5 years of implementation. As of March 2020, around USD 2.27 million had been executed, equivalent to 83% of the total available resources. As shown in Graph 2.



Graphic 2 Budgetary Execution by Outcome

Most of the resources have been allocated to Outcome 3, which to date has executed about USD 875 thousand, that is, 92% of the total available for this Result. However, Outcome 2 is the one that shows the best performance, it has executed USD 696 thousand equivalent to 95% of what was planned.

The execution performance until the first quarter of 2020 indicates that the project will be able to execute all of the assigned resources. The years 2017 and 2020 report the lowest execution (USD 465 thousand and 99 thousand respectively), in contrast to the years 2018 and 2019. This is due to the greater investment in the hiring of local consultants and contractual services of companies. In the first three years of the project, there is evidence of a significant investment in the acquisition of machinery and equipment, especially in 2016 (USD 132 thousand).

In relation to budget execution by type of expenditure, Graph 3 shows that there is an important difference between some values budgeted in ProDoc and those actually executed. This is the case of individual contractual services, the executed value is double the budget, which could be explained by the change registered in relation to the role of the Jambatu Center in the elaboration of certain Outputs that were commissioned from the PMU.

Source: Project CDRs, 2016 - 2020


## Graphic 3 Budget implementation by type of expenditure

Source: CDR, 2015 - 2020; Multi-year POA

Regarding the annual execution by type of expense, most of the items were disbursed for individual contractual services and for travel, although during the first three years significant disbursements were made for machinery and equipment. Likewise, from 2017 to 2020 significant investments have been made in hiring local consultants and business contractual services. The detail is shown in the following Graph 4.





The ProDoc establishes that as part of the management arrangements, annual audits should be carried out on the project. In the execution, it is evident that 2 audits have been carried out, 1 for the review of the execution of funds from the Otonga Foundation for the period July 2016 - January 2018. A second audit was carried out at the MAAE for the same period. Both used the ISRS 4400 methodology. In the first case, values pending settlement were identified, around USD 57 thousand; In the second case, no novelty was found regarding the amounts spent, in addition, it was determined that the risk of budget execution of the MAAE was low, according to the scale used in the audit report.

Source: UNDP Expenditure Report, 2014 - 2020

The expected co-financing, according to the Prodoc, was USD 14,216,124, both in kind and in monetary resources. In practice, with the report provided by the project, up to October 2020 USD 9,780,761 had been raised. Graph 5 shows that the majority of partners contributed according to plan, however, there are gaps by the MAAE, UNDP, GAD Guayas, ETAPA and the University of Queens.





Source: PARG Project Budget only co-financing, 2020

#### 3.2.4 Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation

Overall quality of M&E	Moderately Satisfactory

M&E design at project start up	Moderately Satisfactory

The PARG project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (M&E) presented in the ProDoc fulfil, in general terms, with what is established in the UNDP Evaluation Guide. It includes different milestones and activities that must normally be fulfilled in a GEF financed project. The project used the Microsoft Project program to monitor the programmatic progress of the established outputs, which is considered as an adequate tool, considering that a large part of the indicators at this level are quantitative.

However, a weakness is identified in terms of the monitoring and follow-up design in three of the six project impact indicators. Particularly those that are not quantitative or that have not been sufficiently specified and consequently lend themselves to different interpretations. In general terms, it is observed that the impact indicators were not described in detail, clearly specifying their scope, timing, measurement methodology, means of verification and responsible parties, as established in the ProDoc. For example, Indicator 4: Increase the flow of resources for amphibian's conservation/ADB, does not specify the temporality or period in which the indicator should be measured, the methodology to update the baseline study is not presented. and neither are the means of verification. Another example is Indicator 5: Degree of compliance of environmental licenses respect to official guidelines on amphibian conservation in prioritized sites in the National Strategic Plan; on the one hand, the relationship between this indicator and the project activities is not identified, nor is an interpretation presented that allows people to understand what it means by "degree of follow-up" and how this will be measured.

M&E Plan Implementation	Moderately Satisfactory

Regarding the different milestones, and monitoring and evaluation tools established in the ProDoc, it is verified that the initiation workshop was held on February 17, 2016, as it had been proposed in the ProDoc. This workshop was postponed on two previous occasions, for a MAAE request, due to authorities' change at the Undersecretary of Natural Heritage.

Throughout the project execution, periodic biannual meetings were held with the Board of Directors; a total of 17 meetings minutes have been prepared, the last one was recorded in July of the current year. The Project has annual and quarterly reports and PIR reports for the period from 2017 to 2020. All reports detail the activities carried out up to their cut-off date. The project executed the RMT in the months from June to September 2019, although this was meant to be during the third year, it was postponed until one year before the project closure. As part of the M&E plan, independent "Spot Checks" audits were carried out, one for Fundación Otonga and two for MAAE.

Since 2019, the project developed the "Programmatic Advancement Tool - Methodology", to monitor both the ABS and PARG projects, which allows measuring progress by result. The instrument monitors the fulfillment of certain activities to measure the indicator progress. Although this is very useful for the result indicators, it is not so for the project impact indicators.

The evaluation considers that the M&E tools presented are insufficient and failed to fill the gaps detailed in relation to the M&E design. Furthermore, the weakness registered in the design of the M&E system presents the risk of overestimating the performance of the impact indicators. In this sense, it is striking, for example, that Indicator 6 reports 100% compliance, when in the unanimous opinion of the interviewees, at the closing date of this evaluation and despite the efforts made, the project did not reduce the duration of procedures for collection permits, framework agreements and access contracts. Indicator 4 reports 100% compliance when it is evident that the flow of resources for conservation has drastically decreased in the recent years and that, for example, during 2020 a large number of MAAE employees have been dismissed, including the wildlife and genetic resources team.

It is possible that the lack of an M&E specialist with exclusive dedication to the project, since he shared responsibilities with the ABS project and previously with Paisajes, could also have influenced the fact that a systematic monitoring of the project's progress has not been generated. The project recognizes this weakness and mentions that to lessen the impact, the M&E system was managed together with UNDP.

# 3.2.5 UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution coordination, and operational issues

#### **Implementing Agency - UNDP**

Implementing Agency	Satis	sfactory

The Environment and Energy Area of UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency was in charge of the coordination of the PARG project execution. Interviewees and project records demonstrate a constant accompaniment of UNDP throughout the implementation. Portfolio management facilitated a coherent and articulated intervention with two other projects (Landscapes and Wildlife, Global ABS), which generated opportunities to maximize impact and promote cost-effective practices that added value in aspects such as communication and gender focus, which were not originally collected and budgeted during design.

Stakeholders highlight UNDP support in relation to the high turnover of MAAE management positions and to the political and institutional changes that occurred during implementation. In this sense, UNDP experience is recognized in maintaining the political commitment of the different institutions involved, as well as promoting inter-institutional dialogue and coordination.

Regarding the project administration, which the PMU oversaw, it was made up by a coordinator, an administrative assistant, a communicator and a UN volunteer to support Outcome 3 and ABS Regime, the last two share their time with other projects from the UNDP - GEF portfolio such as Global ABS. At different times, the team was complemented by hiring at least 17 technicians financed mainly with fiscal resources, to strengthen capacities and support specific Outputs implementation of partners such as the Amazon Regional University Ikiam, Jambatu Center, MAAE, Amaru Biopark, Guayas and Carchi GADP.

The interviewees' opinion is that the PMU has had a performance that exceeds expectations, considering the low budget in relation to the goals that were set and that the project design left some gaps that raised the risk profile of the project. The testimonies give account of an experienced team, with specific knowledge of MAAE, previous work with GEF financed projects, commitment, and good predisposition to collaborate with the different institutions and partners. It is mentioned that the coordination was fluid, with good communication and without major inconveniences.

PMU management stands out for the leverage of resources from different institutions, without them, it would not have been possible to meet the project objectives and goals. Actors recognize and value the coordinator involvement, in its role of keeping them informed, committed, and aligned with the goal's fulfillment. Likewise, its contribution in harmonizing relations, facilitating dialogue and collaboration between different actors, is recognized. MAAE leadership and close collaboration with the project, in the opinion of some interviewees, reduced impartiality to the PMU compared to the rest of the participating partners and institutions. On the other hand, it is also mentioned that the coordination showed too much patience on MAAE response times for reviewing of consultancies, ToRs, contracting and procurement processes, affecting the programming.

The actor's perception is that a PMU weakness was the absence of specialized profiles in amphibians, so that sometimes the horizon of what was expected to be achieved with the project's outcomes was lost, especially in terms of the approval of certain consultancies, as well as the purchase of supplies and equipment. In this sense, difficulties that exist in the local market to supply project specific needs are mentioned, as well as limitations at the level of contracting policies.

## **Executing Agency - MAAE**

Executing Agency	Satisfactory

MAAE, as Implementing Partner through the National Biodiversity Directorate and the Genetic Resources Unit, assumed control over the programmatic, administrative, and financial supervision of the project. Interviewees value leadership and ownership from the project design phase, playing a key role in leveraging co-financing resources and coordinating different institutions and levels of government participation.

MAAE showed flexibility to face the challenges of a changing economic, political, and institutional environment, and coordinated the intervention in an articulated way with other projects such as Global ABS, or Paisajes y Wildlife. Despite high rotation of authorities and institutional challenges resulting from Ingenios Code validity, MAAE has been able to direct the project towards the fulfillment of its objectives.

Among the weaknesses found, the response capacity is identified, due to the limited existing personnel to simultaneously manage the execution of different projects, in addition to their regular institutional activities. It is also mentioned that governance could have been more balanced among the other participating institutions, in a context characterized by the discussion around competences and genetic resources access regime. Despite the commitment and support at technical level, project execution was not isolated from the instability and constant change of authorities, which influenced the political support and endorsement of key processes such as those related to institutional strengthening and the NIM implementation modality.

#### 3.3 Project Results

#### 3.3.1 Overall results

Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	--------------

The Mid-Term Review estimated an advance in the achievement of qualitative Outcomes of 84.3%, with an expectation of 100% goals compliance. According to the following Graph 6, the average progress of the 3 Outcomes is 90%. The project has made significant progress in the three expected Outcomes, different factors out the management and project scope, did not allow Result 2 performance to be as expected.



## Graphic 6 Progress of the 3 Outcomes and indicators of the project

Fuente: PIR; Análisis de Resultados PARG, 2020

## 1.3.1.1 Outcome 1

Qualitatively, in the RMT it was perceived that the Result would comply 100% at the end of the project. The results of the final evaluation show that their progress is 98%, 2 of 3 indicators have reached their goal, however, in relation to the number of reproductive events and survival %, it has not been met (Table 1). Less than 1 month before project closure, there is no high expectation of achieving the goal.

The first indicator of this result, protected area declaration took a considerable time in Guayas province, since its identification and approval involved a trial - error exercise. Initially, the possibility of establishing the reserve was proposed in 2 different sites than those declared today; in Flor y Selva, part of population opposed due to border problems between provinces, while in Cerro de Hayas there was a lack of community cohesion. Official declaration is relatively new in Guayas case (3 - 4 months before the beginning of pandemic), which left little time to start an implementation process with authorities and participating communities. Likewise, the indicator mentions that, by the end of the project, these PAs should be recognized and legally integrated into the SNAP, which will not be possible since the mining concessions registered in the two conservation areas block MAAE from joining the SNAP.

Regarding the second indicator, the results of METT sheet scores, for the 2 new PAs is low, however, this performance is consistent with recently created areas, which have not implemented control and surveillance mechanisms yet, nor do they have data reference for decision making, they contemplate a limited budget and lack equipment and infrastructure. In the Cajas National Park (PNC) case, an increase of 26 points is evidenced, which is justified because prior to project, activities related to amphibian's conservation and research that are part of the Cajas Amphibian Plan, had been carried out, therefore the project intervention was of high importance for this PA.

In relation to the third indicator, the captive breeding program, there were delays in the collection of species that should have been reported in the project, this because obtaining research and collection permits took between 1.5 and 2 years. In addition, another drawback was found related to the fact that, although there were protocols to perform the activity, it was not clear how to perform some specific tasks. In this sense, difficulties with the planning of Jambatu Center are mentioned, as well as the role of MAAE in delaying mobilization permits and sample transport from field to Quito.

Indicator	Target	Finding of the final evaluation
# of protected areas and hectares of habitat critical for amphibians with specific conservation measures for highly endangered amphibian species legally- recognized and integrated in the SNAP.	<ul> <li>2</li> <li>Provincial GAD reserves</li> <li>declared with</li> <li>focus on</li> <li>amphibian</li> <li>conservation:</li> <li>Carchi</li> <li>PA (1400 ha)</li> <li>Guayas</li> <li>PA (800 ha)</li> <li>3</li> <li>Management</li> <li>Plans covering</li> <li>total of 2,961</li> <li>ha. Critical</li> <li>Habitat include</li> <li>amphibian</li> <li>conservation</li> <li>measures:</li> <li>Carchi PA;</li> <li>Guayas PA</li> <li>and Cajas NP</li> <li>(761 bectares)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>100% complete; 7,100 ha of humid premontane forest conserved in GAD reserves was reached:</li> <li>Area of Conservation and Sustainable Use - ACUS "Chinambí River Microbasin" and its respective Management Plan. Carchi GAD. 4,300 hectares. Since 2017, two species of amphibians targeted by the project have been monitored: <i>Atelopus coynei</i> and <i>Atelopus sp. aff. longirostris</i>.</li> <li>San Miguel Productivity and Conservation Provincial Area (APPC) and its Management Plan and Financial Sustainability for the area. Guayas GAD. 2,800 hectares. Important populations of the <i>Atelopus balios</i> species have been recorded in the area.</li> <li>Preparation of management plans that cover a total of 35,644 ha of critical habitat include amphibian conservation measures: 1) ACUS "Chinambí River Microbasin"; 2) APPC "San Miguel" - Guayas; 3) PNC technical inputs for this plan development, mainly through the analysis of results obtained from biological monitoring of <i>Atelopus nanay</i>.</li> </ul>

## Table 1 Progress towards achieving Outcome 1

Increase in	METT Score	100% complete.
management	Carchi	
effectiveness of	PA: TBD	Obtained scores for the METT:
3 legally-	Guayas	Carchi PA: 48
recognized PAs	PA: TBD	• PA Guayas: 39
with	• Cajas	Cajas National Park: 88
conservation	NP: 82	
measures for		
highly		
endangered		
amphibian		
species (METT)		
Successful	<u># reproductive</u>	9% reached in reproductive events; 75.25% of
captive breeding	<u>- Atelopus</u>	individuals survival that were rescued in captivity
programmes	nanay: 22	Reproductive events: 1) Atelopus nanay: 0 [3
measured by:	- A.sp. aff.	reproductive trials carried out between 2018-19, all
	palmatus:	unsuccessful, 0 spawning]; 2) A.sp. aff. palmatus: 2
• # of	- Dendrobates	[6 reproductive trials carried out between 2018, 1
reproductive	condor:20	successful, 2 spawning]; 3) Dendrobates condor: 3
events (egg		[several reproductive trials carried out between
mass) of target	<u>%Survivai</u>	2018, 7 successful, 7 spawning]; 9 viable tadpoles.
species	nanav:	4) Atelopus ignescens: 1 [8 reproductive trials
	80%	carried out between 2017 and 2020, 2 spawning].
• %	- A. sp. aff.	Survival percentage of rescued individuals: 80%
survival of	80%	goal was not reached due to.
rescued	- Dendrobates	1) <i>Atelopus nanay</i> : 67% [4 expeditions carried out, 3
individuals in	condor:	females and 3 males]
captivity	80%	2) A. sp. aff. palmatus: 75% adults, 2% tadpoles [2
		collection surveys, 4 females, 19 males and 3
		juveniles]
		3) Dendrobates condor: 100% adults, 40% tadpoles
		[2 expeditions carried out, 15 females and 15 males]
		4) Atelopus ignescens: 59% [3 expeditions carried
		out, 12 females and 11 males]

Source: ProDoc, 2015; PIR, 2020; RMT project, 2019

## Color key

Green = Achieved	Yellow = Partially achieved	Red = Not achieved
------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------

#### 1.3.1.2 Outcome 2

For the RMT, this Outcome showed an achievement of 92% with an expectation of 100% compliance at the end of the project. The progress of the Outcome is 83% and it is important to note that most of the indicators have reached and even exceeded the goal. The first indicator of the isolated and structurally characterized active results of secretions of 4 amphibians, the goal was met and widely exceeded for *Agalychnis spurelli, Cruziohyla* 

*calcarifer and Boana picturata* species, however, for *Atelopus nanay* the goal was not met (0%). A similar situation happens with the second indicator related to the number of new synthesized and pharmacologically tested peptides from skin secretions of 4 species of amphibians, the general goal of 4 peptides is exceeded by 13 units, but again it does not meet the goal for Atelopus nanay.

In general, these first two indicators indicate the effort made in investigations related to Agalychnis spurelli and Cruziohyla calcarifer species, while in the other 2 species (Boana picturata and Atelopus nanay) the expected amount was not reached. For Atelopus nanay, the project had considered that it would be the most difficult goal to achieve because it belongs to a different taxonomic group.

Regarding fourth indicator of this outcome, it is worth mentioning that in 2016 the project was underway, but the Amazon Regional University Ikiam did not have a research laboratory, which was a limitation that affected the goals fulfillment. In response to this challenge, the Amazon Regional University Ikiam sought to partner with PUCE, given its experience in working on peptides and amphibians. So for a period of one year, the research was carried out at this University's laboratories. At the same time, at the end of 2016 - 2017, Amazon Regional University Ikiam's laboratory begins to be built and equipped, in addition, as part of the project, supplies and reagents were acquired, allowing the start of molecular cloning processes at the Amazon Regional University Ikiam.

The result of this indicator was based on a cooperation between Jambatu Center and the Amazon Regional University Ikiam, the first one had to keep the animals and skin samples, which would later be investigated at the Amazon Regional University Ikiam laboratory. The dynamics operated under this logic: Jambatu Center had to generate samples for the Banco de Vida and for the Amazon Regional University Ikiam, in addition to overseeing the frog eggs cryopreservation activities to carry out in vitro fertilizations. Thus, Jambatu Center laboratory was strengthened, the investment sought to speed up certain activities such as maintaining 50% of Ecuador amphibians' tissues and maintaining exudates of 70% of the threatened species in the country. It is important to note that, although the peptide characterizations of all amphibians were not going to be carried out, the samples could be preserved to make them when there is funding.

Regarding the fifth indicator, the 10 publications foreseen by the project, according to the PIR report and the Program Progress Report, the goal has been reached. In addition,

several interviewees mentioned that by that time, 2 articles are pending publication, progress has been made with their drafts, which were sent for review and these have been returned for corrections. In addition, the Amazon Regional University Ikiam indicates that information is being systematized and some trials are pending development. Also, some laboratory investigations are pending, but due to the health emergency, certain planned activities have been left behind.

This Outcome was affected by the low budget, considering that costs associated with scientific research in the country are considerably higher than in other countries, so the project role in raising co-financing resources was key. The project made it possible to equip research centers with basic equipment for their molecular biology and biochemistry laboratories like the mass spectrometer case. In 2017, non-executed remnants of 2016 were used to acquire reagents and other supplies and services, which, despite not being planned, were key to meeting goals. Considering only fiscal resources allocated to the project, USD 1.62 million are registered for technicians' salaries, who are displaced in different parts of the country.

Outcome 2 Progress summary indicators is shown in Table 2.

Indicator	Target				Finding of the final evaluation							
Active compounds		1	2	3	4	100%	completed					
isolated and	А	2	2	2	1				•			
structurally		5	5	5			-	1	2	3	4	
characterized	В	4	4	1	1		A	53	26	15	0	
(peptides and							В	17	5	5	0	
natural proteins							%	212	104	60%	0	
sequenced) from							Reached	%	%		%	
the skin secretions							А					
of 4 amphibians:							%	425	125	500	0	
1= Agalychnis							Reached	%	%	%	%	
spurelli							В					
2= Cruziohyla												
calcarifer												
3= Hypsiboas												
picturatus												
4= Atelopus												
nanay												
# of new peptides			4			100%	complete					
synthesized and						27 nev	v peptides fr	om the	three	amphibi	ian s	pecies
pharmacologically						were c	hemically syr	nthesize	ed:			-
tested from the						- Cruzi	ohyla calcarit	fer (17)				
skin secretions of						- Agaly	chnis spurre	lli (Š)				

 Table 2 Progress towards achieving Outcome 2

4 amphibian species		<ul> <li>Boana picturata (5)</li> <li>Atelopus nanay (0)</li> <li>So far, antimicrobial, antifungal, and hemolytic activity of 14 peptides has been determined.</li> <li>Cruziohyla calcarifer (5)</li> <li>Agalychnis spurrelli (4)</li> <li>Boana picturata (5)</li> </ul>
# of students with Senescyt scholarships pursuing graduate studies in amphibian bio- prospecting	At least 5 Students	Goal not achieved During the project execution, the incorporation of 4 undergraduate students was promoted to carry out internships in the Molecular Biology and Biochemistry Laboratory of the Amazon Regional University Ikiam. The goal was not reached due to external: a) limited budget for acquisition of laboratory material and equipment and payment for research; b) Fiscal budget crisis to give new Senecyt scholarships.
Ecuadorian bio- prospecting laboratory equipped with appropriate technology and conducting research on amphibian bio- prospecting	At least 1	100% logrado En la Universidad Regional Amazónica Ikiam se ha establecido un laboratorio de Biología Molecular y Bioquímica equipado con la tecnología adecuada, que se está utilizando para realizar investigaciones sobre bioprospección de anfibios.
# of publications in peer review scientific journals on bio- prospecting research on amphibian skin secretions by Ecuadorian Institutions	10	100% achieved A Molecular Biology and Biochemistry laboratory equipped with appropriate technology has been established at the Amazon Regional University Ikiam, which is being used to carry out amphibian bioprospecting research.
% Ecuadorian amphibian species with tissues preserved in the Ecuadorian Amphibian Genome Bank (EAGB)	50%	100% achieved. 60% of the tissues of Ecuadorian amphibian species are conserved in the Ecuadorian Amphibian Genome Bank at Jambatu Center. Until that moment, 2,816 tissue samples had been extracted from 325 species of amphibians that represent 60% of the list of amphibian species in Ecuador.

Source: ProDoc, 2015; PIR, 2020; RMT project, 2019

Color key

#### 1.3.1.3 Outcome 3

This Outcome obtained 83% achievement in the RMT and had the expectation of 100% compliance at the end of the project. In the final evaluation it is shown as the weakest of the three Outcomes, with a 89% progress, only one of the three indicators is reported with a performance of 52% (Table 3). The project, according to what was reported, has managed to overcome difficulties presented by political processes and decisions that exceeded the project scope, as was the case of the entry into force of Ingenios Code.

Although the project reports 100% compliance in the first indicator, at the evaluator's discretion the true level of compliance is overestimated. Both the Amphibian Action Plan and the Red List should be ready by the third year, thus leaving two years for the process to be on track and to activate implementation mechanisms for these tools. The Amphibian Action Plan had a considerable delay and was delivered in March 2020. Despite this, it reports an 20% advance in its execution, this is explained because several of the activities carried out throughout the project were included in the Amphibian Action Plan.

Regarding the third indicator related to time reduction to obtain research permits, interviewees' perception at the closing date of this evaluation, this issue has shown a setback, so it is considered that the situation is worse than at the beginning of the project. This is related to the implementation of the Ingenios Code, which incorporated new actors such as Senecyt and redefined institutional competencies. Another factor that significantly affected the project's progress was the merger between the Ministry of the Environment and the National Secretariat of Water. The project has generated an architecture and design for the virtual system that is in force for MAAE, however, this Outcome widely depends on the Ecuadorian Virtual Platform (VUE), for which it is necessary that Senecyt, INABIO and Senadi develop their own institutional platforms, which has not yet happened, mainly due to the lack of financing, personnel and technological resources. Meanwhile, Senecyt has indicated that the process will be carried out manually, until enough resources are available for the platform construction.

Several actors consider that, with the approval of the new regulation that is now in the Presidency, and the transfer of competences to Senescyt, problems related to permits could worsen the current situation, since.

Indicator	Target	Finding of the final evaluation
<ul> <li>Strengthened policy and regulations measured by:</li> <li>% implementation of the Strategic Action Plan for Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibians</li> <li>Nagoya Protocol ratified</li> <li>Regulation 905 aligned with national, sub-regional and international legislation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>20% implementation by MAE of Action Plan (plan approved by Midterm)</li> <li>Nagoya Protocol ratified</li> <li>Regulation 905 updated and aligned</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>100% achieved.</li> <li>20% of the Action Plan implementation by MAAE, approved in March 2020. It was significantly delayed in its preparation because inputs from the Red List were needed.</li> <li>Nagoya Protocol ratified and entered into force on December 19, 2017.</li> <li>ABS Regulation is under review by Presidency of the Republic.</li> </ul>
Improved capacities of national ABS implementing agencies, measured by the ABS Capacity Development Scorecard	ABS Capacity Development Scorecard: 49 3 areas improved CR 1: 6 CR2: 19 CR5: 13	100% achieved. CR 1: 6; CR2: 19; CR5: 13 1,800 men, women and young people from indigenous peoples and local communities have participated in 22 awareness and empowerment workshops on "Protection of Traditional Knowledge Mechanisms, Nagoya Protocol and Sustainable Development Goals" from different organizations. They belong to 13 Ecuadorian provinces. A workshop was held in September 2018, with the participation of local communities and international representatives.
% Reduction in processing times for Collection Permits, Framework Contracts, and Access Contracts	<ul> <li>Processing times:</li> <li>Collection Permits: 1 week</li> <li>Framework Contracts: 1 month</li> <li>Access Contracts: in compliance with established Norm (approx. 6 months)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Goal not met, 50% progress in achievement. Performance affected by MAAE-Senagua merger and health crisis. Processing times:</li> <li>Collection permits: 1 week</li> <li>Framework contracts: 1 month</li> <li>Access contracts (for commercial purposes): there is no such figure in current legislation</li> </ul>
on amphibian conservation as measured by	increase once interconnected	<ul> <li>achievement</li> <li>% annual increase once the interconnected platform is established, not available.</li> </ul>

 Table 3 Progress towards achieving Outcome 3

<ul> <li>Increase in users accessing ABS-CH Platform</li> <li>Increase in records of amphibians from unofficial sources</li> <li>S% annua increase once interconnected platform established and connected to Science Citizen portal</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>43% annual increase once the interconnected platform is stablished and connected to the citizen science portal.</li> <li>The project considers that level of public awareness about importance of amphibian conservation is not represented by the indicators suggested above.</li> </ul>
--	--

Source: ProDoc, 2015; PIR, 2020; RMT project, 2019

#### **Color key**

Green = Achieved	Yellow = Partially achieved	Red = Not achieved

#### 3.3.2 Relevance

Project relevance	Relevant

All the interviewed actors coincide in considering the project as highly relevant and pertinent to the reality, policy priorities and needs of the country. It is recognized as a pioneering project that marks a before and an after in amphibians' conservation and scientific research in Ecuador.

The project turns out to be of great relevance for the country because the diversity of amphibians is a strategic resource for Ecuador, representing a significant 9% of the world's diversity (Interview with Otonga Foundation). The genetic resources of amphibians have a potential use for their application in the cosmetic, therapeutic, and biomedical industries, which is why they justify their relevance in a context in which Ecuador identifies bio-knowledge and bioeconomy as strategic tools for national development in the medium - long term.

From the biological point of view, several interviewees agree that both *ex situ* work and tissue management are of great relevance and importance for amphibian research and management in the country. In this sense, it is pointed out that working with amphibians is not the same as working with other resources of biological diversity. The scientific importance lies in the fact that, in Ecuador, between the 80s and 90s there were mass extinctions of amphibians with catastrophic characteristics, fundamentally associated with climate change, for which it was necessary to take priority action.

The project has national and international relevance given the progress in the Nagoya Protocol adoption and considering that there are still very few projects financed by GEF with this conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources focus. The project has been presented in different international events. Compared to the region, there is progress in biocommunity management protocols design with local languages and intercultural and gender approach.

#### 3.3.3 Effectiveness & Efficiency

Project effectiveness	Satisfactory

Effectiveness refers to progress in the fulfillment of planned activities in relation to its progress percentage towards the fulfillment of the different milestones and key processes. To determine the progress percentages by Outcome, an average between the progress of the indicators that comprise them was made. From this perspective, it can be observed that, months after the project closure, the compliance performance reported by the PIR for 5 impact indicators is equal or greater than 100%, however, the indicator related to the degree of environmental licenses monitoring, the goal is not reached despite the fact that it reports an 20 % advance (Graph 7).

#### **Graphic 7 Progress of impact indicators**



Source: PIR, 2020

In general, the project integrated Senescyt to the Board of Directors, and also included more actors involved in the country's amphibian field. It was able to solve the problem of Jambatu Center's administrative and accounting competences, and the three-month delay in the the project starting. Thus, a big part of the success and goals fulfillment is due to the team's ability to leverage resources from Government and other institutions, and to maintain coordination and interest of different actors.

Regarding consultancies quality, the project has managed quality standards to ensure that the information generated is useful. In general, documents were consistent and had good quality, sometimes measures were taken to ensure this aspect fulfillment, that is why several contests were declared void and / or canceled.

Project efficiency	Highly Satisfactory

In terms of efficiency, which is understood as the ability to achieve the expected Outcomes with the minimum possible use of resources and in the shortest time, and assuming a linear correspondence between budget execution and goals achievement, both Outcomes show a high performance. In all cases, there are important advances even when the entire estimated budget has not been executed. In the three Outcomes case, almost all of their associated indicators have been achieved. However, due to the fact that the project is months away from its closure, there is no expectation of reaching 100% despite having executed 92% of the resources as detailed in Graph 8.



Graphic 8 Budget Execution vs.% of Implementation by Component

Source: CDR 2014 – 2020; PIR, 2020

## 3.3.4 Country ownership

The project is highly relevant for the country, as it is a pioneering experience in the practical implementation of Nagoya Protocol, which has been recognized by the interviewees as the most ambitious intervention that has been implemented in the amphibians field in Ecuador. The project clearly responds to national policy objectives.

At the ownership of the different institutions level, the interviewees value MAAE leadership and ownership in its role of Main Executing Entity that has been visible from the project design phase. In addition, it played an important role in leveraging co-financing resources and coordinating the participation of different institutions and levels of government. However, it is also noted that the country demonstrated that it does not have the capacity to assume direct implementation, so the opportunity to develop capacity to directly implement projects financed by donors and international cooperation was missing.

Other project successes was the fact that different institutions from public and private sector, work in coordination, such as MAAE, Senescyt, INABIO, Senadi, Jambatu Center, Amaru Biopark, Amazon Regional University Ikiam, ETAPA EP.

#### 3.3.5 Mainstreaming

Objectives and Outcomes of PARG project are aligned with and are part of the UNDP country program strategy. In addition, it is aligned with the state objectives and strategy, which in this case are reflected in the National Development Plan 2017-2021 and in Ecuador's commitments regarding environmental issues and the SDGs. In addition, the project has contributed to other achievements such as:

- Being the first work experience related to Nagoya protocol, specifically with amphibians, it has strengthened the institutions involved capacity and lays foundations for a second phase.
- Even though the design did not require considering issues such as gender and indigenous communities' participation, communities were invited to be part of the project activities, particularly in the conservation areas declaration. Gender approach was included in project planning and internal organization and activities were developed in Outcome 1. Regarding the socioeconomic impact, the project reports that it is positive in terms of benefits for women, for example, through tourism activities.

 The First International Symposium on Amphibian Conservation, allowed identification and articulation of different actors and researchers linked to the subject. According to the interviewees, the event allowed a valuable exchange of experiences, forming a collaborative network that did not previously exist in the country.

## 3.3.6 Sustainability

Institutional	framework	and	governance	risks:	the	
probability th	at the benef	its will	continue to	be deliv	ered	Moderately Likely
after the proj	ect closure.					

The project has been key in generating capacity for response and inter-institutional coordination around Ingenios Code and Nagoya Protocol implementation. This management establishes a basis for collaboration and commitment to monitor project results in the future, which has been confirmed by all the project partners and key actors. However, sustainability will depend on MAAE leadership and its ability to maintain commitment and involvement of other actors.

The recent dismissal of MAAE employees, particularly those directly related to the project implementation, such as Wildlife and Genetic Resources Unit, presents a challenge for sustainability, given that these employees maintain historical memory of these processes and have been direct actors in the institutional strengthening promoted by the project.

Regarding the work at territorial level for the PAs declaration, it represents an important risk since its continuity will depend on authorities' political will. In the Carchi Provincial Carchi GAD case there was evidence of commitment and interest, however, the Guayas Provincial GAD case represents a greater risk because the AP declaration was promoted by the previous administration and due to the rotation of the technicians, there is a risk of losing process appropriation from Provincial GAD.

Possibly the greatest institutional risk for the project sustainability is related to Outcome 3 because the country is moving towards a new national authorities election, a new regime that could entail new priorities, institutional changes and ministries authorities and teams rotation.

Socio-political risks: The probability that the benefits will	Madarataly Liplikaly
continue to be delivered after the project closure.	Moderately Officery

In the short term, the country economic situation could influence an increase of pressure on natural resources. This would especially affect the commitment sustainability of the communities involved in protected areas creation and management, to the extent that they do not perceive benefits derived from its declaration, and that they are not actively involved in their management. The greatest risk stems from the short time and limited resources that the project had to accompany community in its appropriation process of the conservation areas created.

## *Environmental Risks: The probability that the benefits will continue to be delivered after the project closure.* Moderately Likely

Declaration of new PAs promoted by the project coincide with areas of mining concessions, which could influence the existence of overlapped competitions among different institutions; Furthermore, it may put its total or partial sustainability on risk, in the event that it is necessary to modify the limits.

According to experts, the sensitivity of amphibians to climate change effects, makes it an excellent species indicator, so the monitoring activities sustainability, as well as their potential replication, largely depend on their inclusion within the PAs biodiversity monitoring programs.

There is great expectation that, once the project is concluded, work will continue at the Regional Amazon University Ikiam and PUCE, since both universities handle the same research line on peptides and amphibians, which are already established, have institutional support, access to technology assembled by the project, and human talent.

Financial resources: The probability that the benefits will	Moderately I Inlikely
continue to be delivered after the project closure.	Woderately Offikely

The economic crisis the country is going through has had an impact on fiscal austerity policies, which will have an effect on the intervention sustainability in the short and medium term, practically in all outcomes. MAAE's budget has been severely affected, and at least in the short term, it will not be able to ensure the provision of necessary resources for monitoring project activities. The entire wildlife unit has been dismissed, while only three people are in charge of genetic resources, so the project sustainability will depend on the speed with which MAAE reassembles an institutional response capacity. to reclaim the memory of recent processes.

The newly declared PAs still need to be recognized by MAAE and integrated into the SNAP, but they also need resources to start the implementation of their management plans that allow community participation. So far, Guayas Provincial GAD has not committed resources to monitor the protected areas created, so their sustainability will depend on the inclusion of these two PAs within the budgetary priorities for the years 2021 and 2022. In this sense, In Carchi GAD case, the creation ordinance establishes a budget that must be allocated to the protected area management. In the Cajas National Park case, it is considered that the sustainability perspective is greater, because the amphibian monitoring programs were already internalized within the PNC management.

Despite the difficulties, it is considered that the research activities initiated by the project have a good perspective of sustainability, since they are internalized in the institutions and are part of the normal activities they carry out. For both Jambatu Center and the Amazon Regional University Ikiam, the challenge will be to write funding proposals and find donors who commit to funding scientific research. Likewise, a complementary achievement that contributes to sustainability is the alliance with the Memphis Zoo that has generated successful cryopreservation trials.

Possibly the greatest perspective of financial sustainability is in the results generated in the PNC, since prior to the project implementation, activities related to amphibian conservation and research were being developed and are part of the Box Amphibian Plan. ETAPA employees confirmed that key processes will be maintained as part of the regular implementation of the plan.

#### 3.3.7 Impact

Overall Project Results	Significant
-------------------------	-------------

According to what is reported by the project, its impact is evidenced by having met and even exceeded 5 of the 6 impact indicators established for the project. The indicator that reports the lowest performance (33%) refers to the expected reduction of time it takes to process collection permits, framework agreements and access contracts.

There are unquestionably important achievements that exceeded the goal, such as the increase of hectares of critical habitats for conservation of target amphibian species. Likewise, captive breeding results, stand out, viable cryopreserved sperm samples for reproduction and skins or secretions that are conserved in BGAE for the amphibian species on the updated IUCN Red List.

However, no means of verification are presented to justify the reported 100% compliance with the indicators related to monitoring of environmental permits degree, respect to official guidelines. Likewise, the project reports a significant increase in the flow of resources for amphibian conservation, which effectively corresponds to the co-financing resources raised by the project. However, given the country's economic crisis, it is very possible that, once the project is completed, the resources available for amphibian conservation will be even less than those recorded in the baseline.

Environmental Status Improvement	Significant

Several actors agree in the fact that, before the project, there was only reference information from other countries and the project has begun a generating information process at this country level, making it possible to take steps towards strengthening management and planning capacity for amphibians' conservation and sustainable use. Although protected areas declarations are recent, reduction of conservation gap for the prioritized species should be considered as a significant long-term impact.

Environmental Stress Reduction	Minimal
--------------------------------	---------

The project has made visible the importance of amphibians, not only for MAAE, but also for the public, working with this class was an undervalued topic because they are not the most striking taxonomic organisms, and therefore they are part of a group that has not received attention, despite the fact that they are species at high risk. At population communication and awareness level, the project generated a great impact in Cuenca city. PARG project participated in several events to transmit results and findings, as well as to publicize the importance of amphibians and their conservation.

At national level, the impact of Outputs such as the red list and standardized protocols is important, in addition, the project showed that joint work can give interesting results and contributions to conservation issues. PARG project promoted the establishment of an amphibian work team that did not exist before.

In addition, to strengthen amphibian conservation activities and reduce pressures on these species, the project managed to raise public resources, more than expected. These investments will contribute to the generation of crucial information for decision-making. As a legacy, it leaves a fully equipped molecular laboratory that would not have been possible

only due to Amazon Regional University Ikiam management. The laboratory will benefit not only researchers, but also contributes to university students and teachers.

Progress towards stress/status change	Significant	
---------------------------------------	-------------	--

The project has laid the foundations for an inter-institutional work that has reaped its first fruits in the short term, but that must maintain a clear commitment and leadership that projects it into a long term. Actors coincide in identifying the project as a milestone that marks a paradigm shift in the sector, so it is estimated that the project impact has been significant.

## 4 CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The project is highly relevant for the country, as it is a pioneering experience in the practical implementation of Nagoya Protocol, which has been recognized by stakeholders as the most ambitious intervention, marking a milestone in amphibian conservation and research in Ecuador. Interviewees agree that the project is highly relevant and pertinent to the reality, policy priorities and needs of the country.

In terms of design, the interviewees emphasize that it is a balanced project, which encompasses *in situ* and *ex situ* conservation approaches, research, and institutional strengthening. The project design is clear, specific and addresses relevant and necessary aspects for a comprehensive intervention. Among the innovative elements of the design, the commitment to position and strengthen *ex situ* conservation stands out, in addition to *in situ* conservation approaches, which have traditionally been more attended by international cooperation projects. Likewise, it proposes a modality of NIM implementation for the first time in Ecuador.

However, weaknesses are identified in relation to the intervention approach and strategy, especially since it is not clear enough how the chain of activities and results would allow meeting several of the proposed impact indicators. This is the case of the indicator related to the "Degree of monitoring of environmental licenses", in which it was not clearly defined which activities would allow its achievement. Finally, political, financial, and institutional aspects were not sufficiently analyzed within project assumptions and risks, and it is why it is concluded that the project design underestimated these issues within the implementation.

The project was implemented in a very dynamic institutional, political and economic context, which registered important changes in relation to the initial assumptions with which it was designed, highlighting the following: 1) Validity of Social Economy Knowledge, Creativity and Innovation Organic Code or Ingenios Code; 2) MAAE Institutional reform; 3) Economic crisis and fiscal austerity policies; 4) Institutional capacity to fulfill implementation arrangements; 5) COVID 19. Flexibility to make changes and adjustments both at a strategic and operational level, stands out. Likewise, the ability to solve challenges and difficulties that, in some cases, exceed the project team capacity and scope.

The project demonstrated the ability to mobilize and commit a wide set of actors and institutions, which provided opportunities to maximize the project impact, improve interventions coherence, and enhance synergies. In this sense, it is outstanding that portfolio management links with the Genetic Resources for Sustainable Development and Wildlife Landscapes projects. The project also had the support of academic institutions and research centers such as the Amazon Regional University Ikiam, Otonga Foundation / Jambatu Center, Amaru Biopark and ETAPA.

Interviewees value MAAE leadership and ownership as the Main Executing Entity from the project design phase, playing a key role in leveraging co-financing resources and coordinating different institutions and levels of government participation. Coordination of project PARG execution was in charge of the UNDP Environment and Energy Area as the GEF Implementing Agency, that accompanied and added value to the intervention based on its long experience with GEF.

PMU shows a performance that exceeds expectations, considering that it had a low budget in relation to set goals and that the project design left some gaps that raised the project's risk profile. Testimonies give account of an experienced team, with specific knowledge of MAAE, previous work with GEF financed projects, commitment, and good predisposition to collaborate with different institutions and partners. PMU management for the leverage of resources from different institutions, stands out, without it, it would not have been possible to meet the project objectives and goals.

Regarding the achievement of project objectives, in general terms it can be considered that they have been fulfilled, but not in magnitude and in accordance with the originally established expectations. The highest performance was demonstrated in the first two Outcomes of the project, although unmet goals are associated with factors outside the project's management and scope, as well as the uncertainty that exists at the time of formulating goals.

Although the project has demonstrated the capacity to mobilize resources, interventions sustainability perspective presents important risks, fundamentally from the financial perspective, considering the fiscal adjustment measures and budget cuts of the institutions involved in the project monitoring. From the institutional perspective, the project has laid the foundations to generate a response capacity and inter-institutional coordination, however, sustainability in the short and long term will depend on MAAE leadership and its ability to maintain commitment and involvement from the other of the actors.

## 4.1 Recomendation

Recomendation	Responsable
Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and ev	aluation of the
The design of future projects should consider with bigger priority and detail the treatment of political, economic and financial risks, since they end up being decisive for the project success or failure. It is recommended to explicitly incorporate specific strategies and tools to mitigate these risks.	MAAE, UNDP
For future projects that address specific issues, where the capable actor universe is very limited, the project must make its best to actively incorporate them during implementation, even if they did not intervene in the design.	MAAE, UNDP
Formulation of medium-term goals makes it possible to project a time horizon for the intervention and is a tool that helps to make decisions on time. It is recommended that projects make the effort to formulate medium term goals even if it is not requested by the donor.	MAAE, UNDP
It is essential that during the start-up phase, a specific planning is generated to clearly define and interpret the project indicators. Indicators monitoring and follow-up require specifying their interpretation and baseline, proposing their measurement methodology, timing, means of verification and the responsible person or institution. It is recommended to strictly apply the Manual for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Results for UNDP Projects.	MAAE, UNDP
Monitoring co-financing of the project must be systematic, for which it is essential that it has tools and a system that allows monitoring the resources mobilization at different times in the project's life and not only at the end of its execution.	MAAE, UNDP
It is essential to maintain concatenation and logical order in the intervention. While certain actions may be carried out later than planned, others such as the Amphibian Action Plan are neuralgic, and their delay affects the entire chain of results.	MAAE, UNDP
Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project	

Accompany the consulting processes, and, during the closing, transfer of the equipment acquired by the project is carried out with the UNDP support. Although MAAE has recommended that the teams continue in the Jambatu Center, it is essential to have legal backing, for which the UNDP guidance and support, is required. It will be important that the agreements establish that the beneficiaries with the equipment become technology transfer centers, so that other institutes, researchers, or universities can use and benefit from the information and / or equipment without conditions or obstacles.	PMU
The project establishes bases of relationship and work to continue with the taxonomic description of some species present in the Cajas massif, in this sense, closure process should try to specify medium and long- term commitments to maintain these research lines.	Jambatu Center Ikiam Amazon Regional University PNC
It is still necessary to work on access to the scientific information generated by the project in terms of scientific aspect and other information for the public. It is recommended not to limit in publishing data generated through a scientific publication, but to work on communicating it at different levels: students, decision makers, etc. This is important so that the information is not lost and can be useful to sensitized on the importance of amphibians and their conservation.	PMU Ikiam Amazon Regional University Jambatu Center
It is essential that the exit strategy document is shared with the different project partners so they can take action on time.	PMU UNDP
In the short term, it is necessary to technically support Carchi and Guayas GADPs so they include within their operating budgets for 2021, resources that allow supporting the implementation of the Management Plans first activities, generated for the new areas of conservation.	PMU MAAE
It is recommended to strengthen the follow-up and maintain permanent contact with community actors, since they are still motivated by the project, but they mention their concern and uncertainty regarding the future of the activities promoted by the project.	UGP UNDP GADP Guayas
Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives	
The involvement of different actors, including communities, NGOs and the academic sector gave important results. However, it is essential to strengthen coordination with the private sector in the framework of post- pandemic productive reactivation initiatives.	MAAE UNDP
The actors that will be part of the project should be involved not only in the ProDoc formulation, but also in the budget design, as this is essential to stablish the scope of indicators and goals.	MAAE UNDP
NIM modality of direct national implementation provides opportunities for capacity building in public institutions. However, it demands a careful risk analysis, investment of resources in the formation of institutional response capacity, as well as necessary political support to accelerate the processes.	MAAE UNDP
It is essential to deepen the articulation and complement with actors such as GIZ, which has several initiatives related to bioeconomy that could potentially give continuity to the results obtained by the project.	MAAE UNDP
Due to the work that ETAPA has been carrying out, it is considered that future similar initiatives would include an endangered species such as	MAAE UNDP

Atelopus exiguus. Although it was a species evaluated prior to the project, it was not included due to stochastic issues, since at that time there was not a enough number of individuals; however, there is currently an enough number to guarantee the feasibility of the investigation.	
It is important to consider that when working on scientific projects there is a lot of uncertainty because it should be expected that the results will not come up as expected. This requires not only significant levels of flexibility and adaptive management, but also having adequate monitoring and follow-up tools to record changes and guide project management.	MAAE UNDP

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

Technical partners of the project, such Jambatu, demonstrated to have specialized capacity in amphibian issues, however, at the administrative level they showed important weaknesses. In these cases, the project must ensure investment in strengthening these partner capacities to ensure viability of implementation and sustainability of the overall intervention.

Projects that intend to create new conservation areas should consider technical and specialized support in social issues within the implementation team. The ability to generate trustful relationships, design mechanisms for access to benefits, conflict resolution and in general, relationship with community, cannot be exclusively under the responsibility of biologists and technicians with science training.

The project team adaptive capacity and flexibility to lead the process of competencies change that the Ingenios Code brought with, is valued. In contexts of high uncertainty and institutional reform, these projects can play a key role in convening stakeholders and facilitating the process of inter-institutional dialogue and coordination. For this reason, the PMU must seek a balanced relationship between different project partners and actors, avoiding bias and maintaining impartiality.

Carrying out research in Ecuador is much more complex and expensive than in other countries, due to structural barriers. In PARG case, it is clearly evidenced that one of the country's limitations is the lack of suppliers of inputs and reagents. Likewise, long periods of time for obtaining permits have an effect on researchers, losing their motivation to continue or start new studies.

One of the main lessons left by PARG is related to shared management between different projects that share the same UNDP portfolio. Positive and negative lessons have been identified. In the first case, the fact that PARG has shared activities with ABS and Wildlife Landscapes has made it possible to strengthen the technical counterpart in MAAE and improve coordination. While, in the other hand. the confluence of 3 projects can decant in overload for MAAE, loss of identity and positioning of the project.

Promotion of a project of the PARG magnitude, as well as others related such as Wildlife Landscapes and ABS, show that there was a commitment of the focal point within MAAE, which also demonstrated the capacity and experience to propose and specify new projects. This shows that it is essential to promote capacity of technicians within MAAE so they are involved throughout the entire projects life cycle.

#### **5 ANNEXES**

#### 5.1 Annex 1: ToR

#### TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

Project No.: 00094106

Project Title: "Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources"

Functional Title: Consultant for Independent Terminal Evaluation

Contract Type: Individual Consultant

Location: Quito - Ecuador

Duration: 60 days

#### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources (PIMS #.5314)

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

#### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

	Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic						
Project Title:	Resources						
			at endorsement	at completion			
GEF Project ID:			(Million US\$)	(Million US \$)			
UNDP Project							
ID:	00094106	GEF Financing:	2.726.908	2.726.908			
Country	Ecuador	IA / AE own:					
Region:	LAC	Government:	9.160.380	9.160.380			
Focal Area:	Environment and energy	Other:	5.055.744	5.055.744			
	Ecuador will be able to						
	implement integrated						
	emergency actions to						
	conserve Ecuadorean						
	amphibian diversity and						
FA Objectives,	use its genetic resources						
(OP/SP):	in a sustainable way. The	Total co-financing:	14.216.124	14.216.124			

	three principal outcomes			
	expected from the project			
	are: 1. Emergency actions			
	to ensure the survival of			
	endangered amphibian			
	species of Ecuador for			
	conservation and bio-			
	prospecting purposes;			
	2. Discovery of active			
	compounds derived from			
	the skin secretions of			
	Ecuadorian amphibians			
	with potential			
	applications in			
	biomedicine; 3.			
	Institutional			
	strengthening for the			
	implementation of			
	biodiversity conservation			
	measures and sustainable			
	use of genetic resources			
	in Ecuador, using			
	amphibians as a pilot case			
	study.			
Executing	LINDR	Total expenditure of the		
Agency:	UNDP	project:	16.943.032	16.943.032
		ProDoc Signature (d	ate project began):	July 10, 2015
			Proposed	
	Ministry of Environment		Sentember	Actual:
	Otonga Foundation	(Operational) Closing Date:	2020	May, 2020
	Research Center, AMARU	(operational) crossing pare.	2020	
	Biopark, ETAPA Municipal			
	Telecommunications,			
	water and Sewerage			
	Company of Cuenca,			
	Decentralized			
	Autonomous Government			
	of Carchi, Decentralized			
0.1	Autonomous Government			
Other partners	or Guayas.			
involved:	ikiam University			

#### **OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE**

The project was designed to: Eliminate barriers and ensure long-term conservation of the country's biodiversity. The goal of the project is to safeguard Ecuador's globally significant biodiversity by building capacity in accessing its genetic resources and sharing the benefits, and at the same time improve the

sustainability of the protected areas system by strengthening the reserves of the decentralized autonomous governments (GAD).

The overall objective of the PARG project in the long term is the conservation of the biological and genetic resources of Ecuadorian amphibians at high risk of extinction, through an integrated strategy that links: i) *in situ* conservation actions (habitat protection); ii) *ex situ* conservation actions (the creation of a Life Bank that preserves specimens of genetic material, skin molecules, and germ cells and that raises genetically viable colonies of species in the laboratory); iii) multidisciplinary and cooperative research to discover active compounds derived from the skin secretions of Ecuadorian amphibians with potential applications in biomedicine; *iv*) monitoring species at high risk of extinction; and, *v*) institutional strengthening for the implementation of biodiversity conservation measures and the sustainable use of genetic resources in Ecuador, using amphibians as a pilot study case. Collectively, these actions will define the integrated approach required to launch a consolidated ABS framework in Ecuador.

The overall outcome of the project and the expected outcome of the UNPD Country Program both affirm that "Up to the year 2018 [the project] has contributed to strengthening institutional and civic capacities to promote the rights of nature, to create conditions for sustainable development and to improve resilience and risk management against the effects of climate change and disasters of natural and anthropic origin".

The main outcome for Environment and Sustainable Development from the UNDP Strategic Plan 2015 - 2019 establishes "inclusive and sustainable growth and development that incorporates production capacities to generate employment and a better lifestyle for the poor and excluded". The secondary outcome for Environment and Sustainable Development from the UNDP Strategic Plan states that "countries reduce the likelihood of conflict and reduce the risk from natural disasters, including climate change".

The strategies for the expected products from the UNDP Country Program Action Plan, plans, and budget instruments are formulated and applied focused on priority groups, with special emphasis on those affected by gender inequality, the conservation and sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem goods and services, climate change, promulgation of resilience, dissemination of sustainable energy alternatives and proper handling of chemicals and contaminants.

The objective of the project is to enable Ecuador to implement integrated emergency actions for conserving the diversity of amphibians in Ecuador and to use its genetic resources in a sustainable way. The three principal expected results of the project, related to its three components of conservation, research and institutional strengthening, are: 1. Emergency actions to guarantee the survival of Ecuadorian amphibian species that are in danger of extinction, for the purposes of conservation and bioprospecting; 2. The discovery of active compounds, derived from the skin secretions of Ecuadorian amphibians, that possess potential applications in biomedicine; and 3. Institutional strengthening for the implementation of biodiversity conservation measures and the sustainable use of genetic resources in Ecuador, using amphibians as a pilot study case.

The resources allocated to the project by GEF reach US \$2,726,908 which, together with cash and in-kind counterpart resources, total US \$16,943,032, to be expended until May 2020.

In the PRODOC (p. 65, paragraph 196), it is stated that "as implementing agency of the GEF, UNDP will ultimately be responsible for delivering the results, which are subject to certification by MAE as the

Principal Implementing Entity. UNDP will provide the project cycle management services defined by the GEF Council, which include the following:

- Provide financial and auditing services for the project,
- Supervise the project's budgetary expenditures,
- Guarantee that project activities, including procurement and financial services, are carried out in strict compliance with UNDP-GEF procedures,
- Ensure that the provisioning of information to the GEF is performed in accordance with GEF requirements and procedures,
- Facilitate the learning process, exchange and dissemination within the GEF family,
- 6) Contract the intermediate and final evaluations of the project, and conduct additional evaluations and/or reviews when necessary and in consultation with the counterparts of the project.

In the same document (p. 71, paragraph 254 and 255), it is noted that: "An independent <u>Final Evaluation</u> will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the <u>UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation</u> <u>Resource Center (ERC)</u>. The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

With these background, the Ministry of the Environment of Ecuador, through the Undersecretary of Natural Heritage – National Biodiversity Directorate, main implementing entity of the project "Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources"– PARG, with the support of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) as implementing agency of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), requires hiring a consultancy to perform the final evaluation of the PARG project, from the beginning of the project (October 2015), until the final-date of its execution.

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.

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.

#### SPECIAL CONDITIONS RELATED TO COVID19

Given the world health emergency crisis, trips detailed in these Terms of Reference will be carried out in case the Ecuadorian National Authority allows them on the effective start date of this consultancy. However, candidates are asked to include an estimated value for all trips in their financial offer. If, at the start date of the consultancy, it is not possible to make national or international trips, the project final

evaluation will be carried out remotely, complying with all conditions established in these Terms of Reference, including interviews with key actors, using one of the available video call systems, for which Project Management Unit will coordinate the logistical details with each person.

Additionally, the selected consultant must sign the Statement of Good Health, which appears in Annex No. H.

#### EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

An overall approach and method<sup>1</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 <u>UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects</u>. 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 is expected to conduct a field mission to Quito and provinces of Carchi, Guayas and Azuay, including the following project sites: Acus Microcuenca del Río Chinambí (Carchi), APPC San Miguel (Guayas), Parque Nacional Cajas (Azuay), Centro Jambatu (Quito), Bioparque Amaru (Cuenca) and Bellavista (Quito). Interviews will be held with at least the following organizations and individuals: (Ministry of the Environment of Ecuador (MAE), Secretary of Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation (SENESCYT), National Biodiversity Institute (INABIO), National Intellectual Rights Service (SENADI), Amazonian Regional University IKIAM, Decentralized Autonomous Governments (GAD Carchi and GAD Guavas), Municipal Public Telecommunications, Water, Sewerage and Sanitation Company (ETAPA EP), Otonga Foundation and Jambatu Center, Amaru Amphibian Rescue Center,; as well as other institutions, senior officials and managerial staff, technical and task team/component leaders, key experts and the consultants in the subject area, members of the project's board of directors, academia, local governments and civil society organizations, etc.

Additionally, the consultant is expected to conduct field missions and meetings with officials and/or technical/specialist teams according to the following table:

Institution / actor	Location	Number of meetings
PARG Project	Quito	3
UNDP	Quito	2
Ministry of the Environment of Ecuador (MAE)	Quito	1
Secretary of Higher Education, Science, Technology and Innovation	Quito	1

(SENESCYT),		
National Biodiversity Institute (INABIO)	Quito	1
National Intellectual Rights Service (SENADI)	Quito	1
Amazonian Regional University IKIAM	Tena	1
Decentralized Autonomous Government (GAD) Carchi	Tulcán	1
Decentralized Autonomous Government (GAD) Guayas	Guayaquil	1
Municipal Public Telecommunications, Water and Sewerage Company (EP ETAPA)	Cuenca	1
Otonga Foundation	Quito	1
Amaru Amphibian Rescue Center	Cuenca	1
President of the Community of Chinambí and President of the community of San Jacinto	Carchi	1
Presidents of the Community of San Miguel.	San Miguel Cantón Naranjal	1
Bellavista Promotor	Quito	1

In addition, the consultant is expected to perform field missions in Pichincha, Azuay, Carchi, and Guayas to carry out field observations in the project's intervention areas, according to the following table:

Area of intervention	Province	City	Duration of
			visit
Otonga Foundation /	Pichincha	Sangolquí	1 morning
Jambatu Center			
Cajas National Park (PNC)	Azuay	Cuenca	2 days
Chinambí	Carchi	Tulcán	2 days
San Miguel	Guayas	Guayaquil	2 days

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information Including all Global ABS documentation, 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 <u>Annex B</u> of this Terms of Reference.

#### **EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS**

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework [see <u>Annex A</u>], 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 <u>Annex D</u>.

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	UNDP ov	vn	Government		Partner Agency		Total	
(type/source)	financing US\$)	g (mill.	(mill. US\$)		(mill. US\$)		(mill. US\$)	
	Planne	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
	d							
Grants								
Loans/Concessions								
<ul> <li>In-kind support</li> </ul>								
---	--	--	--	--				
Other								
Totals								

### MAINSTREAMING

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

### 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>1</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 *Ecuador*. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation consultant. Please note, that all travel and related expenses to field visits need to be included in the financial proposal. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

### EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the TR will be approximately 60 days and shall not exceed 3 months from when the consultant is hired.

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Contract signing		April 1st, 2020

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: <u>ROTI Handbook 2009</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the <u>Handbook on Planning. Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results</u>. Chapter 7, pg. 163

Preparation	05 days	April 6, 2020
Evaluation Mission	20 days	April 21, 2020
Draft Evaluation Report	20 days	May 6, 2020
Final Report	15 days	May 16, 2020

These are tentative dates. MAE and UNDP will send comments on deliverables within 8 business days after their reception.

### EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation consultant is expected to deliver the following:

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

### CONSULTANT PROFILE

The consultant 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 selection of the consultant will be done following the next criteria:

### Education

- Master's degree in environmental sciences, biology, social sciences or economics.
- Undergraduate degree in science, economics, administration, or similar fields.
- Fluency in reading, speaking and writing Spanish and English.

### General experience:

- Work experience in the area of biological sciences of at least 10 years.
  - Recent experience of at least five (5) years on result-based management evaluation methodologies.

Specific experience:

- Experience in at least one (1) process applying SMART indicators and reconstructing and validating baseline scenarios in the last five years.
- Verifiable experience of participation in at least two (2) UNDP or GEF project evaluation processes, either midterm or final reviews, in the last five years.

### 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 <u>UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'</u>

### PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

(this payment schedule is indicative, to be filled in by the CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based on their standard procurement procedures)

%	Milestone
20%	Upon approval of Inception Report as an advance to cover costs of travel.
30%	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

### EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

The evaluation criteria are the following:

Rating parameter	Criteria	Score	Percentage
CV	Knowledge:		30%

Rating parameter	Criteria	Score	Percentage					
	University degree in environmental sciences, biology, social sciences or economics.	10						
	Undergraduate degree in science, economics, administration, or similar fields.	5						
	Fluency in reading, speaking and writing Spanish and English.	10						
	General experience:							
	Work experience in relevant technical areas (biology) of at least 10 years	15						
	Recent experience of at least five (5) years on result - based management evaluation methodologies.	10						
	Specific experience:							
	Experience in at least one (1) process applying SMART indicators and reconstructing and validating baseline scenarios in the last five years.	40						
	Verifiable experience of participation in at least two (2) UNDP or GEF project evaluation processes, either midterm or final reviews, in the last five years.	10						
	TOTAL:	100	]					
	Methodology, agenda and implementation schedule:							
	How much the offeror understands the nature of the work and conforms to the Terms of Reference?	25						
	Does the offeror's portfolio demonstrate experience in the development and elaboration of products similar to those described in the ToRs?	25						
Technical Proposal	Is the methodology, established to achieve the products defined for the consultancy, described in depth?	20	40%					
	Is the methodology adequate to achieve the products defined for the consultancy?	15						
	Has a clear presentation been made? Is the sequence of activities and their planning logical and realistic? Does it lead to an efficient implementation of the consulting objective?	15						
	TOTAL:	100						

Economic proposal	Score	Percentage
The highest score (30%) will be awarded to the most economical offer and the inverse proportional to the other offers.	100	30%

Only the technical proposal that meet the technical phase with a minimum	
score of 50/70 or more, will continue to the review of economic proposal,	
which will weight a maximum of 30%.	

### ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks & Assumptions	
Project Objective: Ecuador implements integrated emergency actions to conserve the	<ol> <li>Increase in additional hectares of habitat critical for conservation of target amphibian species that is under legal protection thereby closing conservation gaps.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>0 ha of humid premontane forest conserved in GAD reserves</li> <li>Conservation gap is 8,328 hectares<sup>2</sup></li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2,200 ha humid premontane forest conserved in GAD reserves</li> <li>Conservation gap reduced by 25%</li> </ul>	Creation ordinance of new Protected Areas (PAs)	<ul> <li>Search &amp; rescue of sufficient individuals of each gender</li> </ul>	
diversity of amphibians of Ecuador and use its genetic resources in a sustainable way	<ol> <li>Replication of in situ amphibian conservation measures tested by project further reducing conservation gaps</li> </ol>	O PA within SNAP     O Socio Bosque	<ul> <li>At least 1 PA within SNAP</li> <li>At least 1 Socio Bosque (hectares to be measured once replication sites determined)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Project reports</li> <li>Management plans</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Rescued individuals remain healthy in captivity</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>Number of amphibian species on updated IUCN red list</li> <li>under successful captive breeding</li> <li>with cryopreserved sperm</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>18 rescued and maintained ex situ</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>20 rescued and under successful captive breeding programmes</li> </ul>	Centro Jambatu & Amaru websites	<ul> <li>Relevant governments entities continue to show willingness to adopt policy measures for amphibian</li> </ul>	
	samples viable for reproductive • with skins or secretions preserved in the Ecuadorian Amphibian Genome Bank (EAGB)	<ul> <li>0 species</li> <li>0</li> </ul>	At least 1 sample from 2 target species     Approx. 70 (40%)	PA reports		
	<ol> <li>Increase in the flow of resources to amphibian conservation/ABS</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>TBD –based on the findings of the case study and economic valuation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>10% increase from case study base line</li> <li>By midterm case study and baselines established</li> </ul>	Case study report and annual budgets of relevant institutions	Capacity     strengthening	
	<ol> <li>Degree of compliance in environmental licensing with regards to official guidelines on amphibian conservation in sites prioritized in the National Strategic Plan</li> </ol>	• 0%	<ul> <li>100% once official</li> <li>By mid-term guidelines defined</li> <li>By Year 4 guidelines made official in secondary Norm</li> </ul>	MAE reports and audits     Guidelines     Ministerial accord	efforts in MAE continue including the completion of the centralized data	
	<ol> <li>% Reduction in processing times for Collection Permits, Framework Contracts, and Access Contracts</li> </ol>	Collection Permits: 2     weeks to 6 months.     Framework Contracts: 2	Processing times:     Collection Permits: 1 week     Framework Contracts: 1     month	<ul> <li>Genetic Resources Module published online via SUIA portal</li> <li>Approval reports</li> </ul>	management system and necessary policies to ensure the	

<sup>2</sup> A gap analysis of critical habitat covered within the Natural Protected Areas Heritage of Ecuador (PANE) calculates that 8,328 hectares of critical habitat to the project's target species (A. balios, A. coynei and Atelopus sp. aff. longirostris) are unprotected.

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks & Assumptions					
		<ul> <li>Months</li> <li>Access Contracts: more than 2 years</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Access Contracts: in compliance with established Norm (approx. 6 months)</li> </ul>	of Collection Permits, and Contracts	exchange of information online					
Outcome 1. Emergency actions to ensure the survival of highly endangered amphibian species of Ecuador for conservation and bio-prospecting purposes	<ol> <li># of protected areas and hectares of habitat critical for amphibians with specific conservation measures for highly endangered amphibian species legally-recognized and integrated in the SNAP.</li> </ol>	<ul> <li>O Provincial GAD reserves declared with focus on amphibian conservation</li> <li>O Management Plans include amphibian conservation measures.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2 Provincial GAD reserves declared with focus on amphibian conservation:         <ul> <li>Carchi PA (1400 ha)</li> <li>Guayas PA (800 ha)</li> </ul> </li> <li>3 Management Plans covering total of 2,961 ha. Critical Habitat include amphibian conservation measures: Carchi PA; Guayas PA and Cajas NP (761 hectares)</li> </ul>	Creation ordinances of new PAs     Management Plans with Financial Sustainability Programs     SNAP reports	<ul> <li>Provinces continue to show interest and political will to declare reserves, and complete requirements for formal integration into the SNAP.</li> </ul>					
	<ol> <li>Increase in management effectiveness of 3 legally- recognized PAs with conservation measures for highly endangered amphibian species (METT)</li> </ol>	METT Score • Carchi PA: 0 • Guayas PA: 0 • Cajas NP: 62	METT Score • Carchi PA: TBD • Guayas PA: TBD • Cajas NP: 82	<ul> <li>METT applied at midterm and end project</li> </ul>	Conservation interventions have a positive impact on PAs and their management					
	<ul> <li>9. Successful captive breeding programmes measured by:</li> <li># of reproductive events (egg mass) of target species</li> <li>% survival of rescued individuals in captivity</li> </ul>	# reproductive events     Atelopus nanay: 2     Asp. aff palmatus 0     Dendrobates condor: 0 <u>%survival</u> Atelopus nanay: 66%     sp. aff. palmatus: 0%     Dendrobates condor: 0%	# reproductive events     Atelopus nanay: 22     A.sp. aff. palmatus: 20     Dendrobates condor:20 <u>%survival</u> Atelopus nanay: 80%     A. sp. aff. palmatus: 80%     Dendrobates condor: 80%	Centro Jambatu & Amaru reports and websites	<ul> <li>Collection permits granted within established time frames</li> <li>Rescued individuals remain healthy in captivity</li> </ul>					
Output 1.1 Ex situ conservation through breeding actions to protect highly endangered amphibian species Output 1.2 In situ conservation of critical habitats of unique species at high risk of extinction, Atelopus coynei, Atelopus balios, Atelopus sp. (Aff. longirostris), in Decentralized Autonomous Governments (GAD) reserves and Atelopus nanay in one existing PANE area.										

Objective	Indicator	Baseline				Target						Means of Verification	Risks & Assumptions		
Outcome 2. Discovery of active compounds derived from the skin secretion of Ecuadorian amphibians with potential applications in biomedicine	<ol> <li>Active compounds<sup>3</sup> isolated and structurally characterized (peptides and natural proteins sequenced) from the skin secretions of 4 amphibians: 1= Agalychnis spurelli</li> <li>2= Cruziohyla calcarifer</li> <li>3= Hypsiboas picturatus</li> <li>4= Atelopus nanay</li> </ol>	1     2     3     4       A     1*     1*     0       B     0     0     0       A     Active compound isolated and characterized by mass spectrometry (*insulin tropic peptide)       B     New peptides molecularly characterized (sequence of amino acids) by molecular cloning and sequencing by mass spectrometry					AB	1 25 4	2 25 4	3 25 1	4		Laboratory reports, publications	<ul> <li>Permits and contracts granted for collection and exportation of specimens and samples within established time frames</li> <li>Availability of sufficient samples of secretions to perform analyse</li> </ul>	
	<ol> <li># of new peptides synthesized and pharmacologically tested from the skin secretions of 4 amphibian species</li> <li># of students with Senerat</li> </ol>	2						4						Laboratory reports, publications	<ul> <li>Synthetic peptides have biological activity and</li> </ul>
	scholarships pursuing graduate studies in amphibian bio- prospecting	1 Student						At least 5 students						Reports generated by laboratory Reports for the scholarships	resemble natural peptides
	<ol> <li>Ecuadorian bio-prospecting laboratory equipped with appropriate technology and conducting research on amphibian bio-prospecting</li> </ol>	0						At least 1							<ul> <li>Sumcent qualified candidates for scholarships</li> </ul>
	<ol> <li># of publications in peer review scientific journals on bio- prospecting research on amphibian skin secretions by Ecuadorian Institutions</li> </ol>	0			10						Publications	<ul> <li>Availability of biological material.</li> </ul>			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> In this context an active compound is synonymous with peptide or protein.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, Chapter 7, pg. 163

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks & Assumptions
	<ol> <li>% Ecuadorian amphibian species<sup>4</sup> with tissues preserved in the Ecuadorian Amphibian Genome Bank (EAGB)</li> </ol>	0%	50%	Genome Bank catalog accessible on Centro Jambatu's webpage	<ul> <li>Timely availability of equipment and materials</li> </ul>
Output 2.1 Institution	al procedures completed to foster am	phibian bio-prospecting resear	ch		
Output 2.2 Research of	on skin secretions for new peptides wi	ith bioactive properties from fo	ur species of Ecuadorian amphibia	ins	
Output 2.3 Technical	and scientific capabilities for bio-pros	pecting improved in Ecuador			
Output 2.4 BioBanking	Output 2.4 BioBanking of genetic resources of Ecuadorian amphibians strengthened				
Outcome 3. Institutional strengthening for the implementation of biodiversity conservation measures and sustainable use of its genetic resources in Ecuador, using amphibians as a pilot case study.	<ol> <li>Strengthened policy and regulations measured by:</li> <li>% implementation of the Strategic Action Plan for Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibians</li> <li>Nagoya Protocol ratified</li> <li>Regulation 905 aligned with national, sub-regional and international legislation<sup>5</sup></li> </ol>	<ul> <li>0% (draft Strategic Plan, no Action Plan)</li> <li>Nagoya Protocol signed and under discussion in National Assembly</li> <li>Regulation 905 not aligned</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>20% implementation by MAE of Action Plan (plan approved by Midterm)</li> <li>Nagoya Protocol ratified</li> <li>Regulation 905 updated and aligned</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Strategic Plan and Action Plan</li> <li>MAE work plans include components of Action Plan</li> <li>Ratification of Nagoya Protocol</li> <li>Updated/aligned Regulation 905</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Government continues to show political will to align regulatory framework for genetic resources and ABS with national, sub- regional and international regulations.</li> </ul>
	17. Improved capacities of national ABS implementing agencies, measured by the ABS Capacity Development Scorecard	ABS Capacity Development Scorecard: 35 3 areas to improve: CR 1: 3 <sup>6</sup>	ABS Capacity Development Scorecard: 49 3 areas improved CR 1: 6	ABS Scorecard	<ul> <li>Training programmes are institutionalized and staff increased</li> </ul>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> As of January 2015, 546 amphibian species have been recorded in Ecuador, distributed across three groups: Anuros (represented by frogs and toads) comprise 514 species, Salamanders (Caudata order) comprise 8 species, and Caecilians (Gymnophiona order) comprise 24 species.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> e.g. National Plan for Good Living, Decree 391, Nagoya Protocol, ITPGR, CONVEMAR

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> CR 1: 3 Capacity to conceptualize and formulate policies, laws, strategies and programmes;

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the <u>Handbook on Planning</u>, <u>Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results</u>, Chapter 7, pg. 163

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks & Assumptions
		CR2: 14 CR5: 7 - Capacity to conceptualize: The institution(s) has financial resources but has limited personnel and expertise. - Capacity to Apply: The ABS institution(s) has weak leadership and provides little guidance. - Capacity to Monitor: The institution(s) has financial resources but has limited personnel and expertise 0% - Genetic Resources Permit Module does not exist in the National Environmental Data base (SUIA)	CR2: 19 CR5: 13 <u>Capacity to conceptualize</u> : - Increased capacity to conceptualize policy and related instruments for ABS, in particular to ensure the rules are more efficient and clearer. <u>Capacity to Apply</u> - ABS decision-making Institutions have expanded knowledge on ABS issues and ability to act on it. <u>Capacity to Monitor:</u> - Improved capacities of ABS Institutions to execute, monitor and evaluate requests for access to genetic resources 100% - SUIA Genetic Resources Permit Module established and producing quality updated reports.		<ul> <li>Approval of the norm that defines the procedures for Access Contract for Genetic Resources</li> <li>The MAE completes the centralized data management system and necessary policies to ensure the exchange of information online.</li> </ul>
	<ol> <li>% Reduction in processing times for Collection Permits, Framework Contracts, and Access Contracts</li> <li>Increase in awareness on</li> </ol>	Processing times: • Collection Permits: 2 weeks to 6 months. • Framework Contracts: 2 months • Access Contracts: more than 2 years • ABS-CH website does	<ul> <li>Processing times:</li> <li>Collection Permits: 1 week</li> <li>Framework Contracts: 1 month</li> <li>Access Contracts: in compliance with established Norm (approx. 6 months)</li> <li>&gt; 5% annual increase once</li> </ul>	Genetic Resources Module published online via SUIA portal Approval reports of Collection Permits, and Contracts ABS-CH website	

CR2: 14 Capacity to implement policies, legislation, strategies and programmes;

CR5: 7 Capacity to monitor, evaluate, report and learn

Objective	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks & Assumptions
	amphibian conservation as measured by • Increase in users accessing ABS-CH Platform • Increase in records of amphibians from unofficial sources	not have a user counter • 317 records of 107 species from 40 members of the Science Citizen portal	interconnected platform established <ul> <li>&gt; 5% annual increase once interconnected platform established and connected to Science Citizen portal</li> </ul>	online • Amphibian factsheets available online via ABS-CH portal and Centro Jambatu website	
Output 3.1. National and local frameworks aligned for conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources of amphibians Output 3.2 Improved capacities of National Competent Authority and related agencies on ABS, including procedures and Prior Informed Consent & Mutually Agreed Terms Output 3.3 National information improved and available for effective decision making on protection and sustainable use of genetic resources of endangered amphibians					

#### Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

- 1. PIF
- 2. UNDP Initiation Plan
- 3. UNDP Project Document
- 4. UNDP Environmental and Social Screening results
- 5. Project Inception Report
- 6. All Project Implementation Reports (PIR's)
- 7. Mid Term progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams
- 8. Audit reports
- 9. Finalized GEF focal area Tracking Tools at CEO endorsement and midterm (specific TT's for this project's focal area)
- 10. Oversight mission reports
- 11. All monitoring reports prepared by the project
- 12. Financial and Administration guidelines used by project Team
- 13. ProDoc Global ABS Project
- 14. Nagoya Protocol
- 15. Community protocols

The following documents will also be available:

- 16. Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems
- 17. UNDP country programme document(s)
- Minutes of the Conservation of Ecuadorian Amphibian Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of its Genetic Resources PARG Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
- 19. Project site location maps.

### ANNEX C: 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 C national levels?	SEF focal area, and to the environment and	development priorities at t	he local, regional and
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and object	ives of the project been achieved?		
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with intern	ational and national norms and standards?		
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social	economic, and/or environmental risks to se	ustaining long-term project	results?
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or	enabled progress toward, reduced environ	nmental stress and/or impr	oved ecological

S	tatus:			
	•	•	•	•
	•	•	•	•

### ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

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

#### Evaluators:

- Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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>7</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 <i>place</i> on <i>date</i>
Signature:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the <u>Handbook on Planning. Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results</u>, Chapter 7, pg. 163

### ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>8</sup>

Opening page:

i.

	<ul> <li>Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>UNDP and GEF project ID#s.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Region and countries included in the project</li> </ul>
	GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
	<ul> <li>Implementing Partner and other project partners</li> </ul>
	Evaluation team members
	Acknowledgements
ii.	Executive Summary
	Project Summary Table
	<ul> <li>Project Description (brief)</li> </ul>
	Evaluation Rating Table
	<ul> <li>Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons</li> </ul>
iii.	Acronyms and Abbreviations
	(See: UNDP Editorial Manual <sup>9</sup> )
1.	Introduction
	Purpose of the evaluation
	<ul> <li>Scope &amp; Methodology</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Structure of the evaluation report</li> </ul>
2.	Project description and development context
	<ul> <li>Project start and duration</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Problems that the project sought to address</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Immediate and development objectives of the project</li> </ul>
	Baseline Indicators established
	Main stakeholders
	Expected Results

3. Findings

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>®</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the <u>Handbook on Planning. Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results</u>. Chapter 7, pg. 163

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>10</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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the <u>Handbook on Planning. Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results</u>. Chapter 7, pg. 163

- 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
- Annexes
  - ToR
  - Itinerary
  - List of persons interviewed
  - Summary of field visits
  - List of documents reviewed
  - Evaluation Question Matrix
  - Questionnaire used and summary of results
  - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

### ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical	Adviser based in the region and included in the final documer
Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by	
UNDP Country Office	
Name:	
Signature:	Date:
UNDP GEF RTA	
Name:	
Signature:	Date:

### ANNEX H: STATEMENT OF GOOD HEALTH



Empowered lives. Resilient nations.

### STATEMENT OF HEALTH – INDIVIDUAL CONTRACTORS

Name of Consultant/Individual Contractor:

Last Name, First Name

Statement of Good Health

In accordance with the provisions of Clause 5 of the <u>General Terms & Conditions for Individual Contractors</u>, I am submitting this statement to certify that I am in good health and take full responsibility for the accuracy of this Statement. I am aware that information pertaining to inoculation requirements in respect of official travel to countries can be referred to at <u>http://www.who.int/ith</u>.

I certify that my medical insurance coverage is valid for the period from to (ir a

to (if applicable)

I certify that my medical insurance covers medical evacuatio through E". Duty stations with "A" or "H" do not require me	ons at Duty Station(s): Duty Station(s) Rating: "B edical evacuation coverage.				
The name of my medical insurance carrier is: Policy Number: Telephone Number of Medical Insurance Carrier:					
A copy of proof of insurance MUST be attached to this form	n.				
Signature of Consultant/Individual Contractor This statement is only valid for Consultant/Individual Contrac	Date actor Contract No.				
Signature of Officer Supervising the Contract	Name				
Business Unit					

## 5.2 Annex 2: List of persons interviewed

	Institution Name	Role	Person
1	PARG Project	Project Coordinator	Pablo Larco Ortuño
2	PARG Project	Responsible Financial Administrative Communicator ABS Technician	Patricia Pachacama Paola Guijarro Sumak Bastidas Paúl Coral
3	United Nations Development	Resident Representative	Matilde Mordt
	Program (UNDP)	RTA Focal Area Biodiversity	Alexandra Fisher María Gabriela Pinto
		Board Member Directive and Technical Committee – Agency	Mónica Andrade Environment & Energy Area Coordinator
		Implementer GEF representative in the country	Carlos Montenegro M&S Technician Environment & Energy Area
4	MAAE	Chairs the Board of Directors and the Technical Committee - Main executing entity-	Wilson Rojas National Director of Biodiversity
		Programmatic, administrative, financial supervision, and responsible for the approval of products	Laura Altamirano Undersecretary of Natural Heritage
5	Senescyt	Member of the Board of Directors and the Technical Committee -	Nicolás Malo Undersecretary for Scientific Research
		Entity that generates research permits and grants access to genetic resources	Erika Villagómez Director of Orientation and Design
6	6 INABIO Member of the Tech Committee - Knowle		Diego Inclán Executive Director
		coordinator of biodiversity research processes - Signs access contracts to GRR for commercial purposes	Francisco Prieto Executive Deputy Director
			Lenin Núñez Legal Adviser
7	Senadi	Member of the Technical Committee - State entity that regulates and controls	Wilson Usiña Member of the Court of the Collegiate Body of Intellectual Rights.

		the application of intellectual property laws, especially Traditional	Paulina Mosquera - Directora de Obtenciones Vegetales y Protección de Conocimientos Tradicionales
		Knowledge and Ancestral Knowledge	Fernando Nogales Sornoza Coordinador Conocimientos Tradicionales
8	Amazon Regional University IkiamMember of the Board of Directors and the Technical Committee - Depresentative of the		Carolina Proaño Research Professor Scientific Research Leader PARG
		Beneficiary Partners - Research Center on Bioprospecting and Updating of the Red List of Amphibians	Mauricio Ortega Teaching researcher Representative under the Steering Committee
9	GADP Carchi	Local Implementing Partner at provincial level	Zayana López Director of Environmental Management
			Willian Edmundo Defas Pillajo Technician GAD Carchi
			Jonathan Tapie PARG Technical
			Diego Fernando Aragón Caiza Technician GAD Carchi
10	GADP Guayas	Local Implementing Partner at the provincial level	Luis Arriaga Director of Environmental Management
12	San Miguel Community	Community Representatives	Key community representatives: Mesías Guayllas Hernán León
13	ETAPA	Member of the Technical Committee of the project - Implementing partner at	José Francisco Cáceres Andrade EP STAGE Focal Point and Amphibian Expert
		the local level - Responsible for the conservation and management of the Cajas National Park	Juan Fernando Webster PNC Biological Monitoring Technician
14	Jambatu Center	Scientific Advisor of the Steering Committee -	Luis Coloma Román Jambatu Center Director
		Member of the Technical Committee - Local	Andrea Coloma Coordinator and Focal Point PARG
		Strategic Partner - In charge of ex situ conservation of amphibians	Andrea Terán BGAE Administrator
15		Local Implementing Partner - In charge of ex	Ernesto Arbeláez Ortiz Director Biopark Amaru

	Bioparque Amaru Amphibian Rescue Center	situ conservation of amphibians, BGAE and reproduction protocols	Fausto Siavichay Director of the Amphibian Conservation Center (CCA) and Technical Coordinator of Biological Monitoring of Amphibians PARG.
16	Chinambí Community	Beneficiary and implementer of the conservation area "Microcuenca Río Chinambí"	Polivio Tipaz (to be checked) América Castro
17	Community of San Jacinto	Beneficiary and implementer of the conservation area "Microcuenca Río Chinambí"	Silvio Lara

## 5.3 Annex 3: List of documents reviewed

Document title
PIF-Project Information Form
Project Document (ProDoc).
Project startup report
Strategic Results Framework.
Matrix of indicators by result (output)
Project Implementation Reports – PIRs
Quarterly and / or quarterly progress reports.
Partial / final reports of consultancies concluded and in process.
Annual progress reports
Financial reports (CDR), including data on co-financing and budgets.
Audit reports
Annual Operating Plans (POA)
Minutes and decisions of the Project Board (Steering Committee).
Communication materials about the project.
Material of interest and relevant to the evaluation produced by the project.
UNDP Country Program Document for Colombia
UNDP Evaluation Guide for GEF Funded Projects.
UNDP Development Results Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Manual.

## 5.4 Annex 4: Evaluation Question Matrix – Annex C

The questions will serve as a basis to help the evaluation team understand the context of the project and stay focused on the most important issues that need to be evaluated and verified. The questions will be applied to the different interviewees, depending on the actor. The evaluator will try to avoid questions whose answers are binary.

Question	Indicator	Verification source
Relevance		
Does the project approach agree with the national priorities?	Alignment with pre-existing policies and new development policies	Project documents, policy, strategy, project staff and partners
Does the project incorporate the perspective of those who would be affected / benefited by the decisions related to the project? Who could influence its results? and Who could contribute information or other resources during the project design processes?	Groups of consultation carried out.	Minutes, project documents, interviews project staff and partners.
What extent did the participation of counterparts and public awareness contribute towards the progress and achievement of Project Objectives?		
What extent does the project contribute towards the progress and achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG)?		
Are the established media appropriate for expressing project progress and intended for public impact? (Is there a website? Or did the project implement appropriate public awareness and outreach campaigns?	Social media, website, brochures, videos, newspapers, manuals, etc.	Reports, interviews
Is the inclusion of the gender perspective contemplated in the planning of results and activities?	Group meeting with gender specialist.	Minutes, project documents, interviews project staff and partners.
What extent does the project respond to the international treaties signed	Alignment with pre-existing policies and new development policies	International treaty documents

by the Government within the framework of environmental policies?		
What extent does the Government support (or not support) the Project, understand its responsibility and fulfill its obligations?	Meetings of the Project Board, Technical Team, Consultation Groups	Minutes, project documents, interviews project staff and partners.
What has been the degree of participation and ownership of the objectives and results by the beneficiary population in the different phases of the project?	Stakeholder perception, reports.	Reports, interviews
What extent has the overall objective of the GEF Project been achieved, has it contributed to conserving its amphibian diversity and using its genetic resources in a sustainable way?	Stakeholder perception, reports.	Reports, interviews
Effectiveness		
What has been the degree of progress towards the achievement of the products and expected results of the project?	% of results and results achieved: Progress towards the results framework	M&E reports, interviews
What extent do the results of the project, as well as its other characteristics (choice of partners, structure of the coordinating unit, implementation mechanisms, scope, budget, administrative processes, use of resources) allow the achievement of the objectives?	% of results and results achieved: Progress towards the results framework	M&E reports, interviews
Is the logical framework of the project: communicated correctly and used as a management tool during project implementation at the country level?	Modifications to the logical framework	M&E reports, interviews
Do the results framework indicators have a SMART focus?	Results framework indicators	M&E reports, interviews
Have the logical framework, work plans, or any changes made to them been used as management tools during project implementation?	M&E documents generated annually, PIR, Quarterly and monthly reports	M&E reports, interviews

Are the mid-term and end- of-project goals achievable?	% of results and results achieved: Progress towards the results framework Abrir en Google Traductor	M&E reports, interviews, ProDoc
What are the main barriers to achieving the Project objective	% of results and results achieved:	M&E reports, interviews
What are the specific recommendations / revisions of goals and indicators?	Modifications made to indicators	M&E reports, interviews
Has the progress made so far led or will it allow future beneficial effects for development (such as income generation, gender equality and empowerment of women, improved governance, legal certainty for key actors, among Others) that can be included in the results framework and monitored annually?	Identification of indirect benefits	M&E reports, interviews
Has there been coordination between the different actors involved in the implementation of the project? Is there the same perception of the project, its objectives and the way in which projects of this type are implemented (understanding of incremental costs, among others)?	Meetings of the Project Board, Technical Team, Consultation Groups	Minutes, project documents, interviews project staff and partners.
Is there an implementation strategy? What is the role of MAAE and its partners? What is the role of UNDP in implementation? Abrir en Google Traductor	Meetings of the Project Board, Technical Team	ProDoc, project reports, interviews
What have been the changes, positive or negative, generated by the work of the MAAE, the Otonga Foundation and the Jambatu Center?	Indirect benefits	ProDoc, project reports, interviews
Have there been effects or some kind of policy change? New policy development Project, policy, strategy	Development of new policies	Project documents, policy, strategy, project staff and partners

documents, project staff and partners		
Is there inclusive participation of beneficiaries with a gender perspective?	Stakeholder perception, stakeholder plan	Project reports, interviews
What processes have required the implementation of a participatory approach? Was the implemented strategy adequate? What results were obtained?	Stakeholder perception, stakeholder plan	Project reports, interviews
How have the changes and adaptive management been reported by the Project Coordinator and shared with the Project Board?	Perception of the project coordinator and other members of the Project Board	Project reports, interviews
Has the progress made so far led or will it allow beneficial effects for development in the future (such as influencing public policies focused on priority groups, gender equality and empowerment of women, improving governance, among others) that may be included in the results framework and monitored annually?	Identification of potential future benefits	Project reports, interviews
How have the lessons learned from the adaptive management process been documented and shared with partners?	Systematization of lessons learned	Project documents
Efficiency		
Have resources been used appropriately and economically to achieve progress toward desired products and outcomes?	% of resources spent vs% progress in achieving results	Expense reports, M&E
Have the budgets and schedules initially established in the project document been respected?	% of resource execution vs planned resources	Expense reports, M&E, ProDoc
Has the availability of inputs and actions been timely?	% of resources spent	Spending reports, interviews
Has the political, technical and administrative support provided by UNDP been timely? What are the challenges to overcome in the future?	Stakeholder perception, reports	Project reports, interviews

What extent did the project results framework function as a management tool?	Stakeholder perception, modifications to the logical framework	M&E reports, interviews
Was there a delay in starting and implementing the project? What were the causes of these and have they been resolved?	Official project start date	Project inception report
Does the project have appropriate financial control? Including reporting and planning of	Planning tools	Spending reports, interviews
management to make informed decisions related to the budget and allow a timely financial flow?		
Do the monitoring and evaluation tools currently used provide the information semi-annual and annual reports necessary? Do they involve key stakeholders / partners? Are they aligned and incorporated with or incorporated into national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient?	The results are well monitored and evaluated in terms of activities, products and results	Project reports, interviews
Describe how the selection, hiring, assignment of experts, consultants and counterpart personnel is carried out Are they cost / effective? How can these tools be made more participatory and inclusive?	Forms of bidding and contracting	Project reports, interviews
Are additional tools required? How can they become more participatory and inclusive?	Stakeholder perception, stakeholder plan	Project reports, interviews
How has co-financing in kind and in money been in practice?		
What lessons can be identified regarding efficiency?	Stakeholder perception, stakeholder plan	Project reports, interviews
Impact		
¿What is the principal achievement of the Project?	% Progress in achieving results	Project reports, interviews

What impacts has the project had?	Stakeholder perception, stakeholder plan	Project reports, interviews
Have other unforeseen results been achieved in the project?	Stakeholder perception, stakeholder plan	Project reports, interviews
Describe the training (individual, institutional and systemic) that can be attributed to the Project	Number of trainings carried out within the project	Project reports, interviews
Sustainability		
Are there strategies and experiences developed by the project that have replication potential?	Stakeholder perception	Project reports, interviews
Whatpracticesofsystematizationofexperiencesarebeingcarried out?	Systematization of lessons learned	Project documents
What extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic or environmental risks to sustaining the project results in the long term?	Stakeholder perception	Project reports, interviews
What extent has a sustainability strategy been implemented or developed?	Sustainability Strategy Document	Project reports, interviews
Is there evidence that project partners will continue activities for the remainder of the project time and beyond its completion?	Formal commitments generated in the project related to sustainability	Project reports, interviews
Are the beneficiaries committed to continuing to work on the project's objectives once it ends?	Formal commitments generated in the project related to sustainability	Project reports, interviews

# 5.5 Annex 5: Comparative Matrix of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations

Finding	Conclusion	Recommendation / Lesson Learned
The project is highly relevant for the	The project is highly relevant for the	As a country, it is important to prioritize a
country, as it is a pioneering experience in	country, as it is a pioneering experience in	second phase of the project, as well as to
the practical implementation of Nagoya	the practical implementation of Nagoya	maintain or continue working in the same
Protocol, which has been recognized by	Protocol, which has been recognized by	lines of research. The project realizes that
stakeholders as the most ambitious	the interviewees as the most ambitious	there are Corrective Actions for the design,
intervention, marking a milestone in	intervention that has been implemented in	implementation, monitoring and evaluation
amphibian conservation and research in	the amphibians field in Ecuador. The	of the project
Ecuador. The project responds to national	project clearly responds to national policy	
policy objectives and the design counted	objectives.	
on the leadership and appropriation of	The actors coincide in considering the	
different institutions of the Ecuadorian	project as highly relevant and pertinent to	
state headed by the MAAE.	the reality, policy priorities and needs of	
	the country	
Among the innovative elements of the	In terms of design, the interviewees	
design the commitment to position and	emphasize that it is a balanced project,	
strengthen ex situ conservation is	which encompasses in situ and ex situ	
mentioned, in addition to in situ	conservation approaches, research, and	
conservation approaches, which have	institutional strengthening. The project	
traditionally been more attended by	design is clear, specific and addresses	
international cooperation projects.	relevant and necessary aspects for a	
Likewise, an innovation in terms of	comprehensive intervention. Among the	
implementation modality is mentioned,	innovative elements of the design, the	
which considered a mixed approach that	commitment to position and strengthen ex	
combines direct national execution with	situ conservation stands out, in addition to	
assisted execution by UNDP.	in situ conservation approaches, which	
	have traditionally been more attended by	
	international cooperation projects.	
	Likewise, it proposes a modality of NIM	

	implementation for the first time in Ecuador.	
The design of the Project Document (ProDoc) and its indicators do not have mid-term goals, which responds to the ProDoc format that was in force at the time of designing the project. Along with indicators line, there are no indicators related to gender and indigenous community's participation or the creation of networks, but it is due to for the GEF fifth replenishment, their inclusion was not a requirement. In general, the design does not consider an explicit gender approach.		It is essential that during the start-up phase, a specific planning is generated to clearly define and interpret the project indicators. Indicators monitoring and follow-up require specifying their interpretation and baseline, proposing their measurement methodology, timing, means of verification and the responsible person or institution. It is recommended to strictly apply the Manual for Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation of Development Results for UNDP Projects.
The budget limitation and the distribution of resources in the different Results, was mentioned as a key aspect of the design. None of the identified risks were classified as a high one; most of them mainly correspond to intervention technical aspects, but institutional, political and financial aspects are not mention and that ended up being decisive for the project development.	However, weaknesses are identified in relation to the intervention approach and strategy, especially since it is not clear enough how the chain of activities and results would allow meeting several of the proposed impact indicators. This is the case of the indicator related to the "Degree of monitoring of environmental licenses", in which it was not clearly defined which activities would allow its achievement. Finally, political, financial, and institutional aspects were not sufficiently analyzed within project assumptions and risks, and it is why it is concluded that the project design underestimated these issues within the implementation.	The actors that will be part of the project should be involved not only in the ProDoc formulation, but also in the budget design, as this is essential to stablish the scope of indicators and goals.
The interviewees value the incorporation of academic actors, private sector		The involvement of different actors, including communities, NGOs and the

institutions and NGOs, who confirmed their early involvement in the design. Likewise, an innovation in terms of implementation modality is mentioned, which considered a mixed approach that combines direct national execution with assisted execution by UNDP.		academic sector gave important results. However, it is essential to strengthen coordination with the private sector in the framework of post-pandemic productive reactivation initiatives. NIM modality of direct national implementation provides opportunities for capacity building in public institutions. However, it demands a careful risk analysis, investment of resources in the formation of institutional response capacity, as well as necessary political
	Desis et les places enteties	support to accelerate the processes.
	Project Implementation	Ι.
Project implementation was affected by a transformation at institutional and political level, linked to the issuance and validity of Ingenios Code in 2016. This Code redesigned the intellectual property regime operation in Ecuador in several aspects, including biodiversity scientific research and access to genetic resources. Several of MAAE's remits passed to Senescyt, new institutions such as Senadi and INABIO were incorporated.	The project was implemented in a very dynamic institutional, political and economic context, which registered important changes in relation to the initial assumptions with which it was designed, highlighting the following: 1) Validity of Social Economy Knowledge, Creativity and Innovation Organic Code or Ingenios Code; 2) MAAE Institutional reform; 3) Economic crisis and fiscal austerity policies; 4) Institutional capacity to fulfill	Lesson The project team adaptive capacity and flexibility to lead the process of competencies change that the Ingenios Code brought with, is valued. In contexts of high uncertainty and institutional reform, these projects can play a key role in convening stakeholders and facilitating the process of inter-institutional dialogue and coordination.
Since May 2017, due to government change, the project met challenges derived from new public policy priorities and a deep institutional reform, which led to merging of two institutions that gave rise to MAAE. The economic crisis that the country had been facing, triggered fiscal austerity policies and cuts in public spending,	implementation arrangements; 5) COVID 19. Flexibility to make changes and adjustments both at a strategic and operational level, stands out. Likewise, the ability to solve challenges and difficulties that, in some cases, exceed the project team capacity and scope.	The design of future projects should consider with bigger priority and detail the treatment of political, economic and financial risks, since they end up being decisive for the project success or failure. It is recommended to explicitly incorporate specific strategies and tools to mitigate these risks.

affecting the availability of counterpart	
resources that the project counted on to	
meet its goals.	
For the first 8 months, the project was	
unable to advance in its execution, so the	
Board of Directors decided to modify the	
NIM implementation modality (MAAE	
would take over 60% and UNDP would	
implement 40%), to a Support modality to	
NIM (MAAE has destined 15% to pay	
technicians and UNDP 85%). The NIM	
implementation modality had many	
barriers because it implied transferring of	
funds to a fiscal account to be	
implemented under state policies and	
procedures.	
The administrative weakness identified in	
the Jambatu Center during 2016, which in	
the opinion of the interviewees, risk the	
fulfillment of project important activities.	
For this reason, in 2017 the Board of	
Directors decided to entrust the PMU the	
execution of certain outcomes that	
originally had to have the FO/ CJ technical	
support	
The Amazon Regional University Ikiam	
participated as a partner to implement	
Outcome 2. However, in 2017 there was a	
change of authorities, policies and	
management, added to a budget cut that	
forced the researcher's firing, whose role	
was fundamental for the project scientific	
assurance.	
For a year, the research was carried out in PUCE laboratories, both the project and the universities benefited, because resources and equipment were directed towards the project needs, and knowledge about cloning was transferred to PUCE.	It is still necessary to work on access to the scientific information generated by the project in terms of scientific aspect and other information for the public. It is recommended not to limit in publishing data generated through a scientific publication, but to work on communicating it at different levels: students, decision makers, etc. This is important so that the information is not lost and can be useful to sensitized on the importance of amphibians and their conservation.
---	---
was severely limited by mobility restrictions and shutdowns due to COVID- 19, which affected the development of all project activities and made it difficult to meet goals. This mainly affected the possibility of maintaining field work	It will be important that the exit strategy document is shared with the different project partners so that they can take action on time.
Since 2017, the PARG project has been managed in conjunction with the "Genetic Resources for Sustainable Development" - ABS project, because of the theme and complementarity between both projects. Thus, since 2018, both the Board of Directors and the PMU have been in charge of both projects. In addition, since 2018, the Amphibian and Genetic Resources Conservation Project (PARG) assumed various administrative procedures to support the Wildlife Landscapes project in terms of monitoring, follow-up and reports, assistance at applying for 2019 projects.	One of the main lessons left by PARG is related to shared management between different projects that share the same UNDP portfolio. Positive and negative lessons have been identified. In the first case, the fact that PARG has shared activities with ABS and Wildlife Landscapes has made it possible to strengthen the technical counterpart in MAAE and improve coordination. While, in the other hand. the confluence of 3 projects can decant in overload for MAAE, loss of identity and positioning of the project.

According to ProDoc, the budget financed		It is advisable to clearly establish how the
by the GEF amounts to USD 2.72 million		contributions in kind and in monetary terms
for the 5 years of implementation. As of		of the different partners are made.
March 2020, around USD 2.27 million had		
been executed, equivalent to 83% of the		
total available resources. Most of the		
resources have been allocated to		
Outcome 3, which to date has executed		
about USD 875 thousand, that is, 92% of		
the total available for this Result.		
However, Outcome 2 is the one that		
shows the best performance, it has		
executed USD 696 thousand equivalent		
to 95% of what was planned.		
The evaluation considers that the M&E		It is essential to maintain concatenation
tools presented are insufficient and failed		and logical order in the intervention. While
to fill the gaps detailed in relation to the		certain actions may be carried out later
M&E design. Furthermore, the weakness		than planned, others such as the
registered in the design of the M&E system		Amphibian Action Plan are neuralgic, and
presents the risk of overestimating the		their delay affects the entire chain of
performance of the impact indicators.		results.
	Project's Results	
The Mid-Term Review estimated an	Regarding the achievement of project	Accompany the consulting processes,
advance in the achievement of qualitative	objectives, in general terms it can be	and, during the closing, transfer of the
Outcomes of 84.3%, with an expectation of	considered that they have been fulfilled,	equipment acquired by the project is
100% goals compliance. According to the	but not in magnitude and in accordance	carried out with the UNDP support.
following Graph 6, the average progress of	with the originally established	Although MAAE has recommended that
the 3 Outcomes is 90%.	expectations. The highest performance	the teams continue in the Jambatu Center,

The project has made significant progress in the three expected Outcomes, different factors out the management and project scope, did not allow Result 2 performance to be as expected.	was demonstrated in the first two Outcomes of the project, although unmet goals are associated with factors outside the project's management and scope, as well as the uncertainty that exists at the time of formulating goals.	it is essential to have legal backing, for which the UNDP guidance and support, is required. It will be important that the agreements establish that the beneficiaries with the equipment become technology transfer centers, so that other institutes, researchers, or universities can use and benefit from the information and /
Official declaration is relatively new in Guayas case (3 - 4 months before the beginning of pandemic), which left little		or equipment without conditions or obstacles.
time to start an implementation process		
with authorities and participating communities. Likewise, the indicator mentions that, by the end of the project, these PAs should be recognized and legally integrated into the SNAP, which will not be possible since the mining concessions registered in the two conservation areas block MAAE from joining the SNAP.		It is essential to deepen the articulation and complement with actors such as GIZ, which has several initiatives related to bioeconomy that could potentially give continuity to the results obtained by the project.
Regarding the second indicator, the results of METT sheet scores, In the Cajas		
National Park (PNC) case, an increase of		
26 points is evidenced, which is justified because prior to project activities related		
to amphibian's conservation and research		
that are part of the Cajas Amphibian Plan,		
had been carried out, therefore the project		
PA.		
In relation the captive breeding program		
there were delays in the collection of		
species that should have been reported in		

the project, this because obtaining	
research and collection permits took	
between 1.5 and 2 years.	
The progress of the Outcome is 83% and	The project establishes the bases of
it is important to note that most of the	relationship and work to continue with the
indicators have reached and even	taxonomic description of some species
exceeded the goal. The first indicator of the	present in the Cajas massif, in this sense,
isolated and structurally characterized	the contribution of the different key actors
active results of secretions of 4	is essential.
amphibians, the goal was met and widely	
exceeded for Agalychnis spurelli,	
Cruziohyla calcarifer and Boana picturata	
species, however, for Atelopus nanay the	
goal was not met (0%).	
Regarding fourth indicator of this outcome,	
it is worth mentioning that in 2016 the	
project was underway, but the Amazon	
Regional University Ikiam did not have a	
research laboratory, which was a limitation	
that affected the goals fulfillment.	
This Outcome was affected by the low	
budget, considering that costs associated	
with scientific research in the country are	
considerably higher than in other	
countries, so the project role in raising co-	
financing resources was key. The project	
made it possible to equip research centers	
with basic equipment for their molecular	
biology and biochemistry laboratories like	
the mass spectrometer case.	
The Outcome 3 obtained 83%	It is still necessary to work on access to the
achievement in the RMT and had the	scientific information generated by the
expectation of 100% compliance at the	project in terms of scientific aspect and
end of the project. In the final evaluation it	other information for the public. It is

is shown as the weakest of the three Outcomes, with a 89% progress, only one of the three indicators is reported with a performance of 52% Regarding the third indicator related to time reduction to obtain research permits, interviewees' perception at the closing date of this evaluation, this issue has shown a setback, so it is considered that the situation is worse than at the beginning of the project. This is related to the implementation of the Ingenios Code, which incorporated new actors such as Senecyt and redefined institutional competencies. The project turns out to be of great relevance for the country because the diversity of amphibians is a strategic resource for Ecuador, representing a significant 9% of the world's diversity (Interview with Otonga Foundation). The project has national and international relevance given the progress in the Nagoya Protocol adoption and considering that there are still very few projects financed by GEF with this conservation and sustainable use of genetic resources	The project is highly relevant for the country, as it is a pioneering experience in the practical implementation of Nagoya Protocol, which has been recognized by stakeholders as the most ambitious intervention, marking a milestone in amphibian conservation and research in Ecuador. Interviewees agree that the project is highly relevant and pertinent to the reality, policy priorities and needs of the country.	recommended not to limit in publishing data generated through a scientific publication, but to work on communicating it at different levels: students, decision makers, etc. This is important so that the information is not lost and can be useful to sensitized on the importance of amphibians and their conservation.
and sustainable use of genetic resources		
	Sustainability	
The recent dismissal of MAAE employees	Perspective of interventions sustainability	Promotion of a project of the PARG
particularly those directly related to the	presents important risks fundamentally	magnitude as well as others related such
project implementation such as Wildlife	from the financial perspective considering	as Wildlife Landscapes and ABS show
and Genetic Resources Unit presents a	fiscal adjustment measures and budget cut	that there was a commitment of the focal
challenge for sustainability given that	at institutions involved in monitoring the	point within MAAE which also
i chanenye ibi sustamability, yiven that		point within wither, which also

these employees maintain historical memory of these processes and have been direct actors in the institutional strengthening promoted by the project.	project. From the institutional perspective, the project has laid the foundations to generate a response capacity and inter- institutional coordination in these issues, however, short- and medium-term sustainability will depend on MAAE	demonstrated the capacity and experience to propose and specify new projects. This shows that it is essential to promote capacity of technicians within MAAE so they are involved throughout the entire projects life cycle.
Regarding the work at territorial level for the PAs declaration, it represents an important risk since its continuity will depend on authorities' political will. Possibly the greatest institutional risk for the project sustainability is related to Outcome 3 because the country is moving towards a new national authorities election, a new regime that could entail new priorities, institutional changes and ministries authorities and teams rotation.	leadership and ability to maintain others actors' commitment and involvement.	It will be important that the exit strategy document is shared with the different project partners so that they can take action on time.
There is great expectation that, once the project is concluded, work will continue at the Regional Amazon University Ikiam and PUCE, since both universities handle the same research line on peptides and amphibians, which are already established, have institutional support , access to technology assembled by the project, and human talent.		It is still necessary to work on access to the scientific information generated by the project in terms of scientific aspect and other information for the public. It is recommended not to limit in publishing data generated through a scientific publication, but to work on communicating it at different levels: students, decision makers, etc. This is important so that the information is not lost and can be useful to sensitized on the importance of amphibians and their conservation.
Possibly the greatest perspective of financial sustainability is in the results		The project establishes bases of relationship and work to continue with the
generated in the PNC, since prior to the project implementation activities related to		taxonomic description of some species present in the Cajas massif in this sense
amphibian conservation and research		closure process should try to specify

were being developed and are part of the	medium	and	long-term	commitments	to
Box Amphibian Plan.	maintain	these	e research	lines.	

## 5.6 Annex 6: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form <sup>2</sup>			
Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System			
Name of Consultant:José Galindo			
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 <i>Quito</i> on <i>date</i> Signature:	$\langle \rangle$		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

## 5.7 Annex 7: Evaluation report reviewed and approved

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared	by	
UNDP Country Office		
Name:		
Signature:	Date:	
UNDP GEF RTA		
Name:		_
Signature:	_ Date:	