United Nations Development Programme
Global Environment Facility

Mexico

GEF Full-sized Project
"Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Resilience of Protected Areas to Safeguard Biodiversity Threatened by Climate Change"

Final Evaluation Report

Evaluation Team
Giacomo Morelli – International Evaluator

Marisol Sánchez – National Evaluator

Date: 20/10/2020

Opening page

Project's Title
"Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Resilience of Protected Areas to Safeguard Biodiversity Threatened by Climate Change"

Award Atlas ID
00074960

Proyecto ID
00087099

PMIS #
4647

GEF Project ID
4763

Evaluation Period
From June to October 2020

Date
20/10/2020

Project Country (ies)
Mexico

GEF Focal Area
Biodiversity

Implementing Agency
United Nations Development Programme

Executing Agency
Comisión Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas (CONANP)

Evaluation Team members
Giacomo Morelli – International Evaluator

Marisol Sánchez – National Evaluator

Acknowledgements
Special thanks to all the people who have decicate some of their time to contribute to this evaluation report with valuable information. Thanks to Gabriel Velázquez, Sofía García and Alicia López who supported the Evaluation Team both in providing relevant documents and reports for the evaluation exercise and in organizing the entire process of remote meetings and interviews through which the evaluation assignment has been carried out

Executive summaryy

Proyect summary table

Project title	Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Resilience of Protected Areas to Safeguard Biodiversity Threatened by Climate Change		
GEF Project ID:	4763	PIF approval date:	29/02/2012
P:	4647	CEO Endorsement Date:	27/09/2013
ATLAS Business Unit, Award # Proj. ID:	00074960	Signature of the Project Document	26/03/2014
Country (ies)	Mexico	Project Coordinator Hiring Date:	01/03/2014
Region:		Kick-off meeting date:	25/06/2014
Focal Area:	Biodiversidad	Date of the final evaluation:	20/10/2020
GEF Focal Area Strategic Objective:		Original closing date (operational):	31/03/2019
Trust Fund [GEF TF, LDCF, SCCF, NPIF]:	GEF Trust Fund	If revised, closing date	30/06/2020
Implenting Agency / Executing Agency	UNDP / CONANP		
Other excuting agencies	-- -- -- -- --		

Project costs	*As per the PRODOC*	*AT the time of the evaluation (as per 30 June, 2020)*
[1] GEF funding	10,172,727	9,697,053.37
[2] UNDP	800,000	800,000
[3] Government – CONANP	52,000,000	26,859,192
[4] Government – CONAFOR	9,000,000	Data not available
[5] Government – CONABIO	500,000	Data not available
[6] NGO (ENDESU)	500,000	Data not available
[7] FMCN	2,171,960	Data not available
[8] GIZ	12,000,000	Data not available
[9] Co-funding [2+3+4+5+6+7+8]	76,971,960	Data not available
Total Project costs [1+9]	87,144,687	37,356,245

Short Project description

The project "Strengthening the effectiveness of management and the resilience of protected areas to protect biodiversity threatened by climate change" promotes the capacity for recovery in an integrated way and by strengthening the effectiveness of the management from within CONANP to the outside, within a framework of preparation of PNA systems that effectively safeguard biodiversity. In this way, it aim at contributing to the consolidation of the effectiveness of management towards resilience.

The Project has an objective and three outcomes:

Objective: The Mexican Protected Area system is spatially configured and managed to increase resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change on biological diversity.

Outcome 1: Mexican PA system readiness framework effectively safeguards BD.

Outcome 2: Expansion of PA system to protect important refugia through connectivity and increased resiliency.

Outcome 3: PA site management effectively reduces climate-related threats to BD as demonstrated through pilot activities and improved METT scores.

The project implies a participatory approach regarding its implementation that involves federal, state, and municipal public institutions, the productive sectors that affect the PNA and their areas of influence, international organizations, CSOs and the academic sector.

Evaluation Rating Table

Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)		
	Rating	**Justification**
M&E design at entry and implementation	**MS** Moderately Satisfactory	The monitoring and evaluation work has been coordinated by the PMU, specifically by the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist. This evaluation qualifies the work done by the second PMU in terms of monitoring as very valuable. This qualification counteracted the follow-up work done before the second PMU was installed, which was not well organized and which has been negatively assessed by the mid-term evaluation.
M&E plan execution	**MS** Moderately Satisfactory	A partir de 2018, se ha realizado el seguimiento del Proyecto trimestralmente a través de un formato de monitoreo que abarcaba cumplimiento de metas por resultados, y en este mismo formato se incluía toda la información necesaria a dar al Proyecto el seguimiento necesario para cumplir con sus metas. La calificación es moderadamente satisfactoria porque en su comienzo el proyecto no implementaba un sistema de monitoreo adapto a dar seguimiento a las actividades del proyecto.
Execution, coordination and operational issues		
	Rating	**Justification**
UNDP	**S** Satisfactory	By following up on the pertinent recommendations of the mid-term evaluation, UNDP has shown that it knows how to correct in the course of the Project the elements that hindered the implementation. That same attitude has been shown to be fundamental to the effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the project.
CONANP	**S** Satisfactory	The same considerations of justification apply to CONANP as have been made by UNDP.
Project Results		
	Rating	**Justification**
Overall results (attainement of the objectives)	**MS** Moderately Satisfactory	The first two results have been substantially achieved. The second result has reached 307% and 87% of the targets of two indicators. Result 3 has only been partially achieved.
Relevance	**R** Relevant	The high level of relevance of the Project has been an essential element for the success of the initiative. All the actors interviewed have reported great interest in the activities in which they have participated.
Efectiveness	**S** Satisfactory	The effective mainstreaming of CC and resilience as BD conservation tools represent the heritage that the Project leaves in the hands of CONANP.
Efficiency	**MS** Moderately Satisfactory	The joint work of the PMU, UNDP, CONANP and the staff of the two institutions at the field level, has allowed the achievement of the results. The rating takes into consideration the two implementation stages characterized by two very different levels of efficiency. During the second stage of implementation (coordinated by a completely renewed PCU), the delay produced during the first stage has been recovered.

Sustainability and financial risks	**MU** Moderately Unlikely	The challenge to project sustainability is financial, given the contingency of budget reduction. In addition to the financial problems, there are also human resources problems: the Field Officers who have been key to move on the Project will no longer be at the disposal of the ANP to continue pushing adaptation actions.
Sustainability and socio-economic risks	**L** Likely	At the political level, the ANPs are recognized as important in facing the challenges that the CC poses both to the conservation of ecosystems and their biodiversity and to the livelihoods of the population. The evaluation has not identified any socio-political risk.
Sustainability and institucional risks	**L** Likely	At the institutional level, the inclusion of the CC criteria in the PNANP 2020-2024 is an evidence of the initiative's future sustainability, being the governing document of the institution's programming that establishes the lines that will guide management actions of CONANP as agent of the Federal Government. The evaluation has not identified any institutional risks.
Sustainability and environmental risks	**L** Likely	No type of environmental risks have been identified that threaten the sustainability of the Project. Rather, the initiative lays the foundation for a more sustainable management of PAs.
Impact	**S** Significant	The impact of the Project has been important both at the central level and at the PA level. The importance of adaptation to CC as an element for the conservation of BD has been demonstrated and the importance of BD as an element, not only of a conservationist nature, but also as a catalyst for the development of the territories where ANPs operate.

The applied rating scales are presented in Annex A

Summary of conclusions, lessons and recommendations

Conclusions

El ejercicio de evaluación ha llegado a formular 12 conclusiones:

Conclusion n° 1

The strengthening of the institutional framework, the administration and the capacities of CONANP and the piloting of adaptation measures aim at laying the foundations for the future work of the PAs. It is the bet of the Project and its reason for being. The Project has therefore served as a laboratory of experiences to compile lessons learned and good practices that serve for future actions. It is therefore required that the institutional effort be increased in different institutions of the federal government to take advantage of the learning, otherwise the Project It will lose much of its importance.

Conclusion n° 2

The Project has managed to mainstreaming the issue of CC resilience at different levels of the central and regional CONANP and in the ANPs involved in the implementation.

Conclusion n° 3

The great relevance of the actions and themes of the Project has constituted its own inertia, which, added to the work of the DECC, the second PMU, the UNDP field officers and the ANP Directors, has been the driving force behind the initiative and has allowed the achievement of the most significant results.

Conclusion n° 4

UNDP and CONANP have de-facto adopted adaptive management concentrating on the most viable results, without formally adjusting the results framework included in the original PRODOC. Having changed the framework, it would have allowed to better focus the efforts towards these results and, above all, it would have identified in a formal and substantial way the limits of action that were in front of the PMU. Additionally, it would have allowed, in the reporting phase, to highlight with greater intensity the work launched and achieved by the second PMU and to communicate to the reader a sense of completeness of the achievements.

Conclusion n° 5

The implementation of the Project has been carried out in two very different stages: a first stage led by a PMU and a second stage by a second PMU completely renewed with a gradual process after the mid-term evaluation. The implementation has been inefficient in the first stage, while it has proven efficient and effective in its second stage. The mid-term evaluation has contributed to rethinking the management of the Project, and both the Steering

Committee and UNDP have been able to accept the findings of such exercise and implement, with the support of the new members of the PMU, the adjustments necessary to direct the Project management towards the expected achievements.

It is highlighted that the inefficiency in the implementation of the Project in its first stage may also have arisen from the challenge, both conceptual and practical, that the first PMU faced, that is, the need to instrument the pioneering and complex project idea. Furthermore, the operationalization of the idea should have happened in a political-institutional setting where many changes were taking place, such as budget cuts to CONANP and changes in Commissioners, which have not encouraged the Project to be strengthened from the beginning.

Conclusion n° 6
At the PA level, the project has proven thematically pertinent and relevante in the participatory approach. The participation of the actors in the PAs and their areas of influence has occurred thanks to the visualization of the CC and its impact on the livelihoods of those who live and operate in the territory. The concepts of vulnerability and resilience have made it possible to bring CC problems to a level of understanding within the reach of many sectors of the population. This type of approach, in turn, has been the entrance so that the importance of the PAs as development agents and not only as entities that maneuver their polygons in isolation could be understood at various levels.

Conclusion n° 7
The landscape approach has proven strategic both for the conservation of biodiversity and for development. Therefore, from a sustainable development perspective, productive activities must necessarily be carried out taking into account the importance of PAs and biological corridors as essential elements for CC adaptation. This implies going beyond the limits of the PA polygons and that CONANP becomes a promoter of an inter-institutional coordination work.

Conclusion n° 8
The formulation of the PACC and the Management Plans has proven to be key for the participation of all local, institutional and social actors, in order to promote joint actions for the identification of threats and risks of the CC and to have alliances established for the implementation of adaptation measures with a landscape approach.

Conclusion n° 9
Thanks to work by complex (through the ecosystem-based adaptation approach), the Project has benefited a very broad spectrum of sectors in the different complexes: communities, *ejidatarios*, producers, tourism sector, universities and research centers, state and municipal institutions allowing the positioning of the ANP as development centers.

Conclusion n° 10
In terms of sustainability, there are no technical concerns identified in the Project. Its main challenge lies in the financial sustainability derived from the constant budget reduction to the environmental sector and in particular to CONANP.

Conclusion n° 11
The theme of CC resilience opens possibilities for alliances with CSOs, state institutions and private companies. These alliances are strategic for the sustainability of the initiative. This is evident for two reasons: CC adaptation is a theme that can be used to raise funds both from international donors and from national and state donors. Moreover, there is a need to maintain high attention to the CC resilience so that the efforts made by the project are not diluted in the perception of the inhabitants.

Conclusion n° 12
Los Oficiales de Campo han resultado ser una pieza clave para el logro de resultados estableciendo contacto directo con las comunidades y diversos sectores a nivel de complejo y proporcionando seguimiento puntual de las acciones en coordinación con los Directores y Directoras de las ANP.

Field Officers resulted to be a key element for the achievement of results. They established direct contact with the communities and various sectors at the level in the complexes and provided timely monitoring of actions in coordination with the Directors of the PAs.

Lessons learned

La evaluación ha identificado 3 lecciones aprendidas de interés para la CONANP y el PNUD relevante para sus ámbitos de compromiso y trabajo institucional.

Lesson learned n° 1

GEF projects are projects oriented to action and to determine systemic change. They request the realization of products and the achievement of results and often include the generation of knowledge, the strengthening of capacities and the collaboration with many partners. Due to these characteristics, the GEF are complex and ambitious projects and they imply that the partners share as soon as possible a common vision of the path towards results and a clear division of roles. As these conditions are not met, the delays and implementation problems that are generated are difficult to recover.

Lesson learned n° 2

In the Project's PAs and in their areas of influence, there are actors available and enthusiastic to share their knowledge and show a willingness to change to promote development that takes into account the implications of CC: academic researchers are satisfied with landing their knowledge to contribute something that has real implications in the territory in which they operate. Rural and indigenous communities are proud to be able to see their traditional knowledge recognized and at the same time are willing to train and participate to promote the development of their territory. Finally, the productive sectors how willingness to change the way they manage their businesses once they better understand the possible solutions to the challenges associated with CC and, broadly, with the environment.

Lesson learned n° 3

Involving different sectors of society in decision-making processes leads to a common understanding of the problems related to CC adaptation, which due to its own characteristics requires coordinated responses. Decision-making processes must be carried out in a transparent manner, with dedicated and competent personnel, and with the aim at identifying actions that are relevant to the interests of those involved, viable and effective, capable of improving conditions in the eyes of the participants.

Recomendaciones

The evaluation proposes recommendations to take into account the learning generated by the Project in the future actions of CONANP and UNDP.

Recommendation n° 1

Linked to conclusion n°1

Addressed to CONANP - Climate Change Strategies Directorate

Consolidate CC adaptation as a management element in the PAs work routine. This may represent an occasion to inform different levels of CONANP about the importance of the central themes of the Project, that is, CC, adaptation, landscape approach, jointly presenting the Project's achievements in terms of learning. It is suggested to start incorporating CC strategies in the Management Plans of each PA, which can begin to take advantage of some of the Project's learnings according to its specificities and apply them according to its availability of financial resources and capacities. It is necessary to couple the presentation of the inter-institutional platforms managed by CONABIO with a presentation of the project's achievements and suggest following up on the work developed in collaboration with CONABIO and taking advantage of the occasion to promote and publicize the use and utility of the platforms .

Recommendation n° 2

Linked to lesson learned n° 3

Addressed to UNDP

Create and adopt a project startup checklist for its future initiatives. In principle, this list should take into account everything necessary so that the Steering Committees of the projects implemented by the agency can take place without creating institutional and personal misunderstandings that end up undermining the efforts of the parties involved.

Recommendation n° 3
Linked to conclusion n°4
Addressed to UNDP and CONANP
Where relevant, do not hesitate to formalize significant changes to the GEF project Results Framework. Changing the Results Framework formally pushes towards the adaptation of the implementation efforts aligning the work towards desirable and realistic objectives based on the experience accumulated during the implementation and not only on the expectations outlined in the project design phase.

Recommendation n° 4
Linked to conclusions n°4, 10 and 11
Addressed to UNDP and CONANP
Continue the collaboration looking for other funding opportunities to follow up on the Project. In particular, the ecosystem-based adaptation approach at the complex level is an interesting element for developing project proposals with international donors. The ecosystem-based adaptation approach puts the themes of the decade at the center and is aligned with the requirements of the GEF, specifically with its directives and programmatic areas for its replenishment 7. The same elements merit reflection on the possibility of applying to the Green Climate Fund (GCF), which due to the financial dimension of its projects would also imply the association with other national institutions.

Recommendation n° 5
Linked to conclusion n°1, 10 and 11
Addressed to UNDP
Publicize the GEF Small Grants Program in the PAs and complexes of the Project so that the Directors can suggest to the communities and CSOs that operate in their territory and in the areas of influence that they may bear in mind that a possibility exists to get funding to carry out adaptation measures identified in the 9 PACC formulated.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BD	Biodiversity
CBD	Convention of Biological Diversity
CC	Climate Change
CONABIO	*Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la Biodiversidad*
CONAFOR	*Comisión Nacional Forestal*
CONANP	*Comisión Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas*
ENDESU	*Espacios Naturales y Desarrollo Sustentable A.C.*
FCC	*Fondo para el Cambio Climático*
FMCN	*Fondo Mexicano para la Conservación de la Naturaleza*
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GCF	Green Climate Fund (Fondo Verde del Clima)
GIZ	*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit*
IATI	International Aid Transparency Initiative
INECC	*Instituto Nacional de Ecología y Cambio Climático*
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
IWP	Integrated Work Plan
LGCC	*Ley General de Cambio Climático*
LGEEPA	*Ley General del Equilibrio Ecológico y Protección del Ambiente*
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
PA	Protected Areas
PQA	Project Quality Assessment
PRODOC	Project Document
ROAR	Results-Orieted Annual Reporting
SADET	*Secretaria de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural*
SER	*Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores*
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SGP	Small Grants Programme
UNDP	United Nation Development Programme
UNFCC	United Nations Framework on Climate Change

Table of contents

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose of the evaluation

The final evaluation of the Project "Strengthening Management Effectiveness and Resilience of Protected Areas to Safeguard Biodiversity Threatened by Climate Change", known as Project Resilience, has four objetives:

1. To analyze and evaluate results and outcomes .
2. Provide recommendations to carry out other similar initiatives.
3. Promote accountability in the use of resources.
4. Document, provide feedback and disseminate lessons learned.

1.2. Scope & Methodology

1.2.1. Scope

The evaluation examines and evaluates the achievement of the results and the lessons (including also the decision-making process and adaptive management) of the Project of the executing and the implementing parties. It also includes an assessment of the reliability in terms of co-financing commitments and recommendations on how to focus GEF resources to optimize future projects toward their objectives. The recommendations are therefore directed primarily to UNDP and CONANP.

The evaluation also involves all beneficiary actors, as well as those responsible for the execution and implementation of the Project as per the Project Document (PRODOC). Its approach is mixed since the evaluation covers both the project design, its execution and results.

1.2.2. Evaluation tools

The evaluation has been carried out through a participatory approach, it represents a synthesis of facts and points of view compiled by the Evaluation Team that has identified its findings through the triangulation of the information obtained from the different sources of information, that is, Project participants and Project documents and reports

The research design of the evaluation exercise has used the document review as consolidated secondary data sources available to the Evaluation Team. The primary data has been collected through two evaluation tools: interviews and group meetings with people who have participated in different ways in the Project.

1.2.3. Stages of the evaluation

Due to the pandemic emergency of Covid-19, all the evaluation stages have been conducted by the Evaluation Team remotely using ZOOM, WhatsApp and the telephone as means of communication with the people interviewed.

The three stages of the evaluation exercise have been the following:

Stage I – Desk review
Dates: from 6 to 21 July, 2020

The desk review has begun using the first documents made available to the Evaluation Team as of July 7 in a folder shared in a cloud on the internet.

The Evaluation Team has delivered the Inception Report to UNDP on July 21, later revised and approved on August 27, 2020 by UNDP. It represents the reference document on which this evaluation report is based.

The documents, reports and web pages consulted are presented in Annex B.

Stage II – Data collection
Dates: from 10 August to 4 Septmber, 2020

89 remote meetings have been carried out via ZOOM, WhatsApp and telephone, reaching a total of **99 people** interviewed, belonging to the following institutions:

- CONANP – 26 persons

  7 from central offices, 4 regional directors and 15 PNA directors

- SEMARNAT – 3 persons

- PNUD – 27 persons

  1 person of the Panama Regional Office, 2 persons from Mexico National Office, 5 persons in charge of other UNDP proyects, 5 persons from the PMU and 14 UNDP Field Officers.

- CONABIO – 9 persons
- Consultants – 6 persons
- CSO – 9 persons
- Beneficiaries/ volunteer participants – 15 persons
- Private enterprises – 1 persons
- International organizations – 1 persons
- Other – 2 persons

It is acknowledged that the Evaluation Team has not been able to interview any representative of the institutions (CONAFOR, ENDESU, FMCN and GIZ) that committed to the project regarding its co-financing.

During the stage, the Evaluation Team realized that the time dedicated to interviewing the Field Officers was not going to be enough to cover exhaustively the part of the Project related to the implementation of activities in the PNA. Therefore, with prior authorization from UNDP, the Evaluation Team has distributed a questionnaire by email to each Field Officer to complement the information gathered during the interviews.

Annex C presents the work schedule for the primary data collection stage.

On September 10, 2020, the Evaluation Team officially presented the preliminary findings of the evaluation during a meeting at ZOOM to officials belonging to UNDP and CONANP.

Stage III – Writing of the Evaluation Report
Dates: from 7 September to 20 October, 2020

The writing of the report has taken place in two phases. The first from September 7 to 20, 2020, when the Evaluation Team has delivered the draft of the report. And,the second from October 4 to 20, when upon receiving the observations and comments by UNDP and CONANP, the Evaluation Team has addressed them in the final report delivered on October 20, 2020 together with the matrix for addressing the observations and comments.

The Evaluation Team has been supported throughout all the stages by the PMU, in particular by the Project Coordinator and by the Project Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist. Both have been in charge of contacting and scheduling all interviews and Meetings of the Evaluation Team with the different actors of the Project. UNDP Field Officers have also played an important role in the implementation of this exercise: they have contacted project beneficiaries and people who have voluntarily participated in it.

1.2.4. Considerations and limitations

The situation related to the Covid-19 pandemic has not allowed a greater involvement of the communities in the evaluation exercise, the possibility of holding focus groups, which can generate debates among participants, and field visits. On the other hand, the form of remote work has allowed an exhaustive reach of the other actors, in particular the UNDP and CONANP.

As anticipated in the inception report, the main limitation of the methodology has been the lower probability of identifying details of the opinions of the ANP communities that would have been visited with a field mission typical of the evaluations of GEF/UNDP projects. This limitation has, however, been mitigated by the possibility of covering all the PNAs in 20 business days, being canceled the time of transfer of the Evaluation Team from one place to another, which would have occurred in case of a mission on the ground.

Es importante también notar que no se han registrado discrepancias de opiniones, sino más bien una grande convergencia de opiniones entre todos los actores Interviewdos. Además, cada persona involucrada en el proceso de recopilación de datos primarios ha podido relatar su experiencia en el proyecto permitiendo recopilar datos que adhieren a la lógica de “muestreo intencional” necesaria a dar respuesta a las numerosas preguntas de evaluación previstas por este ejercicio.

It is also important to note that there have been no discrepancies of opinions, but rather a great convergence of opinions among all the actors interviewed. In addition, each person involved in the primary data collection process has been able to relate her/his experience in the project, allowing the data collection to adhere to the logic of "purposeful sampling", which has been necessary to answer the numerous evaluation questions foreseen by this exercise.

Finally, a methodological limitation is highlighted which refers to the fact that only and necessarily the people who have participated in the Project have been interviewed. The findings of the evaluation, therefore, cannot deepen the implications of the lack of participation of any actor in terms of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact that a greater participation of other institutions would have had. Such a deepening would necessarily represent a hypothesis, which could neither be corroborated nor rejected.

1.3. Structure of the evaluation report

The evaluation report meets the requirements identified in the "Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects" and consists of three main sections:

Project description and development context
The section briefly describes the project and the context in which it was designed and implemented.

Findings
This section provides answers to the three categories of project progress, that is, Project Design and Formulation, Project Execution and Project Results, being the last category presented answering the evaluation questions, established in the Terms of Reference of the present evaluation and confirmed in the Inception Report.

Conclusions, recommendation and lessons
The section includes evidence-based conclusions and proposes recommendations and lessons learned so that UNDP and CONANP can use the learnings generated by the same evaluation exercise.

2. Project description and development context

2.1. Project start and duration

The project was signed on March 26, 2014, had an extension of one year at no extra cost, with a duration of 75 months of implementation and its closing date was June 30, 2020

2.2. Problems that the project sought to address

The project has sought to address the loss of BD, which increases with the impact of CC, affecting ecosystems and making them susceptible to various effects and decreasing the quality and quantity of the services obtained from these and which of course negatively affect the livelihoods and development possibilities of communities. Coupled with the conversion of the soil that eliminates habitats at great speed and severity, frequently irreversible, threatening flora and fauna, this fragmentation of habitats reduces the possibility for ecosystems and species to migrate and adapt to new conditions.

In coastal areas, the resulting transformation from tourism and infrastructure development is responsible for mangrove conversion and increased sedimentation in aquatic habitats, which ultimately reduces the productivity of coral reefs and aquatic populations.

In addition to the ecological consequences, the Project has glimpsed the impact of climate change on the economy and the quality of life of the people living in the PNAs and in their area of influence. That is why the Project included social vulnerability as part fundamental of the biodiversity conservation process under the ecosystem-based adaptation approach.

2.3. Immediate and development objectives of the project

The project "Strengthening the effectiveness of management and the resilience of protected areas to protect biodiversity threatened by climate change" has promoted the capacity for recovery in an integrated way and by strengthening the effectiveness of the management from within CONANP to the outside, within a framework of preparation of PNA systems that effectively safeguard biodiversity. In this way, it has contributed to the consolidation of the effectiveness of management towards resilience.

Three components have been developed at different scales in 17 Protected Natural Areas (see Annex D, the list of the Project's PNAs) to reduce the specific impacts and threats of climate change to biodiversity, simultaneously

promoting the development of capacities of the staff and local people. Specifically, the Project promoted the normative, institutional, including inter-institutional, participatory articulation solution and the generation of effective management practices to these threats. The central idea was to compensate for the loss and degradation in existing areas, resulting from CC, as well as to manage the surrounding landscapes and the connection of PNAs in such a way as to maintain their value in creating biological connectivity and contribute to the stability of the production processes developed within the CC conditions in the future.

2.4. Baseline Indicators established

Objective: The Mexican Protected Area system is spatially configured and managed to increase resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change on biological diversity		
Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**
- Resilience to CC is integrated into the PA System.	CONANP has a Climate Change Strategy, but resilience to CC is not reflected in planning and management instruments	- CONANP planning and management instruments mainstream CC resilience.
- Financial sustainability to increase resilience of Mexican PA system.	- CONANP budget does not address resilience activities. - No multisectorial coordination platform exists regarding efforts and investments on PA at a subnational level.	- Internal budgetary restructuring to allocate 10% of CONANP budget to resilience activities. - Multisectorial platform to attain budgetary coordination.
Outcome 1: Mexican PA system readiness framework effectively safeguards BD.		
Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**
- Institutional framework strengthened to increase PA resilience from CC impacts and risks.	CONANP framework includes: -National PA Program (PNANP) 2013-18 and CONANP Strategy for 2040 are under construction -ECCAP provides general guidelines towards resilience but not aligned with public and institutional policy- - The communication strategy foresees limited promotion of conservation areas as instruments of resilience.	-CONANP Strategy for 2040 and other Institutional Plans include CC and resilience -PNANP 2013 – 2018 includes CC and resilience -ECCAP updated and aligned with public and institutional policy (PNANP) and legal framework related to CC The Communication Strategy promotes the importance of conservation areas as instruments to (a) increase the resilience of communities and ecosystems, and (b) maintain integrity across the landscape / seascape.
- Planning, Management and Information System for decision making to mainstream CC into integrated land-use planning that increases biodiversity resilience.	- No PA has CC resilience mainstreamed in its planning and management instruments - No National Climate Information Portal for Protected Areas exists - 0% PAs with access to Portal	- National Climate Information Portal for Protected Areas established with geospatial data, including an Early Alert System and linked to the already existing monitoring efforts (as SNIB, INFyS and SIMEC and other relevant initiatives). - 100% PAs with access to Portal and staff trained to use it to make effective resilience-based management decisions.
Outcome 2: Expansion of PA system to protect important refugia through connectivity and increased resiliency.		
Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**
Expansion of areas of conservation in priority	0 ha (total AP 25,384,818 ha)	- 25,984,818 ha: At least 600,000 ha of new areas included in new or existing

ecoregions and refugia facilitated by GIS database, measured by the increase in area under conservation to promote connectivity and protect important refugia.		conservation areas nationwide Costero/marino: Coastal/marine: 369,139 ha; Terrestrial: 230,861 ha
Area of functional connectivity between critical habitat blocks surrounding and within PAs maintained or increased to enhance ecosystem resilience through ecoregion-based incentive schemes.	- 0 ha - General incentives exist for BD conservation	- 30,000 ha that enhance connectivity and ecoregion incentives schemes, as a partial result from management actions from Outcome 3 - 12 eco-region based incentive schemes/portfolios that enhance resilience
Outcome 3: PA site management effectively reduces climate-related threats to BD as demonstrated through pilot activities and improved METT scores.		
Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**
Strengthened management of vulnerable PAs, based on site-specific information generated from pilots in order to address CC risks and threats, with a landscape focus and sustainable productive activities: a) Increased management capacity of priority PAs reflected in METT scores b) Cost-effective management actions to reduce vulnerability, to be undertaken in ecoregional cluster : - Integrated fire management - Assisted terrestrial regeneration - Assisted coastal regeneration - Assisted marine regeneration - Sustainable land management - Prevention, control, eradication, and monitoring of introduced/ invasive species	a) Average METT score 69% Current METT does not include a resilience component b) 0 resilience-based projects or management actions to reduce vulnerability - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 0 - 100 ha	a) Increase of 10% in the METT scores (x^{-} = 79%) b) Resilience-based projects and management actions reduce vulnerability in 12 ecoregional clusters: - 6,000 ha + 10 km firebreaks - 3600 ha + 5 km gallery forest - 400 ha - 200 ha - 600 ha - 650 ha
Improved capacity for planning, implementation and monitoring of site-specific co-managed strategies for increasing resilience in PAs.	- 0 programs/ workshops on resilience in PAs - Average score on Capacity Development Scorecard: Q 9: 1.625 Q 11: 1.625	12 programs/ workshops on resilience in PAs Promedio de *Capacity Development Scorecard*: Q 9: 2.625 Q 11: 2.625

	Q 13: 1.6875 Q 14: 1.3125 Areas to improve (Q9) Most PAs have adequate Management Programs but are implemented partially or not at all.. (Q11) Environmental information used to support decision making processes is unavailable, incomplete or out-of-date. (Q13) Capacity and technological needs are, when available, obtained through external financing. (Q14) Monitoring is done irregularly, with or without an adequate monitoring framework.	Q 13: 2.6875 Q 14: 2.3125 Specific improvements: - Management instruments are implemented effectively in selected PAs. - Information system for adaptive management (Outcome 1). - Institutional capacity development program and 3% of CONANP budget (from Outcome 1) reassigned to basic technological needs. - National monitoring system with proper capacity building (Outcome 1).
Governance framework regarding land-use is strengthened through coordination and gender- and indigenous -sensitive participation forums to consider PA conservation and increased risks associated with CC.	- Mexico Resiliente Alliance provides an advisory role. - Community Advisory Councils are not engaged in CC resilience. Only 8 of 17 PAs have advisory councils and 2 operate irregularly. - 0 Gender organizations and official institutions responsible for gender equality recognized as stakeholders and consulted in PA decision-making processes	- Mexico Resiliente Alliance institutionalized as a national advisory council and its members co-implementing at least one project in the field - Strengthened Community advisory councils or ad hoc groups to enhance land use governance in 17 PAs contribute to CC resilience measures/activities. - TBD Gender organizations and official institutions responsible for gender equality recognized as stakeholders and consulted in PA decision-making processes

2.5. Main stakeholder

The PRODOC indentifies the following stakeholders:

Comisión Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas (CONANP)

It is an institution of the federal government that is in charge at national level of the management of PAs, with the commitment to guarantee that the strategies for the adaptation of the management of the PAs are carried out to combat CC and are effectively enforced. CONANP works to conserve Mexico's natural heritage and the ecological processes of 182 PA, negotiating conservation goals with the inhabitants and users for their well-being. Within the framework of the Project, CONANP hss the main role of being the Project Executing Agency through the General Directorate of Institutional Development and Promotion (*Dirección General de Desarrollo Institucional y and Promoción*) and the Directorate of Climate Change Strategies (*Dirección de Estrategias de Cambio Climático*).

Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la Biodiversidad (CONABIO)

It is an inter-secretarial commission, where the president of the Commission is the head of the Federal Executive. Its mission is to promote, coordinate, support and carry out activities aimed at the knowledge generation of biological diversity, as well as its conservation and sustainable use for the benefit of society. It is an applied research organization, promoter of basic research, which compiles and generates information on biodiversity, develops human capacities in the area of information technology on biodiversity and is a public source of information and knowledge accessible to all. Within the framework of the Project, CONABIO has the capacity to generate, manage and analyze information on the magnitude, nature and implications of climate change for the management of the PAs.

Comisión Nacional Forestal (CONAFOR)

It is a decentralized public body, whose objective is to develop, favor and promote productive activities of conservation and restoration in forest matters, which promotes and participates in the formulation of plans,

programs, and in the application of the sustainable forest development policy. CONAFOR is the institution responsible for the promotion of sustainable forest management. It promotes the development of strategies for the adaptation of forest management in conservation areas to climate change.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
UNDP works in nearly 170 countries promoting actions to reduce poverty, inequalities and exclusion. It supports countries in the development of policies, capacity building that strengthen institutions. In Mexico, it works with the government and with all sectors of society, finding solutions to national development challenges. UNDP offers guidance, technical support, management tools, and theoretical and practical knowledge of national and regional institutions, helping to implement public policies, initiatives, and projects aimed at overcoming poverty. UNDP is the implementing institution of the project.

Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)
CSOs are organizations recognized by Mexican law; they actively participate in the provision of services such as technical assistance, training and development of key documents. CSOs make an important contribution to the management of protected natural areas and the search and implementation of economic resources. The role of national CSOs such as The Nature Conservancy (TNC), the Mexican Fund for Nature Conservation, the AMBIO Cooperative, and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) constitute a great technical contribution in the implementation of actions at the national level.

2.6. Expected results

Objective
The Mexican Protected Area system is spatially configured and managed to increase resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change on biological diversity

Outcome 1
Mexican PA system readiness framework effectively safeguards BD.

Three products are expected under outcome 1:

Product 1.1:
Strengthening of decision-making tools and instruments aimed at informing management and financing decisions to address the risk of CC in heritage of the PAs and promote the resilience of ecosystems and communities in the face of threats induced by CC.

Product 1.2
Multisectoral financing framework through mainstreaming and institutional coordination in support of community and ecosystem resilience through the implementation of the Climate Change Strategy from Natural Protected Areas (ECCAP).

Product 1.3
ECCAP implementation through BD and CC monitoring mechanisms and systems in coordination with other stakeholders.

Ouctome 2
Expansion of PA system to protect important refugia through connectivity and increased resiliency

Four products are expected under outcome 2:
Product 2.1
The national expansion of AP in priority ecoregions based on a landscape approach and facilitated by the GIS database and the studies of marine and land connectivity.

Product 2.2
Incentive schemes implemented

Product 2.3
Official publication of the ANP through decrees, including the demarcation of limits and management programs, the provision for public consultation, the determination of governance mechanisms, the rights of the zoning plan and use of the different zones with the provisions for the implementation of monitoring and resilience to the CC.

Product 2.4
Improvement in functional connectivity between the ANP and large blocks of habitat outside it and through administration (land use compatible with conservation on public and private land).

Outcome 3
PA site management effectively reduces climate-related threats to BD as demonstrated through pilot activities and improved METT scores.

Five products are expected under outcome 3:

Product 3.1
Strengthening the management of vulnerable PAs based on participatory planning processes, with a focus on the design and implementation of Climate Change Adaptation Programs (PACC) for each site (based on specific information to face the anticipated CC threats, erosion protection, integrated fire management and control practices, improved disease outbreak control, corridor management, and improved production practices) in order to reduce vulnerability.

Product 3.2
Land use governance framework strengthened to ensure the conservation of Pas and increase resilience to CC risk.

Product 3.3
Community capacity building programs for planning, executing and monitoring site-specific joint management strategies to increase resilience in the PAs.

Product 3.4
Ordinances or other instruments that contribute to reducing the fragmentation of forests and municipal action plans for environmental contingencies.

Product 3.5
The practical application of PA management and monitoring / enforcement with key stakeholders.

3. Findings

3.1 Project design and formulation

3.1.1. Analysis of the Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)

The central theme of the Project design has been the integration of the concepts of vulnerability, adaptation and resilience to the CC as transversal axes in the policy and management of the 17 ANPs of the Project. The problem addressed by the Project is that the ANP system did not have sufficient capacities to face and adapt to the adverse impacts of CC on its ecological and social systems. Therefore, the Project has sought to introduce these concepts at different scales within the CONANP institution and in other institutions, not only public, but also in communities, CSOs, and productive sectors that live and operate within and in the areas of influence of the ANP, in order to reinforce efforts towards the conservation of biodiversity.

The project design is articulated in three results that correspond to three areas of intervention, which point in the same direction towards mainstreaming the issue of resilience to the CC for the conservation of biodiversity

- to provide CONANP with an institutional framework that promotes adaptation to CC as a conservation element of the BD and of a management system that allow informed decisions about adaptation to CC (outcome 1);
- to expand the extension of protected areas and the ecological connectivity system between them (outcome 2); and,
- Finally, to pilot actions on the ground and coordinate working groups in order to create and strengthen capacities (outcome 3).

The logic of the Project is developed in a circular way, i.e. each outcome feeds and is fed back by the activities carried out to achieve the other two outcomes:

- The work of drafting document guides for the management of the ANP and the management system feeds the process of identification of the biological corridors;
- The work of restoration of biological corridors feeds the work of piloting actions on the ground.
- The processes of piloting actions on the ground feed the creation of guide documents for actions to adapt to CC.

It is evident that in order to achieve the three results, it is necessary to strengthen the degree of collaboration between the different actors that operate at different levels, central and peripheral, in the ANPs and their area of influence so that a multisectoral approach is possible.

From this perspective, it is very evident that the learnings generated throughout the implementation play a key role in increasing the resilience of ANPs to the adverse impacts of CC on BD.

Indicators analysis

At the objective level "The Mexican Protected Area system is spatially configured and managed to increase resilience to the adverse impacts of climate change on biological diversity". The objective has two indicators for its measurement.

Indicator 1:	**Target**
Resilience to CC is integrated into the PA System.	- CONANP planning and management instruments mainstream CC resilience.

Indicator 1 of the objective is the same as the first indicator for outcome 1, although the two are formulated differently. Furthermore, the two indicators have the same target, although formulated differently.

Indicator 2:	**Target**
- Financial sustainability to increase resilience of Mexican PA system.	- Internal budgetary restructuring to allocate 10% of CONANP budget to resilience activities. - Multisectorial platform to attain budgetary coordination.

Indicator 2 of the objective is not relevant and has two measurement values at the baseline and target levels representing a formal formulation error. Formally, an indicator must have only one measurement value. In addition, the first target is not aligned with how the CONANP budget is organized, which does not have a line dedicated to resilience activities. The second goal is not realistic, as CONANP is the institution dedicated to the management of ANP, it is illogical to seek that other organizations (public or private) formally commit themselves to an effort of multisectoral budget coordination. Concluding the objective has no indicators.

Outcome 1 "Mexican PA system readiness framework effectively safeguards BD" is well formulated. The objective has two indicators for its measurement.

Indicator 1.1	**Target**
Institutional framework strengthened to increase PA resilience from CC impacts and risks.	- CONANP Strategy for 2040 and other Institutional Plans include CC and resilience -PNANP 2013 – 2018 includes CC and resilience -ECCAP updated and aligned with public and institutional policy (PNANP) and legal framework related to CC - The Communication Strategy promotes the importance of conservation areas as instruments to (a) increase the resilience of communities and ecosystems, and (b) maintain integrity across the landscape / seascape.

Indicator 1.1 is SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound)

Indicator 1.2	**Target**
- Planning, Management and Information System for decision making to mainstream CC into integrated land-use planning that increases biodiversity resilience	- National Climate Information Portal for Protected Areas established with geospatial data, including an Early Alert System and linked to the already existing monitoring efforts (as SNIB, INFyS and SIMEC and other relevant initiatives). - 100% PAs with access to Portal and staff trained to use it to make effective resilience-based management decisions.

Indicator 1.2 is SMART. It has two target. This represents an error in the formulation of the indicator, but it does not cause problems because the targets do not contradict each other. The second goal should refer to an additional Indicator regarding staff capabilities.

Outcome 2 “Expansion of PA system to protect important refugia through connectivity and increased resiliency” is well formulated.

Indicator 2.1	**Target**
Expansion of areas of conservation in priority ecoregions and refugia facilitated by GIS database, measured by the increase in area under conservation to promote connectivity and protect important refugia.	- 25,984,818 ha: At least 600,000 ha of new areas included in new or existing conservation areas nationwide Costero/marino: Coastal/marine: 369,139 ha; Terrestrial: 230,861 ha.

Indicator 2.1. is SMART.

Indicator 2.2	**Target**
Area of functional connectivity between critical habitat blocks surrounding and within PAs maintained or increased to enhance ecosystem resilience through ecoregion-based incentive schemes.	- 30,000 ha that enhance connectivity and ecoregion incentives schemes, as a partial result from management actions from Outcome 3 - 12 eco-region based incentive schemes/portfolios that enhance resilience

Indicator 2.2 is SMART. It has two target. This represents an error in the formulation of the indicator, but it does not cause problems because the goals do not contradict each other. The second goal should refer to an additional Indicator regarding the creation of an incentive system.

Outcome 3 " PA site management effectively reduces climate-related threats to BD as demonstrated through pilot activities and improved METT scores" is well formulated.

Indicator 3.1	**Target**.
Strengthened management of vulnerable PAs, based on site-specific information generated from pilots in order to address CC risks and threats, with a landscape focus and sustainable productive activities.	- Increase of 10% in the METT scores ($\bar{x} = 79\%$) - Recommendation for the inclusion of a resilience component in METT, based on the Ecosystem Health Index and other initiatives, by year 3. - Resilience-based projects and management actions reduce vulnerability in 12 ecoregional clusters: • 6,000 ha fire management + 10 km firebreaks • 3600 ha forest restauration + 5 km gallery forest • 400 ha assisted coastal regeneration • 200 ha marine regeneration • 600 ha sustainable land management • 650 ha prevention, control, and arreication of invasive species

Indicator 3.1 is SMART. It has three targets. This represents an error in the formulation of the indicator, but it does not cause problems because the targets do not contradict each other. The second goal is not relevant. While the third should refer to an additional Indicator related to pilot projects. The goal "200 ha of marine regeneration" is wrong both in the number (200) and in the unit of measure (ha).

Indicator 3.2	**Target**
Improved capacity for planning, implementation and monitoring of site-specific co-managed strategies for increasing resilience in PAs.	12 programs/ workshops on resilience in PAs Promedio de Capacity Development Scorecard: Q 9: 2.625 Q 11: 2.625 Q 13: 2.6875 Q 14: 2.3125 Specific improvements:

	- Management instruments are implemented effectively in selected PAs. - Information system for adaptive management (Outcome 1). - Institutional capacity development program and 3% of CONANP budget (from Outcome 1) reassigned to basic technological needs. - National monitoring system with proper capacity building (Outcome 1).

Indicator 3.2 is SMART. It has two targets. This represents an error in the formulation of the indicator, but it does not cause problems because the first target is not relevant. It is not relevant because of the number of programs / workshops implemented, but for its effects on capacity development.

Indicator 3.3	**Target**
Governance framework regarding land-use is strengthened through coordination and gender- and indigenous -sensitive participation forums to consider PA conservation and increased risks associated with CC.	- Mexico Resiliente Alliance institutionalized as a national advisory council and its members co-implementing at least one project in the field - Strengthened Community advisory councils or ad hoc groups to enhance land use governance in 17 PAs contribute to CC resilience measures/activities. - TBD Gender organizations and official institutions responsible for gender equality recognized as stakeholders and consulted in PA decision-making processes

Indicator 3.3 is SMART. It has three targets This represents an error in the formulation of the Indicator, but it does not cause problems because the three targets are easy to understand.

It is highlighted that the communication strategy of the Project, foreseen in the PRODOC, is not adapted to measure compliance with result 1. It is not treated like the other tools of a document that intends to guide the actions of any institution in the country, but rather a working instrument of the Project itself to spread the message and the achievements of the Project beyond the actors directly involved in the activities.

The relationship between the outcomess and the objective of the Project is self-evident. It is about addressing the gaps that exist at CONANP level in order to promote adaptation to CC as a useful tool for the institutional purposes of the same institution, that is, the preservation of the BD of the PAs. The three outcomes aspire to lay the foundations for the improvement of the quality of the effectiveness of action of the recipient institution, CONANP, in the long term. The Project in its essence intends to promote a new positioning of the PAs, and consequently of CONANP, as development actors that, fulfilling their institutional mandate necessarily linked to the conservation of the BD and ecosystems, allow understanding at various scales, national, regional and community, of its importance that goes beyond pure conservation. From this perspective, adaptation to CC represents the key to visualizing in the eyes of different actors the natural, economic and social value, not yet fully perceived, of the development of the PAs and the need to include them in a territory that exceeds the boundaries of their polygons. This is the bet of the project. The impossibility of measuring the Project objective is therefore mitigated by how the Project outcomes and their relative indicators are formulated, which capture and measure significant progress towards the Project objective.

3.1.2. Assumptions and Risks

In PRODOC, eight main risks are identified that could prevent or hinder the Project from reaching its objective and the measures to mitigate them. The first seven risks have not appeared during the implementation and therefore have not caused any type of problem.

It is not possible to state taht the risk identified as “the actors have priorities incompatible with the goals of the Project” has manifested itself. However, the evaluation records that from the beginning CONAFOR has not joined the implementation efforts and the Resilient Mexico Alliance has not committed to the Project either. Furthermore, the Alliance has not been very active during the last project implementation period. The lack of active participation of the Resilient Mexico Alliance has significant implications for the achievement of the Project. It is evident that

the Project could not achieve the institutionalization of the Alliance as a consultative body for questions of adaptation to CC (see section 3.3.1. Overall results).

The lack of an active participation of CONAFOR has also significant implications for the Project. This has determined that the Project did not cover other governmental areas foreseen during its history. Both the reasons for the lack of linkage and the implications that this has produced in terms of efficiency, sustainability and impact, could not have been identified and determined during the evaluation process in terms of the achievement of the outcomes.

It is important to note that the risk identified as "the delay in co-financing causes interruptions in implementation" has not been manifested because there was no coordination of the Project with the institutions that have signed the co-financing letters. In fact, the Project has been implemented without taking into account the co-financing and actions, which at least in principle, these institutions should have implemented in the Project's time frame.

3.1.3. Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into project design

No specific lessons learned that emerged from other projects have been incorporated into the Project design. The Project is considered a pioneer and has tried to internalize the issue of climate change in CONANP. The central idea of the Project is to mainstream the key concepts of adaptation to climate change and resilience into the policy and management of the country's PAs through the promotion of the ecosystem-based adaptation approach. However, the Project has joined the efforts already carried out in previous years by CONANP itself, which was already developing the issue of Climate Change in its institutional structure and already had a process for preparing the PACC in other PAs not included in the Project.

3.1.4. Planned stakeholder participation

The Project envisaged that CONANP, as executing agency of the project, would have the collaboration of CONABIO and CONAFOR. As mentioned, (see section 3.1.2. Assumptions and Risks), no representative of CONAFOR has participated in this evaluation process; therefore, the reasons for such disinterest in the project are not known. The ENDESU organization has not participated in the implementation of the Project either.

It is important to mention that when the Project was designed, the area that assumed the counterpart commitment from CONABIO was the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor (MBC), which disappeared in December 2018. There has been a significant discrepancy between what PRODOC envisioned and the Project (as it happened), due to how it has been implemented. Notably, neither the Technical Advisory Committee nor the Operational Group have been established, envisioned as elements to guarantee both participation and technical support. As already mentioned, the Project has not had a substantial articulation with the Resilient Mexico Alliance. In general terms, at the federal level, due to the lack of official collaboration institutions, the Project has turned out to be a CONANP Project, with few and not substantial interactions with other national institutions. Excluding technical collaboration with CONABIO, the participation of actors has not met the expectations of PRODOC. On the contrary, at the level of the ANP, the uniting and catalytic potential of coinciding interests at the landscape level has been more fully deployed.

CONABIO's participation has been important to achieve very important information management products in technical terms, but the discussion has not taken place at a higher level and ultimately the relationship between the Project and CONABIO has remained at a technical level. The latter developing a role more similar to what is typically required of consultants and not partners.

The Project has been linked with INECC in the design phase of the PACC, in terms of analysis and assessments of vulnerability, adaptation-based approach criteria and indicators, this has facilitated the coordination to incorporate the elements and criteria of the national policy into the PACC as for the CC. In the monitoring part, by means of a Collaboration Agreement, CONANP, CONABIO and CONAFOR have been mutually linked to launch the National Biodiversity Monitoring System (SNMB). This monitoring has been the one that has been carried out in the Project's PAs, supported financially and operationally by the Project.

The participation of communities, state institutions, academia, CSOs and the productive sectors at the AP and complex level have been formed in a more participatory way, leading to achievements whose importance is shared from different points of view. , forming and strengthening strategic alliances.

3.1.5. Replication approach

In the design, the strengthening of the institutional framework of the CONANP administration and the piloting of adaptation measures aim at laying the foundations for the future work of the PAs. From this perspective, the design has the aspiration of giving the Project itself a catalytic role of CC resilience efforts through the AP system in the territory of the Mexican government, not only during its term, but also after the closing. It is the bet of the Project and its reason for being.

Such an aspiration has proved realistic and all those involved in the evaluation exercise have communicated that the Project has opened up new possibilities for intervention at the landscape level that were not easily identified before.

The replication approach and the pioneering nature of the initiative is implicitly identified in the PRODOC. Likewise, it is mentioned that the function of the Technical Advisory Committee (later not formed in the implementation) is, in addition to providing technical support, to identify lessons learned applicable to other projects in Mexico and in the world.

3.1.6. UNDP comparative advantage

UNDP comparative advantage lies in its role as implementing entity in setting up development processes, facilitating dialogue as a neutral agent and helping to sustain the favorable momentum in Project implementation. The agency also has as a strength its ability to apply, in all its initiatives, strict administrative and purchasing standards that guarantee a transparent execution of the Project. The dual role of UNDP as resource manager and implementer agency has been fully manifested during the Project phase, coordinated by the second PMU (see section 3.3.3. Effectiveness & efficiency).

In addition, UNDP is recognized, by belonging to the United Nations System, with a certain degree of prestige that allows it to reinforce its capacity as a process facilitator. This element has been very important to ensure the continuity of execution of the Project during the political transition that was generated throughout the life of the Project, during which there were two presidential terms in the country and there was the change of four commissioners in CONANP.

The evaluative exercise has also noted that, being an institution not involved in Mexican internal politics, it is capable of generating trust between actors, who would otherwise feel less willing to collaborate. In the opinion of some interviewees, UNDP gives the Project a kind of seal of quality and transparency.

Finally, having a leadership experience at the global and regional level, in the implementation of development projects, UNDP can promote intervention strategies already tested in other countries and in different circumstances. In this sense, it is important to highlight that the small grant mechanism, approved in the second substantive review of PRODOC, to link communities to the Project, had already been successfully applied by UNDP in two experiences, one in Peru and the other in Mexico.

3.1.7. Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

PRODOC envisioned the creation of a consultative platform trying to institutionalize the Resilient Mexico Alliance. An effective and permanent link with the Alliance did not occur (see section 3.3.3. Effectiveness and efficiency).

On the other hand, the Project was deeply linked with other UNDP projects on the environmental issue, generating discussions, synergy and sharing visions. Due to its innovative nature, the Project contributed to other projects of the agency:

- The “Program to Support Disaster Risk Reduction in Mexico” (PMR-UNDP) had an infrastructural approach. The ecosystem-based adaptation approach promoted by the Project has been an important learning for PMR-UNDP.
- The work carried out by CONABIO, specifically the CC Explorer platform, has served as input for the development of species mappings, to identify areas of connectivity for the creation biological corridors within the UNDP/CONANP/GEF project “Strengthening the Management of System of Protected Areas to Improve the Conservation of Species at Risk and their Habitats” through climatic scenarios.

3.1.8. Management arrangements

Given the particular characteristics of the public administration in Mexico, the administrative / financial support of UNDP was requested. Therefore, the Project has been executed under the National Implementation Modalities (NIM for its acronym in English National Implementation Modalities) executed by CONANP, in accordance with the UNDP Program, Policies and Operations Procedures, due to its role as implementing entity. The project Steering Committee was made up of representatives belonging to SEMARNAT, CONANP and UNDP.

3.2 Project implementation

3.2.1. Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)[1]

The implementation of the Project has not envisaged any change in its design, decided and formalized during sessions of the Steering Committee.

In fact, the second PMU inheriting the Project that had problems in different management areas, from the administrative to the implementation of activities, has concentrated efforts to meet the most viable and relevant goals, leaving aside activities, which, for their own nature, were less viable. Therefore, the work has focused a lot on the implementation of activities in the PAs and on the coordination of activities with CONABIO. This choice has turned out to be fruitful because by the end of the project, CONANP has tools and experiences that represent the most important learning for the institution, in order to continue promoting the mainstreaming of the CC issue and future resilience.

Project management has also taken into account the most important recommendations of the mid-term evaluation. The extension of the Project has made it possible to recover the delays accumulated in the first stage of implementation under the responsibility of the first PMU. The replacement of the members of the first PMU with new officers, the recognition of the work of the UNDP Field Officers, the strengthening of the work with the Advisory Councils of the PAs and the stipulation of agreements with CSOs have been key to the achievements at the end of the Project. Likewise, as mentioned, the mid-term evaluation has contributed to rethinking the management of the Project, and both the Steering Committee and UNDP have been able to accept the findings of such exercise.

The evaluation also notes that the focus on PAs has also emerged from the urgency that has characterized the second phase of implementation and from the need to anchor implementation to activities that will lead to tangible results on the ground. The inertia of the Project, the relevance of the Project's themes, the work of the second PMU in charge, the UNDP Field Officers and the Directors of PAs, have been the driving force behind the initiative. Another fundamental aspect identified has been the Project's dependence on the decisions and priorities of the Regional and PAs Directors, who promoted the Project in different ways in the regions, adapting it to the specific conditions of each AP. In addition, at the end of the Project, the Directors of PAs have realized that a figure similar to the Field Officer is required to give continuity to the work already carried out and promoting them towards their sustainability.

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

Regarding the national ownership of the Project, there is a low ownership of the Project partners. The PRODOC anticipated a great participation of institutional actors at all levels, but the Project has turned to shape itself as a Project to support CONANP's technical and institutional capacities.

At the federal level, contributions from other institutions have not significantly approached the level of collaboration envisioned in PRODOC. CONAFOR has not substantially participated in the implementation or effective collaboration with the Resilient Mexico Alliance did not really happened.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that the issue of nature-based soultions and ecosystem-based adaptation has been positioned with the INECC, SEMARNAT, CONABIO, SADER, SRE, derived directly from the actions of the Project. Partner CSOs and those that have supported the development of the PACC have internalized this issue in their activities, as it is now linked to their own initiatives.

[1] The Evaluation Team has used the definition of adaptive management from the UNDP/GEF Evaluation Guidance. The formal change of project results is therefore necessary so that it can be affirmed that there has been an adaptive management of the Project.

At the AP and complex level, the participation and collaboration of state governments, municipal governments, CSOs, universities, research centers, local communities have been very important. Their level of ownership of the Project is high and have participated actively in the development of the PACC.

3.2.3. Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation

The monitoring and evaluation work has been coordinated by the PMU, specifically by the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist. This evaluation assesses the work done by the second PMU, in terms of very valuable follow-up. As of 2018, the Project has been monitored on a quarterly basis through a monitoring format that covered achievement of targets by results. This same format includes also risk management, problem management, lessons learned, participation in general, participation in advisory councils, gender focus, quality of consultancies and Agreements, and data to inform the calculation of the Capacity Development Score Card.

Such a system has been built by the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist of the second PCU in charge of project implementation with support from the UNDP M&E area.

3.2.4. Project finance

Project implementation has proven to be effective. The execution of the available budget has been consistent with spending needs. The 122.5% budget increase relative to outcome 1 has occurred due to the attribution to this outcome of many of the expenses incurred during the first stage of Project implementation.

	Amount in USD (as per the PRODOC)	Executed in USD (as of June 30, 2020)	Balance in USD (as of June 30, 2020)	% executed
Outcome 1	1,225,054.36	1,500,945.70	-275,891.34	122.52%
Outcome 2	2,923,180.00	2,537,413.74	385,766.26	86.80%
Outcome 3	5,542,989.88	5,177,233.87	365,756.01	93.40%
PMU	481,502.76	481,460.06	42.70	99.99%
TOTAL	**10,172,727.00**	**9,697,053.37**	**475,673.63**	95.32%

Institution	Amount in USD (as per the PRODOC)	Ejecutado en USD as of June 30, 2020))
UNDP	800,000	800,000
Government – CONANP	52,000,000	26,859,192
Government – CONAFOR	9,000,000	Data not available
Government – CONABIO	500,000	Data not available
ONG (ENDESU)	500,000	Data not available
FMCN	2,171,960	Data not available
GIZ	12,000,000	Data not available
Total	**76,971,960**	**27,659,192**

El Equipo de Evaluación no ha recibido la información necesaria para detallar como se dio la cofinanciación del Proyecto por parte de cinco instituciones que firmaron las cartas de acuerdos antes que el PRoeyecto fuere aprobado.

3.2.5. Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

Adaptive management resulting in formal changes to the Project results framework did not occur (see section 3.2.1. Adaptive management).

All the reports fed by the M&E system launched by the second PMU included the formulation of 6 types of routine use reports by UNDP, that is:

- the quarterly IWP (Integrated Work Plan);

- the annual IWP whose information emphasizes results based on the SDGs,
- the ROAR (Results-Oriented Annual Reporting);
- the PQA (Project Quality Assessment), the IATI (International Aid Transparency Initiative), and
- the PIR (Project Implementation Report)

3.2.6. UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues

The collaboration between UNDP and CONANP has been characterized by a not very clear division of roles and responsibilities during the first phase of the Project coordinated by the first PMU. When the second PMU entered in service and following up on the pertinent recommendations of the mid-term evaluation, the Steering Committee and the PMU began to proceed more effectively towards achieving the results (see section 3.3.3. Effectiveness & efficiency for details).

3.3 Project Results

3.3.1. Overall results (attainement of the objectives)

Outcome 1 has been achieved.

Outcome 1
Mexican PA system readiness framework effectively safeguards BD.

Indicator 1.1: Institutional framework strengthened to increase PA resilience from CC impacts and risks.

Target:

- CONANP Strategy for 2040 and other Institutional Plans include CC and resilience
- PNANP 2013 – 2018 includes CC and resilience
- ECCAP updated and aligned with public and institutional policy (PNANP) and legal framework related to CC
- The Communication Strategy promotes the importance of conservation areas as instruments to (a) increase the resilience of communities and ecosystems, and (b) maintain integrity across the landscape / seascape.

The project has achieved the fulfillment of the target and has positioned the theme of Protected Areas as cost-effective solutions based on nature. It has also managed to establish and strengthen an institutional framework to increase the resilience of PAs, through institutional instruments strengthened with climate change criteria.

Achievement of the target in detail:

- CONANP Strategy for 2040 and other Institutional Plans include CC as fundamental component
- 2 National Programmes of PAs (PNANP) 2013-2018 and 2020-2024.
- ECCAP updated and aligned with public and institutional policy (PNANP) and legal framework related to CC
- The Communication Strategy
- 9 PACC
- 6 Management Plans.
- PROCODES Operating Rules

Indicator 1.2: Planning, Management and Information System for decision making to mainstream CC into integrated land-use planning that increases biodiversity resilience

Target

- National Climate Information Portal for Protected Areas established with geospatial data, including an Early Alert System and linked to the already existing monitoring efforts (as SNIB, INFyS and SIMEC and other relevant initiatives).
- 100% PAs with access to Portal and staff trained to use it to make effective resilience-based management decisions

The target has been achieved by developing the National Information Portal in coordination with CONABIO, it includes an Early Warning System for coral bleaching and the information generated on this platform is linked to CONANP's internal monitoring system I-Effectiveness.

Achievement of the target in detail:
The project has developed a robust information system for decision-making and monitoring through 3 Platforms.

- *Sistema Integral de Monitoreo de Biodiversidad y Degradación en Áreas Naturales Protegidas*. The platform contains Surface Indicators for each class of Vegetation, Habitat Loss, Habitat Transformation Rates, Ecosystem Integrity and Habitat Quality of key fauna in ecosystems. *https://monitoreo.conabio.gob.mx/*
- *Sistema de Información y Análisis de los Ecosistemas Marinos de México (SIMAR).* Este This system allows the monitoring of the health of marine ecosystems within PAs through a remote observation network of marine biodiversity. It has a coral bleaching alert. *https://simar.conabio.gob.mx/*
- *Explorador de Cambio Climático*. This platform shows the key areas for the conservation of biodiversity through connectivity data and the generation of maps of biological corridors with CC criteria to promote territorial actions in 13 PAs. *https://www.wegp.unam.mx/Conabio/*

The information generated through these platforms is linked to the CONANP i-Effectiveness System, which monitors the management effectiveness of Mexico's protected areas system.

Result 2 has been achieved, although indicator 2.2 has partially achieved its target. The achievement far beyond the expected of indicator 2.1 amply compensates for the deficiency relative to the achievement of indicator 2.2

Outcome 2
Expansion of PA system to protect important refugia through connectivity and increased resiliency.

Indicador 2.1: Expansion of areas of conservation in priority ecoregions and refugia facilitated by GIS database, measured by the increase in area under conservation to promote connectivity and protect important refugia.

Target
- 5,984,818 ha: At least 600,000 ha of new areas included in new or existing conservation areas nationwide Costero/marino: Coastal/marine: 369,139 ha; Terrestrial: 230,861 ha.

The target has been largely achieved and it has been exceeded (307%), decreeing 79 million 819 thousand and 59 new hectares for conservation. The decrees include the issue of Resilience to Climate Change.

Achievement of the target in detail:
The Project has made the arrangements for new PAs to support the extension of the PA System enlargement. Each decree document includes the concept of resilience to the CC, leaving everything institutionally ready for conservation actions in new PAs. The area that has been decreed during the life of the project has exceeded the target since December 2017 (25 million 984 thousand and 818 ha), reaching an advance of 307% by decreeing 79 million 819 thousand and 59 hectares:

- *Parque Nacional Revillagigedo* (previously *Reserva de la Biósfera*). Now it is the largest conservation marine area of the northern hemisphere.
- *Caribe mexicano*
- *Islas del Pacífico de la península de Baja California*
- *Pacífico Mexicano Profundo*
- *Sierra de Tamaulipas*

The five decrees make explicit the issues of the Project with the following words “the protection and conservation of ecosystems and their biodiversity reduce the vulnerability of the population and increase their resilience, in addition to favoring the adaptation of biodiversity to climate change, including species at risk. Therefore, the establishment of protected natural areas constitutes a fundamental tool to face the adverse effects of climate change”.

Indicador 2.2: Area of functional connectivity between critical habitat blocks surrounding and within PAs maintained or increased to enhance ecosystem resilience through ecoregion-based incentive schemes.

Target:
- 30,000 ha that enhance connectivity and ecoregion incentives schemes, as a partial result from management actions from Outcome 3

- 12 eco-region based incentive schemes/portfolios that enhance resilience

The target has been achieved: the Project has improved the strategic connectivity between critical habitat blocks in the zones of influence of the ANP, strategic alliances have been reached between private owners and / or communities, adding territories for the conservation of the ANP, maintaining and increased the resilience of ecosystems and reaching 26,294.66 hectares of ADVC.

Achievement of the target in detail:
The Project closes with a total of 26,294.66 hectares of ADVC: 10,015.07 hectares certified and 16,279.59 hectares awaiting CONANP granting its certification. This is 87.65% compared to the target (30 thousand Has). The certification of the Areas Voluntarily Destined for Conservation (ADVC) recognizes the figure of ADVC to generate strategic alliances between private owners or communities, who seek to join and add their hectares for conservation and increase the resilience of the PAs. In fact, this certification facilitates access to subsidies for sustainable land management, which becomes a co-responsible strategy for the conservation of the country's natural capital.

Outcome 3 has been partially achieved-

Outcome 3
PA site management effectively reduces climate-related threats to BD as demonstrated through pilot activities and improved METT scores

Indicator 3.1: Fortalecer la gestión de las ANP vulnerables, basándose en sitios específicos de información generada a partir de los pilotos con el fin de abordar los riesgos y amenazas del CC, con un enfoque de paisaje y actividades productivas sostenibles.

Target:
a) Increase of 10% in the METT scores ($\bar{x}$ = 79%)

b) Resilience-based projects and management actions reduce vulnerability in 12 ecoregional clusters:

- 6,000 ha fire control + 10 km firebreaks

- 3600 ha forest restauration + 5 km gallery forest

- 400 ha assisted coastal regeneration

- 200 ha marine regeneration

- 600 ha sustainable land management

- 650 ha prevention, control, and arreication of invasive species

The target is considered met because only 0.41 points are left to reach 10% on the METT score.

Achievement of the target in detail:
a) The increase in PA management capacity reflected with the METT Tool (Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool) where the evaluation of management effectiveness is recognized as a vital component of the management of PA, proactive and responsive, achieved by the project has been 78.59 points of the 79 points of the goal compared to the baseline of 69 points.

b) The Project implemented the following actions:

- 161 ha de manejo integral de incendios + 24.4 km de brechas cortafuego. Además, son previstos 12 ha y 25 km adicionales antes el cierre del proyecto.
- 5,309.25 ha + 5 km de restauración terrestre y de bosques en galería, respectivamente. El Proyecto fomentó la conectividad de zonas antes degradadas con una intervención diversa que incluye recuperación de hábitats de especies prioritarias y de zonas de recarga hídrica. Además, son previstas 519 ha adicionales al cierre del Proyecto.
- 147.4 ha de restauración costera. Ha habido una diversidad de intervenciones, como la rehabilitación del flujo hídrico, restauración y conservación del manglar, restauración de dunas costeras.
- 0.72 ha de regeneración marina. El proyecto ha implementado la regeneración de arrecife, hábitat de fauna marina como parte del paquete de restauración marina.

- 166.5 ha de gestión sostenible de la tierra. A esta medida cabe sumar 600 ha de forma indirecta para el Complejo Ocote-Sumidero por parte de FONCET.
- 258.77 ha de prevención, control, erradicación y monitoreo de especies exóticas e invasoras. La transformación se ha asociado a programas de bioseguridad, plagas y enfermedades que hacen posible la permanencia de estas medidas.

Indicator 3.2: Improved capacity for planning, implementation and monitoring of site-specific co-managed strategies for increasing resilience in PAs.

Target:
Average of the Capacity Development Scorecard:

Q 9: 2.625

Q 11: 2.625

Q 13: 2.6875

Q 14: 2.3125

The goal has been reached 100%. The Project has measured its capabilities in effective management through the Average Capacity Development Scorecard, achieving a set of capabilities and effective management in the installation of instruments for planning, decision making from a national information system, and accountability through a system of quarterly monitoring reports.

Achievement of the target in detail:
The following averages of the Capacity Development Scorecard values have been achieved:

- Q 9: 2.882 ⇒ the development of the 9 PACC and the 6 Management Plan have reconfigured the way of planning the environment. With this capacity, the Project has increased its effectiveness of improvement practices in territorial management.
- Q11: 2.625 ⇒ decision makers obtain and use up-to-date environmental information to make decisions. The Planning, Management and Information System (SPGI) for CC decision-making has completed its development, is released and has been a tool for the preparation of the PACC. The I-Effectiveness System, which monitors the effectiveness of Management of the protected areas system in Mexico has indicators that are based on information from SPGI platforms.
- Q14: 2.7000 ⇒ the monitoring information is produced in time and with precision, and is used by the implementation team to learn and possibly change the course of action. The Project installed capacities in accountability from the field to the point of being able to generate evidence from third parties, its quarterly reporting system from the field, intentionally nurtured 12 different institutional accountability exercises and the information allowed the decision making deployed in a systematized framework.
- Q13: 2.6875 ⇒ the necessary skills and technologies are available and there is a national-based mechanism for updating the required knowledge and for the improvement of technologies. The project has been able to install this set of capabilities. They are the three previous types of capabilities: effective management from the installation of planning instruments, decisions made from a national information system, and accountability from a quarterly monitoring reporting system.

Indicator 3.3: Governance framework regarding land-use is strengthened through coordination and gender- and indigenous -sensitive participation forums to consider PA conservation and increased risks associated with CC.

Target:
- Mexico Resiliente Alliance institutionalized as a national advisory council and its members co-implementing at least one project in the field

- Strengthened Community advisory councils or ad hoc groups to enhance land use governance in 17 PAs contribute to CC resilience measures/activities.

- TBD Gender organizations and official institutions responsible for gender equality recognized as stakeholders and consulted in PA decision-making processes

The partial achievement of the target of the governance Framework indicator is configured with the Project's contribution to the Advisory Councils, a figure that has been strengthened and through which the issue of climate change and resilience has been mainstreamed. The Resilient Mexico Alliance has not materialized its institutionalization. Nor have gender organizations been created.

The Project has not achieved the expected institutionalization of the Resilient Mexico Alliance. A member of the Alliance (TNC) has participated in the planning for the co-implementation of three adaptation measures.

11 Advisory Councils have been strengthened in environmental governance and have an institutionalization manifested through: a) regulations b) periodic meetings per year c) CC Sub-Councils and d) an inclusive mechanism in key decision-making.

Gender organizations or institutions have not been created. However, the Project has promoted the gender perspective and the empowerment of women through about 85 events for the development of technical and management capacities, plus another about ten direct interventions in the implementation of adaptation measures, through 9 CSOs with a participation of around 110 women, in 9 ANP and with a more specific leadership of about 45 women.

3.3.2. Relevance

The Project is relevant. It is has been aligned to the General Law of Climate Change (LGCC) of Mexico promoting many of the objects specified in it. These include the regulation of actions for adaptation to CC, the reduction of the vulnerability of the population and ecosystems to the adverse effects of CC, the establishment of new natural protected areas, biological corridors, and other conservation modalities. and priority areas of ecological conservation to facilitate genetic exchange and favor the adaptation of biodiversity to CC, through the maintenance and increase of native vegetation cover, wetlands and other management measures, as well as the establishment of bases for concertation with society.

The Project supports the biodiversity focal area and the strategic priorities of GEF-5, with the objective of the focal area being the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of ecosystem goods and services. Specifically, the Project pursues the objective of improving the sustainability of protected area systems, which is one of the five pillars of the focal area. The Project is also aligned with the efforts of UNDP, which, as the leading United Nations agency for development, has put in place and is underway to support the countries where it operates to advance towards the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In particular, as a partner of the GEF and the Green Climate Fund, UNDP is mandated to support countries in consolidating the Paris Agreement in development priorities. Adaptation to CC, community resilience, and ecosystem conservation are action priorities for the agency.

As already mentioned (see section 3.1.1. Analysis of the Results Framework), the Project design has three clearly different components, which can be summarized as: pilot activities in the field; strengthening of decision support tools; and creation of a consultative sector platform. It is clear that the first two components fall under the control of the PMU and CONANP in their different articulations, being, on the contrary, the third, which, by its very nature, requires bringing together different organizations and consequently does not allow a close control by CONANP and the PMU of its implementation. The first two components of the Project have proven to be of much higher relevance for the stakeholders involved. This difference has had significant repercussions on how the Project has been implemented and achieved its results (see section 3.3.1. Overall results).

The choice of partners and the mechanism for implementing the Project as envisioned in PRODOC, were not fully effective in complying with the institutionalization of the Resilient Mexico Alliance as a consultative platform for issues inherent to climate change resilience. The discussions within the platform have not arrived to the point of introducing the subject to its members. Furthermore, in CONANP four commissioners have alternated during the life of the project: such events have not made it easier for the process to have a deep institutional appropriation capable of promoting this institutionalization process.

The reduction of vulnerabilities to CC due to the implementation of adaptation measures for the conservation of the BD through the PAs has been the central theme of the Project in its design and implementation. The process related to the PACC, the mainstreaming of the Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) approach in the PACC, the inclusion of adaptation measures in the management programs, the updating of the ECCAP and the inclusion of the subject in the PNANP are undoubted evidences of an institutional process internal to CONANP on the issue of adaptation to CC as a means of conserving biodiversity. From this point of view, the initiative has proven to be

very relevant at the country level to provide CONANP with essential elements to face the impacts of CC in terms of biodiversity loss.

The evaluation also notes that the creation of spaces for discussion and citizen participation in the decision-making process has been very pertinent, not only in terms of the achievement of results, but also in pushing towards compliance with the General Law of Ecological Balance and the Environmental Protection (LGEEPA) and its Regulations on PAs.

The supplying of CONANP with these tools represents an important strengthening step that may allow it to fulfill its mandate to conserve biodiversity in the PAs. With other products, specifically with its contribution to the Comprehensive System for Monitoring Biodiversity and Degradation in Protected Natural Areas, the Information System and Analysis of Marine Ecosystems of Mexico and the Climate Change Explorer, the Project has also strengthened CONABIO, allowing it to to advance with its institutional work related to promoting, coordinating, supporting and carrying out activities aimed at knowledge of biodiversity. The relevance for the work of the two institutions is unquestionable.

All the stakeholders interviewed have agreed to define the Project relevant to the needs of CONANP, CONABIO at the central level and of the PAs and the communities benefiting from the Project. The results of the Project have been showed, from this point of view, highly appreciated by all. The evaluation also highlights that the participatory form, which has strongly characterized the implementation at the AP level, should also be considered very pertinent because it has allowed a good connection with the project of many actors who live and operate within or in the areas of influence of the PAs.

The project and its achievements are absolutely relevant to the country. All the actors interviewed at the local level have also communicated interest and enthusiasm towards the project, showing that the relevance of the Project has gone beyond the interest of CONANP, the leading national institution of the Project. The ecosystem-based adaptation approach, has been key to understanding the common challenges that CC poses to all those who live and professionally operate a territory.

According to anecdotal evidence compiled by the Evaluation Team, the Project has found the enthusiasm of the communities where the PACC have been formulated and adaptation measures have been implemented. The project has allowed a better understanding of the resilience to CC and its effective relationship with the conservation of the territory and therefore of biodiversity. It is noted that this understanding was already present in a more advanced way with rural and indigenous populations, and less with small-scale productive sectors, especially the cattle rancher. From this perspective, the project was very relevant to facilitate relations of mutual recognition between the PAs and sectors that were traditionally perceived as antagonists to conservation. The involvement of large producers, notably the non-artisanal fishing sector, large cattle ranchers and the mining sector, have not joined the process.

The central idea of the Project to strengthen the effectiveness of the management of the ANP, in its polygon and outside, has proven relevant to meet the conservation needs of the DB and pertinent as a form of work capable of generating collaborations between different actors.

Finally, it is important to highlight that, although there have been problems in the implementation and achievement of results (see section 3.3.1 General results), these are not attributable to the duration of the Project. They are rather attributable to some management problems that arise (see section 3.3.3 Effectiveness & efficiency) during the Project phase coordinated by the first PMU in charge of implementing the project activities.

3.3.3. Effectiveness & Efficiency

The effectiveness and efficiency of implementation of the Project should be evaluated taking into account the findings of the mid-term evaluation report and considering the Project implemented in two stages. The first stage ends, and the second begins, with the mid-term evaluation and the change of all the members of the PMU. The process has not been punctual, but has lasted some months.

As evidenced (see section 3.3.1 "Overall results") the project has reached achieve two of the three results outlined under the original PRODOCs results. And above all, it has come to position the ANPs as development centers, thanks to the ecosystem-based adaptation approach. This has been the most important achievement, the importance of which has been highlighted by all those interviewed by the Evaluation Team.

This achievement and the effective mainstreaming of CC and resilience as BD conservation instruments represent the heritage that the Project leaves in the hands of CONANP.

The Project has achieved the following:

- The Project has contributed to reducing the vulnerability to Climate Change of biodiversity and people present in the territory in an area of 6,000.04 hectares in areas of forests, jungles, wetlands, coasts and seas, which have been transformed by an ecosystem-based adaptation approach, through CC adaptation measures. In addition, the foundations have been laid to be able to expand on this achievement in the future through tool design.
- Both SEMARNAT and the National Institute of Ecology and Climate Change (INECC) identify the results of the Project as lessons learned and replicable good practices of nature-based solutions (SBN) to the point that the SBN are inputs for the characterization of the NDC, which in turn supports the country to comply with international obligations such as the CBD and the UNFCC.
- The CC and resilience theme is also included in the Sectorial Program for Environment and Natural Resources (PROMARNAT 2018-2024). The lessons learned and good practices of the Project have contributed to this end. In particular, to Priority Objective n. 2 "Strengthen climate action in order to move towards a low carbon economy and a resilient population, ecosystems, productive systems and strategic infrastructure, with the support of available scientific, traditional and technological knowledge."
- The guide for formulating the PACC "Tool for the Formulation of Programs for Adaptation to Climate Change in Protected Natural Areas" has been developed from a participatory process with specialized people from the government sector, civil society and international organizations. This guide may already be binding on other initiatives that are developed within CONANP.

The PMU, through the Project's Communication Strategy, has also been able to promote the role of the PAs in facing CC, also generating knowledge products and installing a territorial-based capacity to issue third-party evidence. The Communication Strategy has been configured from four strategic axes, that is, evidence from third parties, visibility from social networks of the Project and the UNDP, spaces for specialized dissemination and knowledge products.

The Project has a robust library of 446 files or links of third party evidence covering a wide range of the Project's results.

The theme of PAs as nature-based solutions has been presented in more than one specialized space. Among others are noted:

- World Parks Congress (WPC), Sidney, Australia, from 12 to 19 November 2014.
- *Plataforma Global 2017 para la Reducción del Riesgo de Desastres*, Cancún, Mexico, from 22 to 26 de mayo 2017.
- 5th International Climate Change Adaptation Conference: Adaptation Futures 2018, from 21 to 28 June 2018.
- *III Congreso de Áreas Protegidas de Latinoamérica y El Caribe y evento paralelo de Áreas Protegidas Resilientes*, Lima, Perú, October 2019.
- *III Simposio de Adaptación al Cambio Climático en Latinoamérica*, Campus Puebla, México, March 2020.
- Meeting of Friends of Ecosystem based adaptation of the International Union for Conservation of Nature, where CONANP presented the project actions at the global meeting of this platform.

Among the most relevant knowledge products that have been produced during the period are the publications of the Adaptation Programs to Climate Change, preceded by executive summaries, the book of systematization of the experience “Resilience; Protected Natural Areas, natural solutions to global challenges ”, as well as its presentation at a wide audience event in 2019, and the Faros de Esperanza videos published in various spaces. The videos show the diversity of landscapes, flora, fauna, and productive activities that take place in the PAs, promoting the PAs as beacons of direction to face climate change.

In the PAs, the Project has evidently made progress in terms of different achievements, the ecosystems of the PAs being different from each other. The difference also exists of consequence in terms of actors present in the areas and their interests in the development and conservation of both the protected areas and the territory around them.

The Project has undoubtedly been effective in promoting the ecosystem-based adaptation approach and in promoting adaptation to CC as a fundamental element for the effective management of PAs in CONANP. In addition, the pilot experiences carried out in the Project's PAs have given rise to very important lessons for monitoring the work. These learnings are well analyzed and described in two studies produced by the project:

- "Systematization of good practices and lessons learned in the management effectiveness and resilience of Pas" (October 2019).
- "Systematization of lessons learned in the incorporation of the ecosystem-based adaptation approach in the design of Climate Change Adaptation Programs and the contribution of their participation processes to the governance of the PAs" (March 2020).

As already mentioned (see section "3.1.5. Replication approach"); the commitment and rationale of the Project was to guide climate change resilience efforts in PAs, not only during its term but also after closure. This bet has been won by the Project.

The first stage of the Project has been implemented inefficiently as described by the mid-term evaluation and confirmed during this evaluation exercise. In the second stage, the Project has been efficiently implemented. Specifically, UNDP has developed fully all its own characteristics that go beyond the simple application of its management standards.

There has been, among all the actors encountered, a great appreciation of the role of UNDP both as a resource manager and as an implementing partner. This role has been better understood thanks to the work of the second PCU and the application of the recommendations developed by the mid-term evaluation, which had identified inefficient implementation from many perspectives.

In consideration of the mid-term evaluation, therefore, the work has been focused on the achievement of the results, considerably improving the monitoring and evaluation system, financial management, the relations between PCU and Field Officers and the Directors of CONANP, at AP and regional level. Training on the issues of the Project related to CC at all relevant levels were conducted. The coordination and supervision of the work of consultants l that have been used to carry out many activities has been imporved as wel. A great success has also been the hiring of the new Project Administrator.

A significant element in terms of efficiency has been the training of the Field Officers carried out by the PMU, because successively it has been able to translate all the work, allowing the Project topics to be deepened in the PAs both in the conceptual part as in the practical part. It has ultimately pushed towards concrete actions, through the formulation of the 9 PACC, the 6 Management Programs and the implementation of adaptation measures in the field. The push that the Field Officers gave within the Project has been necessary so that the targets could be achieved at the PA level: they have covered different tasks in the PA, such as intermediaries of the PMU and promoters of the Project themes in the PAs, coordinators of consultants and technical support to carry out the actions.

The work of coordinating and supervising the actions of the consulting firms has been shown to be very well organized and oriented towards caring for the quality of work in the PAs. The consultants were supported by the PAs and, specifically, by the Field Officers and the products delivered by the consultants were then reviewed by the PMU, the UNDP and the Directorate of Climate Change Strategies of the CONANP in order to ensure that the work was fulfilled.

The financial management of the Project has been supported by the Annual Operating Plans (POA), thus demonstrating a reasonable use of the financial resource. From an administrative and accounting point of view, the second stage of implementation has not registered any type of problem.

During the implementation of the Project, no adaptive management has taken place: the Steering Committee has not made any formal decision in relation to the objectives set out in the original PRODOC. The results framework, as formulated in the original proposal of the Project, has constituted the main reference document for the implementation, follow-up and monitoring of the activities. Still, the implementation of the Project has in fact left aside the component dedicated to the creation of a consultative institutional platform that is reflected in a formal non-achievement related to result 3. More substantially, the work carried out has been focused on the other components of the Project. This decision, although not formalized in any document, has been pertinent allowing the achivement of Project's results considered to be most important, because they have generated enthusiasm

towards the new topics proposed by the Project and have allowed a substantial mainstreaming of them at different levels.

This evaluation highlights two very important efficiency elements:

1. The stipulation of agreements with CSOs to implement adaptation measures. This has guaranteed a better approach and connection with those who live or carry out activities in the PAs and in their areas of influence and has allowed, through the grant mechanism, to maximize the execution of resources to facilitate the implementation of adaptation measures. This element of efficiency is not only related to the achievement of results, but also gives the process carried out in the PAs a higher level of sustainability because it has reinforced the strategic alliance for the management of natural areas.
2. Hiring a consultant to systematize the lessons learned generated in the Project to verify if there were lessons learned that could serve as inputs for the PNANP 2020-2024; and to control how the course of the actions promoted and coordinated by the second PMU. In addition, it was a necessity to have information for communication purposes about the project.

The monitoring system has been strongly anchored to the results framework. This anchoring has served as an element of advancement of the Project, allowing activities to be implemented in line with the goals set out in the PRODOC.

The effort put in place during the second stage of implementation is better visualized by reporting the degree of progress in the implementation and execution of the Project. Indeed, the identification of such a progress in the mid-term evaluation that valued the efficiency of the Project in September 2017 as moderately inefficient. The report stated "…with the implementation of 36% of the goals and 66% of the Project time elapsed, the conversion of inputs into desired results has been inefficient, especially in terms of result 1, 42% progress with 98% budget exercised…".

The most significant element of inefficiency has been related to the implementation process, which has resulted in the first stage of the Project, before the PMU was completely renewed, and which has determined a substantial delay in the entire process. As already reported (see section 3.1.5 Replication approach), the Project had a pioneering nature, therefore, it may be that the difficulty of implementing a pioneering and complex project idea has contributed to delaying implementation. This delay meant that the second part was implemented in an atmosphere of haste and urgency and the establishment of an inter-institutional consultative body was left aside to privilege the most substantive actions of the Project and institutional training for the CONANP, the beneficiary institution of the Project. As mentioned, the decision has not been reflected in any formal changes to the results framework.

This type of inefficiency should not be considered harmful in terms of management effectiveness of the second stage of Project implementation. The conversion of a platform to voluntary participation, Resilient Mexico, into an institutionalized body would have determined a much closer type of involvement of the PCU, which, therefore, would have subtracted resources from the other components. In addition, it would have required substantial political support for the process. This support has not been possible.

UNDP and CONANP have not coordinated the actions of the Project with the institutions that had signed the letters of agreement for the co-financing of the same Project. Therefore, there has not been any type of coordination that could at least in principle have strengthened the actions of the Project.

Finally, this evaluation confirms that all four external audits related to the years 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018 carried out up to the date of this evaluation have been positive, reporting full compliance with all administrative, accounting and management issues.

In conclusion, the evaluation assesses the efficiency of the Project as moderately satisfactory taking into account the achievements of the Project and the first stage being valued as moderately unsatisfactory by the mid-term evaluation and the second as very satisfactory for this exercise.

Note on the COVID-19 PANDEMIC and the effectiveness of the Project

Fortunately, the COVID-19 pandemic has not resulted in a significant impact on any of the Project's achievements.

The closing event has not yet occurred (at the time of this evaluation). The event would have been important as an occasion for consolidation among the Project stakeholders of learnings generated throughout the implementation, but it does not constitute any detriment to the Project's achievements. In fact, the most significant activities had already ended when the problem emerged in the country.

At the PA level, the Pandemic has imposed a suspension or slowdown of activities related to adaptation measures, community monitoring of biodiversity, the granting of ADVC certificates and the cancellation of a community workshop. In addition, it has not allowed the final review visits and workshops to close activities in the field.

The pandemic has affected the possibility of making closing reflections both at the general level, as well as at the PA level, therefore, it has had negative effects on the effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the Project, especially regarding the internalization of results and learnings. In terms of all other relevant evaluation criteria, that is relevance, efficiency, national ownership, national integration, coverage and targeting, participation, and scale and scale, the pandemic can be considered not significant.

3.3.4. Country ownership

The Project is rooted within the institutions SEMARNAT, as the head of the sector, and CONANP. With its work of mainstreaming of the CC issue, it has joined the efforts of CONANP, and more precisely the Directorate of Climate Change Strategy (DECC), already started before the Project began. The DECC has been coordinating the development of some Climate Change Adaptation Programs (PACC) that since 2011. Furthermore, as mentioned, it has strengthened the environmental sector by aligning itself with the General Law on Climate Change.

At the end of the Project, SEMARNAT and CONANP have the adaptation to the CC included in their programming guide document, the Sectorial Program for Environment and Natural Resources (PROMARNAT 2020-2024) and the National Program for PAs (PNANP 2020-2024).

Finally, it is understood that the work developed by CONABIO allows the same institution to strengthen its operation as an agency in charge of promoting and coordinating activities aimed at knowledge of biological diversity, as well as its conservation and sustainable use for the benefit of Mexican society.

3.3.5. Integration

The project, beyond working only with the PAs, has promoted a participatory process and an working method through the ecosystem-based adaptation approach, allowing the PAs themselves to be positioned as actors in the territory, no longer perceived as “conservation islands”, but as institutions active for the development of the territory itself. The integration of the work of different actors has occurred at the landscape level.

In its original idea, the Project intended to integrate the piloting of actions in the PAs, the connectivity work and the extension of protected areas, the technical work of information generation of CONABIO at a multi-institutional level on a national scale. Such integration has not occurred for substantially three reasons already mentioned:

- Change in national priorities during the different governments that have occurred throughout the implementation of the Project.
- The lack of commitment to the Project of many actors foreseen in PRODOC.
- The declining operation of the Resilient Mexico Alliance during the years of Project implementation.
- The predominantly technical relationship between the Project and CONABIO.

It is also important to highlight that the Project has managed to integrate the themes of its pertinence in the process that has led to the decrees related to the creation of new PAs.

3.3.6. Sustainability

At the political level, the inclusion of CC criteria has been marked in five decrees relating to five protected areas, 4 new and one expanded. The ANPs are recognized for their fundamental importance in facing the challenges that the CC poses both to the conservation of ecosystems and their biodiversity and to the livelihood of the population. It is a political recognition that clearly positions CONANP as an important actor to join efforts for adaptation and mitigation of CC.

At the institutional level, the inclusion of the CC criteria in the PNANP 2020-2024 is evidence of the initiative's future sustainability, being the governing document of the institution's programming that establishes the lines that will guide management actions of CONANP as agent of the Federal Government.

The process of drafting the nine PACC and the six Management Programs and the implementation of adaptation measures, has strengthened the capacities of the PAs involved. In addition, it has promoted alliances between the actors that have participated in the process and work experiences are already taking place in several PAs that aim to follow the path set by the Project with the implementation of adaptation measures with resources collected from different sources. It is important from this perspective to highlight that different types of actors are involved in this process, such as rural and indigenous communities, cattle ranchers, the hotel sector, academia, state and municipal institutions and CSOs.

The challenge that CONANP is facing is to continue building on the achievements of the Project. As such they do not show any element contrary to sustainability, on the contrary, the mainstreaming of the Project themes, i.e. CC, resilience, ecosystem-based adaptation based on ecosystems has been consolidated. The themes are included at different levels showing that the path to the future is laid out.

Jointly with these achievements at the political and institutional level, the Project work carried out at the technical level with CONABIO should be considered. It improves the monitoring capacity of the institution and at the PA level in the field (preparation of the PACC and the Management Plan), which has allowed the implementation of adaptation measures. Fieldwork in the PAs has also made it possible to accumulate experiences, strengthen capacities, and identify lessons learned and good practices.

The challenge to follow up is substantially financial, given the contingency of budget reduction decided by Government of Mexico. In addition to the financial problems, there are also human resources problems: the Field Officers, who have been key during the implementation, at the end of the Project will no longer be at the disposal of the PAs to continue pushing adaptation actions.

The theme of CC resilience opens up possibilities to keep working in the Project's PAs with the Climate Change Fund (FCC) and in alliances with CSOs that are crucial for the sustainability of the initiative mainly for two reasons:

- Adapting to CC is a theme that can be used to raise funds from both international, national and state donors. In addition, the theme is also important for companies that take care of the environmental sustainability of their ventures through their corporate social responsibility departments
- It is important that the Project's PAs continue to provide lessons learned to CONANP within a period of time that goes beyond the simple implementation period of the initiative to maintain high attention to the issue of CC resilience, so that efforts made by the project will not be diluted in the perception of the inhabitants after a long time.

The learnings generated by the Project are now under consideration by the GEF Small Grants Program (SGP) managed by UNDP for incorporation into the planning of the program strategy for 2020/30. This program represents a means of following up the Project at the field level. In fact, it was in the plans of the Project and the SGP to hold a common event so that the issues of intervention of the Project with communities and CONANP could be promoted. The COVID-19 pandemic emergency has prevented the event from occurring.

Finally, it is important to highlight that the Project partners are developing in some complex climate change adaptation activities financed by various entities, such as the hotel sector (Hotels of the RIU chain), aquaculture company (Regal Spring), civil society organization (FMCN), international foundations (Bat Conservation International), international cooperation organization (North American Fund for Cooperation).

3.3.7. Impact

Through the implementation of adaptation measures to CC, under the ecosystem-based adaptation approach, the Project has contributed to reducing the vulnerability to Climate Change of the BD and human livelihoods, covering an area of 6,000.04 hectares in forests, rainforests, wetlands, coasts and seas of the 17 PAs of the project.

The Project has impacted with the expansion of the biodiversity conservation area by decreeing 79 million 819 thousand and 59 hectares, which have been included in the management improvement and in specific actions to reduce CC impacts with adaptation strategies aiming at increasing the resilience of PAs. It is highlighted that the

importance of the PAs for CC adaptation has been among the justifications of the decrees. In addition, with the certification of a total of 26,294.66 hectares of ADVC with connectivity and resilience criteria, the Project has impacted on the strategic expansion over the coverage of the PAs. It has mitigated the direct and indirect CC impacts on BD, together with the strategic planning of the PACC by complex: capacity-building activities at the community, institutional and organizational levels have impacted on the sum of collaborative efforts between different sectors. In addition, it has impacted on the livelihoods of the local population, men and women, that are linked in the actions of conservation and adaptation to CC.

The Project evidences the progress of the achievement of the impacts, through the METT tool, where the project has increased its effectiveness in the management of the 17 ANPs by 9.59%, allowing progress in the fulfillment of the objectives and the means required for achieve them.

The programmatic instruments promoted by the Project within CONANP, such as PNANP 2020-2024, Strategy 2040, ECCAP, Procodes operating rules, strengthen and mainstream the CC issue in national policy directed to the PAs. The Management Plans that the Project has supported have included CC criteria, establish a legal precedent at the PA level to address the CC impacts, and may be subject to replication in other PAs.

The Project promoted the PACC as a regional planning instrument that crossed the polygons of the 17 PAs of the Project, impacting areas of influence through a strategic connectivity approach with cCC criteria. The PACC instrument gives way to a management of the territory with a focus on landscape that promoted the resilience to the CC as a model of territorial management at the complex level. It includes inter-institutional coordination with productive sectors, business and local communities. The interviewees agree that it was an innovative model of the project that promotes concrete actions of measures adaptation to CC towards the resilience of ecosystems and communities (including elements of vulnerability and risks).

The anecdotal evidence collected during this evaluation with the resident population identifies the term CC to some problems that they themselves have been experiencing and the terms of adaptation and resilience to the changes that are made to face CC. The nexus that exists between CC and the reduction of plants and animals, the low availability of water has been clarified during the implementation, and the adjustments to their production models (crafts, livestock and agriculture) to make their livelihoods compatible with the services rendered by ecosystems. Therefore, the project has provided the inhabitants, men and women, of the 17 PAs with a greater understanding of their relationship with natural resources and their activities, promoting CC adaptation activities, reducing vulnerability to ecosystems and their productive activities.

3.3.8. Coverage & targeting

As described in the PRODOC, 17 PAs have been selected from the 174 that existed at the beginning of the Project. The slection has been done through a prioritization system based on the ecoregional distribution of protected natural areas, elaborated with spatial data collected in the country's PAs, in terms of vulnerability drivers (eg biodiversity, human development, hurricanes, fires, etc.) and other characteristics (biodiversity, topography, etc.). The shortlisted PAs have been weighted in terms of connectivity, operation and other sources of financing. The 17 PAs have, then, been managed as ecoregional landscape/seascape units. This geographic coverage has remained unchanged throughout the implementation period.

In fact, the data collected in this exercise allows this system to be fully replicable, as well as easy to update for use in further decision-making. The Project with these 17 PAs has had the opportunity to provide experiences in different contexts with specific characteristics, which represent good practices to guide their replication in other PAs.

The increase in coverage with the decree of new ANP has obviously protected the natural wealth in BD in the country. The work to increase biological connectivity from within the PAs to their areas of influence, i.e. the ecosystem-based adaptation approach, with the inclusion of new territories under the ADVC scheme, has been the CONANP strategy. This strategy has seen the communities, the ejidatarios and local owners incorporate their lands into a voluntary management program for CC adaptation to CC for both productive and BD conservation purposes.

Apart from CONANP, which represents the main beneficiary institution, thanks to the ecosystem-based adaptation approach and the participatory process, the Project has benefited a wide range of very broad sectors in the different complexes: communities, ejidatarios, producers, tourism sector, CSOs, universities, research centers, state and municipal institutions. The evaluation highlights that the Project has pushed for a reduction of the gender gap,

allowing women to participate actively in the decision-making spaces reinforced by the Project, such as the workshops and working groups for the formulation of the PACC incorporating the participation of women in the Advisory Councils of the ANP.

3.3.9. Participation

The Project has been implemented in a very participatory way only at the PA level. With a difference between the different PAs, the process has involved a very high number of actors belonging to different areas of importance for the effective management of the PA mentioned above, communities, productive sectors (cattle ranchers, fishermen and operators of the tourism sector), academia, research centers, state and municipal institutions, international organizations and CSOs.

The formulation of the PACC has represented the occasion in which the participation has been visualized and the collaboration framework has been created that has continued to be nurtured later. The level of participation occurred with more than 1,800 actors. Where the PACC have been carried out, their formulation has represented the ignition spark of the engine opening space for participation and consolidating the institutional work of 11 advisory councils, including the formation of sub-councils expressly dedicated to adaptation to CC.

The key messages to promote the involvement of the inhabitants and the productive sectors in the project activities and therefore guarantee their participation have been:

- Promote the nexus between CC adaptation, conservation of BD and the communities' livelihoods.
- Focusing the understanding of CC as a phenomenon is a process that involves the participation of all sectors of society.
- PAs as essential elements that preserve the capacity of the ecosystem to provide essential services to human activities.

However, the participatory process has been possible thanks to the interest shown in the initiative by the Regional and ANP Directors and the accompaniment of the Field Officers to the PACC consultants and the CSOs in charge of implementing the measure of adaptation. In fact, it has turned out to be extremely important to establish communication based on the transparency of the process to generate trust and show the willingness to consider the experiences, problems and concerns of the communities. Finally, building the process together and proposing viable and effective alternative solutions has been the element that has given credibility to the process, the element capable of generating alliances especially with productive sectors traditionally recognized as antagonistic to conservation, such as livestock. The participation process has also guaranteed the active involvement of women and youth from the communities. The PMU has ensured that in all agreements with CSOs to carry out adaptation measures and that it had gender issues among its priorities.

Finally, it is necessary to consider the different contingent situations in which they were in the different areas of the Project. It is evident that, in Chiapas, in the complex of *La Selva del Ocote* and *Cañon del Sumidero*, the project has encountered some specific conditions that allowed it to link with local actors in an exceptional way. At the federal level, the participatory process has not been carried out as planned in PRODOC. The relations of the Project with other institutions have not promoted any initiative that went beyond discussions to inform about the implementation of the Project and consequently provide feedback. Still, interest in the Project has been high as indicated by its participation in various events on the subject of protected areas and CC.

3.3.10. Scale & extension

The Project, through a consultancy, has produced the systematization of lessons learned and good practices document presented in October 2019, which supported the PMU and the DECC in documenting concrete learning.

Another success has been the documentation of the Project in a book of systematization of the experience “Resilience; Protected Natural Areas, natural solutions to global challenges ”, supported by the Project and financed and promoted by the UNDP Resident Representative. Likewise, the book was used by the exhibition of the Museum of Memory and Tolerance in Mexico City with the name “tick tock, climate change is now”, in the period from March to September 2020.

The project also carried out through consultancy the document "Systematization of lessons learned in the Incorporation of the adaptation approach based on ecosystems in the design of Adaptation Programs to Climate

Change and the contribution of their participation processes to the governance of the PAs", presented in the month of March 2020.

The project has improved the Guide for preparing the PACC of CONANP, with the inclusion of vulnerability analysis, risk analysis, focus on ecosystem-based adaptation, which is the basis for the selection of Socio-Environmental Conservation Objects (OCSA).

The four documents cited are of utmost importance to allow the process carried out by the Project to be replicated in the future in other ANPs efficiently, having clear and effective work guidelines.

The 17 PAs as pilot sites within the Project represent a diversity of ecosystems, challenges and different forms of management, which has led to differences in progress between the 17 Pas. In principle, marine areas compared to terrestrial PAs present challenges different and the population is minor or null in some marine ANP. In terrestrial ecosystems, adaptation measures make it possible to show changes in times that are much faster than in marine ones.

Within the strategies and experiences developed by the project, the PACC carried out have had a positive impact on the territory and have given way to generating knowledge and strategic alliances in the Project's PAs that can be replicated in other PAs. Such replication may also involve work done with the substantial involvement of the Advisory Councils and with the installation of CC Sub-Councils.

The implementation of CC adaptation measures, through a systemic approach, the strengthening of participation, capacity development, work with women, with rural and indigenous communities and with productive sectors, and alliances with local CSOs , have been a strategy that can be adapted and replicated in each ANP.

As already mentioned (see section 3.1.5. Repetition approach), the bet and the reason for being of the Project was to guide the efforts of resilience to climate change in the PAs not only during its term but also after closure. This bet has been won by the Project because the political, institutional and technical tools and the systematization of lessons learned clearly show a way forward.

4. Conclusions, lessons and recommendations

4.1. Conclusions

The evaluative exercise has identified twelve conclusions:

Conclusion n° 1

From the design, the strengthening of the institutional framework, the administration and the capacities of CONANP and the piloting of adaptation measures aim at laying the foundations for the future work of the ANPs. The design aims to give the Project itself a catalytic role for CC resilience efforts through the AP system, not only during its term but also after closure. It is the bet of the Project and its reason for being.

The focus of repetition and the pioneering nature of the initiative is implicitly identified in the PRODOC. The Project has therefore served as a laboratory of experiences to compile lessons learned and good practices that serve for future actions. It is therefore required that the institutional effort be increased in different institutions of the federal government to take advantage of the learning, otherwise the Project It will lose much of its importance: this would represent both a lost opportunity for the future and, furthermore, it will not value the work done in the years of implementation of the initiative.

Conclusion n° 2

The Project has managed to mainstreaming the issue of CC resilience at different levels of the central and regional CONANP and in the ANPs involved in the implementation.

Conclusion n° 3

The great relevance of the actions and themes of the Project has constituted its own inertia, allowing the initiative to fulfill its main commitment, that is, to lay the foundations for future interventions on the issues of CC, BD conservation, vulnerability and resilience. Such inertia, added to the work of the DECC, the second PMU, the UNDP field officers and the ANP Directors, has been the driving force behind the initiative and has allowed the achievement of the most significant results.

Conclusion n° 4
UNDP and CONANP have de-facto adopted adaptive management concentrating on the most viable results, without formally adjusting the results framework included in the original PRODOC. Having changed the framework, it would have allowed to better focus the efforts towards these results and, above all, it would have identified in a formal and substantial way the limits of action that were in front of the PMU. Additionally, it would have allowed, in the reporting phase, to highlight with greater intensity the work launched and achieved by the second PMU and to communicate to the reader a sense of completeness of the achievements. Finally, it could have alleviated the sense of urgency that has marked the implementation of the second stage of implementation to recover the delays generated during the first stage.

Conclusion n° 5
The implementation of the Project has been inefficient in the first stage, while it has proven efficient and effective in its second stage. The mid-term evaluation has contributed to rethinking the management of the Project from its highest levels, and both the Steering Committee and UNDP have been able to accept the findings of such an exercise and implement, with the support of the new members of the the PMU, the necessary adjustments to direct the Project management towards the expected achievements.

The adjustments have significantly improved the monitoring and evaluation system, the financial management, and the relations between the PMU and Field Officials, the PA and regional directors of CONANP. They have allowed effective coordination and supervision of the work of the consultants with whom collaboration agreements have been made to carry out the implementation of adaptation measures to CC. In addition, training on CC-related Project topics at all relevant levels have been conducted.

It is highlighted that the inefficiency in the implementation of the Project in its first stage may also have arisen from the challenge, both conceptual and practical, that the first PMU faced, that is, the need to instrument the pioneering and complex project idea. Furthermore, the operationalization of the idea should have happened in a political-institutional setting where many changes were taking place, such as budget cuts to CONANP and changes in Commissioners, which have not encouraged the Project to be strengthened from the beginning.

Conclusion n° 6
At the PA level, the project has proven thematically relevant and relevant in the participatory approach. The participation of the actors in the PAs and their areas of influence has occurred thanks to the visualization of the CC and its impact on the livelihoods of those who live and operate in the territory. The concepts of vulnerability and resilience have made it possible to bring CC problems to a level of understanding within the reach of many sectors of the population. This type of approach, in turn, has been the entrance so that the importance of the PAs as development agents and not only as entities that maneuver their polygons in isolation could be understood at various levels.

Conclusion n° 7
The landscape approach has proven strategic both for the conservation of biodiversity and for development. Therefore, it is evident that from a sustainable development perspective, productive activities must necessarily be carried out taking into account the importance of PAs and biological corridors as essential elements for CC adaptation. Therefore, an ecosystem-based adaptation approach is key to the social and economic development of the territory. This implies going beyond the limits of the PA polygons and that CONANP, in each territory, becomes a promoter of an inter-institutional coordination work in each territory that is articulated with a landscape and participatory approach.

Conclusion n° 8
The formulation of the PACC and the Management Plans has proven to be key for the participation of all local, institutional and social actors, in order to promote joint actions for the identification of threats and risks of the CC and to have alliances established for the implementation of adaptation measures with a landscape approach.

Conclusion n° 9
Thanks to work by complex (through the ecosystem-based adaptation approach), the Project has benefited a very broad spectrum of sectors in the different complexes: communities, *ejidatarios*, producers, tourism sector, universities and research centers, state and municipal institutions allowing the positioning of the ANP as development centers.

Conclusion n° 10
In terms of sustainability, there are no technical concerns identified in the Project. Its main challenge lies in the financial sustainability derived from the constant budget reduction to the environmental sector and in particular to CONANP.

Conclusion n° 11
The theme of CC resilience opens possibilities for alliances with CSOs, state institutions and private companies. These alliances are strategic for the sustainability of the initiative is evident for two reasons: CC adaptation is an theme that can be used to raise funds both from international donors and from national and state donors. Moreover, there is a need to maintain high attention to the CC resilience so that the efforts made by the project are not diluted in the perception of the inhabitants.

Conclusion n° 12
The Project has evidenced the figure of the Field Officer as a key element for the achievement of results. Field officers were important to mainstreaming of the CC issue at the PA level. They established direct contact with the communities and various sectors at the level of complex and provided timely monitoring of actions in coordination with the Directors. The Field Officers are undoubtedly a human resource that the Project has strengthened to continue promoting the sustainability of the Project.

4.2. Lessons learned

The evaluation has identified three lessons learned of interest to CONANP and UNDP relevant to their areas of commitment and institutional work.

Lesson learned n° 1
GEF projects are projects oriented to action and to determine systemic change. They request the realization of products and the achievement of results and often include the generation of knowledge, the strengthening of capacities and the collaboration with many partners. In terms of implementation and execution, the GEF encourages broad participation from a variety of actors covering the public and private sector, communities, academia, and CSOs. Furthermore, in the context of GEF projects, the generation of knowledge is not to be understood as a merely technical and / or academic exercise, but rather as a search for practical solutions to overcome the identified barriers to determine the desired changes and can be successful pilots for replication. Due to these characteristics, the GEF are complex and ambitious projects and they imply that the partners share as soon as possible a common vision of the path towards results and a clear division of roles. As these conditions are not met, the delays and implementation problems that are generated are difficult to recover.

Lesson learned n° 2
In the Project's PAs and in their areas of influence there are available and enthusiastic actors proud to share their knowledge and to show a willingness to change to promote development that takes into account the implications of the CC. From this point, three elements of great interest to CONANP are noted.

1. Researchers experience satisfaction in landing their knowledge, often very specific and disjointed with what is happening in the communities. Development projects that aim at finding solutions to problems of both environmental and social relevance, and therefore economic, allow them to contribute something practical that has real implications in the territory in which they operate.
2. Rural and indigenous communities are proud to be able to see their traditional knowledge recognized and at the same time are willing to get capacitated and participate to promote the development of their territory. It is a mutual recognition in which the role of the communities is no longer simply that of passive recipient of grants, but also of an active entity that promotes their development in a collaborative framework among peers.
3. The productive sectors can show a willingness to change the way they manage their businesses once they better understand the possible solutions to the challenges associated with CC and the environment in general.

In all likelihood, these considerations apply to all Mexican PAs, not just those of the Project.

Lesson learned n° 3
Involving different sectors of society in decision-making processes leads to a common understanding of the problems related to CC adaptation, which due to its own characteristics requires coordinated responses. Decision-making processes must be carried out in a transparent manner, with dedicated and competent personnel, and with the aim at identifying actions that are relevant to the interests of those involved, viable and effective, capable of improving conditions in the eyes of the participants.

4.3. Recommendations

The evaluation proposes five recommendations to take into account the learning generated by the Project in the future actions of CONANP and UNDP.

Recommendation n° 1
Linked to conclusion n°1
Addressed to CONANP - Climate Change Strategies Directorate
Consolidate CC adaptation as a management element in the PAs work routine. This may represent an occasion to inform different levels of CONANP about the importance of the central themes of the Project, that is, CC, adaptation, landscape approach, jointly presenting the Project's achievements in terms of learning. It is suggested to start incorporating CC strategies in the Management Plans of each PA, which can begin to take advantage of some of the Project's learnings according to its specificities and apply them according to its availability of financial resources and capacities. It is necessary to couple the presentation of the inter-institutional platforms managed by CONABIO with a presentation of the project's achievements and suggest following up on the work developed in collaboration with CONABIO and taking advantage of the occasion to promote and publicize the use and utility of the platforms .

Recommendation n° 2
Linked to lesson learned n° 3
Addressed to UNDP
Create and adopt a project startup checklist for its future initiatives. In principle, this list should take into account everything necessary so that the Steering Committees of the projects implemented by the agency can take place without creating institutional and personal misunderstandings that end up undermining the efforts of the parties involved. To this end, it should be taken into account how to distribute the responsibilities that the project requires, reflecting at the same time the particular regulations of each institution involved and how they apply to the project, and the convergence of the expectations of the parties to the project. In short, a check-list to guide the first discussions of the Steering Committees. It is suggested that the check-list is organized in such a way that everything related to administrative, purchasing, logistics, and decision-making processes is discussed in the first meetings of the Steering Committees. In this way, it is expected that after the first meetings an alignment of understandings will emerge between all the representatives of the institutions that make up the Steering Committee of a project. It is important to note that this document could not only help reduce the possibility of misunderstandings within the committees, but also deepen and jointly analyze the challenges of implementation.

Recommendation n° 3
Linked to conclusion n°4
Addressed to UNDP and CONANP
Where relevant, do not hesitate to formalize significant changes to the GEF project Results Framework. In fact, in GEF-funded projects, partners are allowed to make substantial, albeit justified and documented, modifications to the Results Framework through decisions made by the Steering Committee. Changing the Results Framework formally pushes towards the adaptation of the implementation efforts aligning the work towards desirable and realistic objectives based on the experience accumulated during the implementation and not only on the expectations outlined in the project design phase, clearing the way of concerns about achieving results that are no longer considered relevant or feasible. In addition, a more relevant Results Framework with the real possibilities of achievement allows the writing of final reports to be more focused on success and less on justifying the reasons on the basis of non-compliance with expected results. It is evident that the two types of report promote a different degree of appreciation of the projects, the institutions in charge and the personnel employed by the people who will read them.

Recommendation n° 4
Linked to conclusions n°1, 10 y 11
Addressed to UNDP and CONANP
The United Nations General Assembly has declared March 1, 2019, the United Nations Decade for the Restoration of Ecosystems 2021-2030. The decade aims to massively expand the restoration of the degraded and destroyed environment, as a measure to combat climate change and improve food security, water supply and biodiversity. The moment is strategic. The restoration of ecosystems is essential to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, mainly those related to climate change, poverty eradication, food security, water conservation and biodiversity. It is also a pillar of international environmental conventions, such as the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and the Rio Conventions on Biodiversity, Desertification, and Climate Change. The Project has worked on many aspects

that are of interest to the United Nations Decade for the Restoration of Ecosystems 2021-2030 and has produced results and lessons of high relevance to the objectives of the decade.

Continue the collaboration looking for other funding opportunities to follow up on the Project. In particular, the ecosystem-based adaptation approach at the complex level is an interesting element for developing project proposals with international donors. The ecosystem-based adaptation approach puts the themes of the decade at the center and is aligned with the requirements of the GEF, specifically with its directives and programmatic areas for its replenishment 7. The same elements merit reflection on the possibility of applying to the Green Climate Fund (GCF), which due to the financial dimension of its projects would also imply the association with other national institutions.

Recommendation n° 5
Linked to conclusions n°1, 10 y 11
Addressed to UNDP
Publicize the GEF Small Grants Program in the PAs and complexes of the Project so that the Directors can suggest to the communities and CSOs that operate in their territory and in the areas of influence that they may bear in mind that a possibility exists to get funding to carry out adaptation measures identified in the 9 PACC formulated.

Annexes

Annex A – Rating scale

This table includes the rating scales according to the "Guidance for Conducting TerminaL Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Project".

Rating scale		
Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, m&E, I&E Execution	**Sustainability ratings:**	**Relevance ratings**

6: Highly Satisfactory (HS) The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency **5: Satisfactory (S)** There were only minor shortcomings **4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** There were moderate shortcomings **3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** The project had significant shortcomings **2. Unsatisfactory (U)** There were major shortcomings in the achievement of project objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency **1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)** The project had severe shortcomings	**1. Likely (L)** Negligible risks to sustainability **2. Moderately Likely (ML)** Moderate risks **3. Moderately Unlikely (MU)** Significant risks **4. Unlikely (U)** Severe ris	**2: Relevant (R)** **1: Not Relevant (NR)** **Impact ratings** **3: Significant (S)** **2: Mínimal (M)** **1: Neglegible (N)**

Annex B – Documents, reports and web-pages consulted

Documents and reports

- Cartas de cofinanciación de CONANP, CONAFOR, CONABIO, PNUD, GIZ; ENDESUR y FMCN

- Conservación, Restauración y Conectividad de la Biodiversidad de México ante el Cambio Global − síntesis y mensajes clave (borrador, marzo 2020)

- Documento de Proyecto (ProDoc) y relativo Marco de Resultados

- Documento Teoría de cambio de Proyecto - Diario Oficial de la Federación: 07/12/2016

  - DECRETO Área Natural Protegida, con el carácter de reserva de la biosfera, la región conocida como Sierra de Tamaulipas, localizada en los municipios de Aldama, Casas, González, Llera y Soto La Marina, en el Estado de Tamaulipas.
  - DECRETO por el que se declara Área Natural Protegida, con el carácter de reserva de la biosfera, la región conocida como Pacífico Mexicano Profundo.
  - DECRETO por el que se declara Área Natural Protegida, con el carácter de reserva de la biosfera, la región conocida como Islas del Pacífico de la Península de Baja California.
  - DECRETO por el que se declara Área Natural Protegida, con el carácter de reserva de la biosfera, la región conocida como Caribe Mexicano.

- Diagnóstico del desempeño y capacidades de Consejos Asesores en Áreas Naturales Protegidas.

- Diario Oficial de la Federación: 27/11/2017

  - DECRETO por el que se declara como área natural protegida, con el carácter de parque nacional, la región conocida como Revillagigedo, localizada en el Pacífico Mexicano.

- Estrategia de Cambio Climático desde las Áreas Naturales Protegidas: Una Convocatoria para la Resiliencia de México 2015-2020. CONANP

- Estrategia hacia 2040: una orientación para la conservación de las áreas naturales protegidas de México. Comisión Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas, Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales, México. CONANP

- Estrategia de Comunicación de Proyecto

- Evaluación de Medio Termino

- Herramienta para la Elaboración de Programas de Adaptación al Cambio Climático en Áreas Naturales Protegidas

- *GEF 5 Focal Area Strategies*

- Guía para realizar evaluaciones finales de los proyectos respaldados por el PNUD y financiados por el FMAM. PNUD. 2012

- *Integrated Work Plans* trimestrales y anual

- Ley General de Cambio Climático del 6 de junio de 2012 y su reforma publicada DOF 13-07-2018

- Ley General del Equilibrio Ecológico y la Protección al Ambiente

- Libro “Resiliencia; Áreas Naturales Protegidas, soluciones naturales a retos globales”

- *Project Implementation Report* (Años 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019 y 2020)

- Revisiones (primera y segunda) sustantivas del PRODOC.

- Programas de Adaptación al Cambio Climático

  - Complejo Mariposa Monarca
  - Complejo Reserva de la Biosfera Pantanos de Centla-Área de Protección de Flora y Fauna Laguna de Términos

- Corredor Isla Mujeres-Puerto Morelos
- Reserva de la Biosfera Tehuacán-Cuicatlán
- Cinco Áreas Naturales Protegidas del Complejo Cañón del Sumidero-Selva El Ocote

- PACC (Resúmenes Ejecutivos)
  - Reserva de la Biosfera Tehuacán-Cuicatlán
  - Corredor Isla Mujeres – Puerto Morelos
  - Complejo Cuenca Don Martín
  - Complejo Mariposa Monarca
  - Cinco Áreas Naturales Protegidas del Complejo Cañón del Sumidero – Selva del Ocote
  - Reserva de la Biosfera Pantanos de Centla – Área de Protección de Flora y Fauna Laguna de Términos
  - Reserva de la Biosfera El Vizcaíno
  - Complejo de los Parques Nacionales Sierra de San Pedro Mártir y Constitución de 1857

- Programa Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas (PNANP 2014-2018)

- Programas de Manejo
  - Programa de Manejo Parque Nacional Revillagigedo
  - Programa de Manejo Área de Protección de Flora y Fauna Laguna de Nichupté
  - Programa de Manejo Parque Nacional Costa Occidental de Isla Mujeres, Punta Cancún y Punta Nizuc
  - Documento borrador Programa de manejo del Parque Nacional San Pedro Mártir

- Programa Sectorial de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (PROMARNAT) 2019-2024

- Proyecto de documento del Programa para México (2014-2018)

- Reglamento de la Ley General del Equilibrio Ecológico y la Protección al Ambiente en Materia de Áreas Naturales Protegidas. Diario Oficial de la Federación el 30 de noviembre de 2000

- Resolución aprobada por la Asamblea General el 1marzo de 2019

- Sistema de M&E (archivo Excel)

- “Sistematización de buenas prácticas y lecciones aprendidas en la efectividad de manejo y resiliencia de las ANP”

- “Sistematización de lecciones aprendidas en la Incorporación del enfoque de adaptación basada en ecosistemas en el diseño de los Programas de Adaptación al Cambio Climático y la contribución de sus procesos participación a la gobernanza de las ANP”

Web pages

https://monitoreo.conabio.gob.mx/

https://simar.conabio.gob.mx/

https://www.wegp.unam.mx/Conabio/

https://www.gob.mx/conanp

https://www.thegef.org/

https://www.gob.mx/conabio/

https://www.gob.mx/conanp/

https://www.undp.org/

https://www.facebook.com/watch/ResilienciaAnp/

Annex C – Work Schedule – Data collection

Timeo	Type	Name	Position
Monday, August 10, 2020			
09:00-10:00	Meeting	Sofía García Gabriel Velázquez	Coordinadora Proyecto Resiliencia. PNUD Especialista en Monitoreo y Evaluación Proyecto Resiliencia. PNUD
10:00-11:00	Meeting	Andrea Zamora Adriana Rodríguez	Oficial de Campo de P.N. Cañón del Sumidero. CONANP Oficial de Campo de R.B. Selva El Ocote. CONANP
13:00-14:00	Interview	Erika Martínez	Especialista en Manejo y Conservación. Proyecto Resiliencia PNUD
14:00-15:00	Interview	Lourdes Azpeítia	Administración del Proyecto. Proyecto Resiliencia PNUD
15:00-16:00	Interview	Brenda Suárez	Especialista en Desarrollo de Capacidades. Proyecto Resiliencia PNUD
16:00-17:00	Interview	Mauricio Ochoa	Consultor
Tuesday, August 11, 2020			
13:00-14:00	Meeting	Vanessa Francisco Jorge Christian Alva	Oficial de Campo de P.N. Arrecife de Puerto Morelos. PNUD Oficial de Campo de P.N. Costa Occidental de Isla Mujeres, Punta Cancún y Punta Nizuc; A.P.F.F. Manglares de Nichupté. PNUD
14:00-15:00	Interview	Sofía García	Coordinadora Proyecto Resiliencia. PNUD
Wednesday, August 12, 2020			
09:00-10:00	Interview	Alicia López	Oficial de la Unidad de Monitoreo y Evaluación. PNUD
10:00-11:00	Interview	Edgar Gonzalez	Director de Programas y Desarrollo Sustentable. PNUD
13:00-14:00	Meeting	Genoveva Trejo Vanessa Maldonado Verónica Mendieta	Jefa de Departamento de Cooperación y Asuntos Bilaterales. Dirección de Estrategias de Cambio Climático. CONANP Coordinadora de Iniciativas de Adaptación y Mitigación al Cambio Climático. Dirección de Estrategias de Cambio Climático. CONANP Analista de Estrategias de Cambio Climático. CONANP
17:00-18:00	Interview	Gonzalo de León	Director del Parque Nacional San Pedro Mártir. CONANP
Thursday, August 13, 2020			
10:00-11:00	Meeting	Gabriel Muñoz Guillermo Sánchez	Oficial de Campo de A.P.F.F. Laguna de Términos. PNUD Oficial de Campo de R.B. Pantanos de Centla. PNUD
13:00-14:00	Interview	Cristino Villareal	Director Reserva de la Biosfera Mapimí. CONANP
14:00-15:00	Meeting	Jesús Vadillo	Oficial de Campo de R.B. Janos. PNUD

		Ricardo Olivo Samuel Mariano	Oficial de Campo de A.P.R.N. Distrito de Riego Don Martín. CONANP Oficial de Campo de R.B. Mapimí. PNUD
15:00-16:00	Meeting	Jorge Bustillos	Coordinador de Fomento a la sinergia institucional para consolidar la gestión de las áreas naturales protegidas de México. PNUD
Friday, August 14, 2020			
09:00-10:00	Meeting	Érika Casamadrid Sergio Garzón	Directora General Adjunta de Esquemas de Financiamiento Ambiental. SEMARNAT Unidad GEF/PNUD. Dirección General Adjunta de Esquemas de Financiamiento Ambiental. SEMARNAT
13:00-14:00	Interview	Abraham Villaseñor	Participante en la elaboración del PACC
14:00-15:00	Interview	Xavier Moya	Coordinador del Programa de Apoyo a la Reducción de Riesgos de Desastres en México. PNUD
15:00-16:00	Interview	Fernando Camacho	Director General de Desarrollo Institucional y Promoción. CONANP
16:00-17:00	Meeting	Alejandra Chee Ibes Dávila Elizabeth Arista	Oficial de Campo de R. B. Bahía de los Ángeles. PNUD Oficial de Campo de P.N. Sierra de San Pedro Mártir. PNUD Oficial de Campo de P.N. Revillagigedo. PNUD
17:00-18:00	Interview	Maria Elena Rodarte	Directora Regional Sierra Madre Occidental y Desierto Chihuahuense en los estados de Durango, Zacatecas y Chihuahua. CONANP
Monday, August 17, 2020			
10:00-11:00	Interview	Ignacio March	Director de Evaluación y Seguimiento. CONANP
14:00-15:00	Interview	Gabriel Velázquez	Especialista en Monitoreo y Evaluación Proyecto Resiliencia. PNUD
16:00-17:00	Interview	Alejandro González	Director Parque Nacional Revillagigedo. CONANP
Tuesday, August 18, 2020			
09:00-10:00	Interview	Oswaldo Flores	Pronatura México A.C.
10:00-11:00	Interview	Reiner Ressl Sergio Cerdeira	Director General de Geomática. CONABIO Subcoordinador de Monitoreo Marino. CONABIO
13:00-14:00	Interview	Sofía García	Coordinadora Proyecto Resiliencia. PNUD
14:00-15:00	Meeting	Mónica Franco Francisco Martínez	Representante legal de Costa Salvaje A.C. Líder de Proyecto Costa Salvaje A.C.
17:00-18:00	Meeting	Adrian Varela David Borré	Coordinador de Conservación. Pronatura Noreste A.C. Líder de Proyecto. Pronatura Noreste A.C.
Wednesday, August 19, 2020			

09:00-10:00	Interview	José Arturo Gonzalez	Subdirector, encargado de los asuntos de la dirección del PNCOIMPCPN y APFFMN. CONANP
10:00-11:00	Meeting	Patricia Koleff Tania Urquiza	Directora General de Análisis y Prioridades. CONABIO Subcoordinadora de evaluación de ecosistemas. CONABIO
13:00-14:00	Meeting	Luis Dávila Maria Luisa Hernández	Oficial de Campo de R.B. Mariposa Monarca. PNUD Oficial de Campo de R.B Tehuacán-Cuicatlán. PNUD
16:00-17:00	Meeting	Paulo Carbajal Mariana Arteaga Alejandro Betancourt	Líder del Proyecto. Foro para el Desarrollo Sustentable A.C. Seguimiento del proyecto. Foro para el Desarrollo Sustentable A.C. Técnico del proyecto Foro para el Desarrollo Sustentable A.C.
17:00-18:00	Interview	José Hernández	Director Área de Protección de Flora y Fauna Laguna de Términos. CONANP
Tuesday, August 20, 2020			
10:00-11:00	Meeting	Roberto Escalante	Director Parque Nacional Cañón del Sumidero. CONANP
13:00-14:00	Meeting	César Guerrero Mariana Espinosa	Representante legal. Terra Peninsular A.C. Técnico. Terra Peninsular A.C.
14:00-15:00	Interview	Rosalía Ávalos	Encargada del Despacho Área de Protección de flora y fauna Islas del Golfo- Baja California, Reserva de la Biosfera Bahía de los Ángeles, Canal de Ballenas y Salsipuedes Parque Nacional Archipiélago de San Lorenzo. CONANP
16:00-17:00	Interview	José Dávila Paulín	Director Área de Protección de Recursos Naturales Cuenca Alimentadora del Distrito Nacional de Riego 004 Don Martín. CONANP
Friday, August 21, 2020			
10:00-11:00	Interview	Fernando Reyes Flores	Director Reserva de la Biosfera Tehuacán - Cuicatlán. CONANP
13:00-14:00	Interview	Rafael González Franco	Consultor Menos Dos Grados Consultores Sc
16:00-17:00	Interview	Carlos Alberto Vázquez	Biodiversidad Medio Ambiente Suelo y Agua A.C. (BIOMASA A.C.)
17:00-18:00	Interview	Sebastien Proust	Coordinador Nacional del Programa de Pequeñas Donaciones. PNUD

Monday, August 24, 2020

10:00-11:00	Interview	Arturo Zaldívar	Líder del proyecto. Asesoría Técnica y Estudios Costeros Scp
13:00-14:00	Interview	Yadira Gómez	Director Regional Península de Yucatán. CONANP
14:00-15:00	Interview	Ana Luisa Figueroa	Director Regional Noroeste y Alto Golfo de California. CONANP
15:00-16:00	Interview	Edgar González	Director de Programas y Desarrollo Sustentable. PNUD
17:00-18:00	Interview	Fernando Camacho	Director General de Desarrollo Institucional y Promoción. CONANP
Tuesday, August 25, 2020			
09:00-10:00	Interview	Adolfo Vital	Director Reserva de la Biosfera Selva El Ocote. CONANP
10:00-11:00	Interview	Ismael Cruz	Coordinador del Proyecto Especies en Riesgo. PNUD
13:00-14:00	Interview	Luis Vega	Director de Concertación y Coordinación. CONANP
14:00-15:00	Interview	Gabriel Velázquez	Especialista en Monitoreo y Evaluación Proyecto Resiliencia. PNUD
15:00-16:00	Interview	Alejandra Calzada	Consultora
16:00-17:00	Interview	Valeria Petrone	Especialista en Gestión y Planeación de Estrategias de Cambio Climático
Wednesday, August 25, 2020			
9:00-10:00	Interview	Luis Cervantes	Líder. Centro Globalcad 3.0 Sl.
10:00-11:00	Interview	Érika Martínez	Especialista en Manejo y Conservación. Proyecto Resiliencia PNUD
13:00-14:00	Meeting	Michael Schmidt Julián Equihua Mariana Munguía	Directora General de Proyectos Interinstitucionales. CONABIO Experto de la Dirección General de Proyectos Interinstitucionales. CONABIO Experta de la Dirección General de Proyectos. CONABIO
14:00-15:00	Interview	Domingo de Jesús Zatarain	Director Área de Protección de Flora y Fauna Islas del Golfo-Sonora. CONANP
15:00-16:00	Interview	Enriqueta Velarde	Investigadora. Universidad Veracruzana
17:00-18:00	Interview	María del Pilar Jacobo	Directora de Estrategias de Cambio Climático. CONANP
Thursday, August 26, 2020			
10:00-11:00	Interview	Miguel Ángel García Bielma	Encargado del ADVC "Estación de Biología San José del Este". Universidad Autónoma del Carmen
13:00-14:00	Interview	Everardo Meléndez	Director Reserva de la Biosfera El Vizcaíno y Complejo Lagunar Ojo de Liebre. CONANP

14:00-15:00	Meeting	Flor Torres Eva Benavides	Líder Grupo de Ecología y Conservación de Islas A.C. Grupo de Ecología y Conservación de Islas A.C.
15:00-16:00	Interview	Simone Bauch	UNDP/GEF Panamá
16:00-17:00	Interview	Priscila Meling Alfredo Meling Esteban Meling	Ganaderos del Ejido El Bramadero. ANP Sierra de San Pedro Mártir, BC.
17:00-18:00	Meeting	Fernando Camacho María del Pilar Jacobo	Director General de Desarrollo Institucional y Promoción. CONANP Directora de Estrategias de Cambio Climático. CONANP
Friday, August 28, 2020			
09:00-10:00	Interview	Mauricio Escalante	Asesor del Programa de Apoyo a la Reducción de Riesgos de Desastres en México. PNUD
10:00-11:00	Interview	Brenda Suárez	Especialista en Desarrollo de Capacidades, Proyecto Resiliencia. PNUD
13:00-14:00	Interview	Sofía García	Coordinadora Proyecto Resiliencia. PNUD
14:00-15:00	Interview	Emilio Michel Morfín	Investigador. Universidad de Guadalajara. Miembro del Grupo de Trabajo para la Evaluación Rápida de Vulnerabilidad, ex Presidente del Consejo Asesor y parte del Subconsejo de Investigación.
15:00-16:00	Interview	Pedro Sánchez Montero	Director de Áreas Naturales y Vida Silvestre. Secretaría de Medio Ambiente e Historia Natural del Estado de Chiapas
17:00-18:00	Interview	Adrián Méndez	Director Regional de la Frontera Sur, Istmo y Pacífico Sur. CONANP
Monday, August 31, 2020			
14:00-15:00	Interview	Benigno Gómez	Investigador. ECOSUR
15:00-16:00	Interview	Luz Guerrero Hipólito	Representante Sub consejo Productivo, Consejo Asesor e integrante del grupo de herbolaria Yeje Z´ana. Comunidad Crescencio Morales. Municipio de Zitácuaro, Michoacán.
Tuesday, September 1, 2020			
10:00-11:00	Interview	Juan Carlos Franco Guillen	Director. CECROPIA Soluciones Locales a Retos Globales AC
13:00-14:00	Interview	Erika Martínez	Especialista en Manejo y Conservación. Proyecto Resiliencia. PNUD
14:00-15:00	Interview	Alejandro Perez	Representante Comunitario GTPACC. Comunidad de Crescencio Morales, Municipio de Zitácuaro, Michoacán.
16:00-17:00	Interview	Felipe Martínez Meza	Director Reserva de la Biosfera Mariposa Monarca. CONANP
18:00-19:00	Interview	Limberg Alegría López	Comisariado Ejidal Triunfo Agrarista, líder comunitario y grupo de ganadería silvopastoril. Chiapas

Wednesday, September 2, 2020			
10:00-11:00	Interview	Sergio Arizpe	Participante local en el proyecto de conservación del murciélago magueyero y mariposa monarca. Desarrollo Ecológico Las Gallas, SPR
14:00-15:00	Interview	Claudia Padilla Souza	Participante GTPACC.
15:00-16:00	Meeting (Technical)	Sofía García Gabriel Velázquez	Coordinadora Proyecto Resiliencia. PNUD Especialista en Monitoreo y Evaluación Proyecto Resiliencia. PNUD
17:00-18:00	Interview	Gloria Cuevas	Dirección de Adaptación al Cambio Climático. SEMARNAT
Thursday, September 3, 2020			
09:00-10:00	Interview	Celia Piguerón	Directora *The Nature Conservancy*
13:00-14:00	Interview	Christian Portillo	Líder de Proyecto, Participante Grupo Núcleo del PACC. Pronatura Noroeste. A.C.
Friday, September 4, 2020			
9:00-10:00	Interview	María del Carmen García	Director Parque Nacional Arrecifes de Puerto Morelos. CONANP
13:00-14:00	Meeting	Fernando Camacho María del Pilar Jacobo	Director General de Desarrollo Institucional y Promoción CONANP Directora de Estrategias de Cambio Climático. CONANP
15:00-16:00	Interview	Luis Alonso Avalos	Líder de Responsabilidad Social y Asuntos Comunitarios. Empresa Regal Springs
17:00-18:00	Interview	Alberto Varela Camberos	Beneficiario. ADVC Rancho El Quemado, Municipio de Casas Grandes, Chihuahua
Thursday, September 10, 2020			
15:00-17:00	Meeting Presentación Hallazgos preliminares	Edgar González Sofía García Gabriel Velázquez Erika Martínez Alicia López Brenda Suarez Luis Mejía Alejandra Cerna	Director de Programas y Desarrollo Sustentable. PNUD Coordinadora Proyecto Resiliencia. PNUD Especialista en Monitoreo y Evaluación Proyecto Resiliencia. PNUD Especialista en Manejo y Conservación. Proyecto Resiliencia PNUD Oficial de la Unidad de Monitoreo y Evaluación. PNUD Especialista en Desarrollo de Capacidades. Proyecto Resiliencia PNUD Especialista de Planeación Estratégica, Monitoreo y Evaluación – PNUD Asociada del Programa de Medio Ambiente, Energía y Resiliencia – PNUD

		Lourdes Azpeitia	Administradora General Proyecto Resiliencia – PNUD
		Fernando Camacho	Director General de Desarrollo Institucional y Promoción CONANP
		María del Pilar Jacobo	Directora de Estrategias de Cambio Climático. CONANP
		Genoveva Trejo	Jefa de Departamento de Cooperación y Asuntos Bilaterales. Dirección de Estrategias de Cambio Climático. CONANP
		Vanessa Maldonado	Coordinadora de Iniciativas de Adaptación y Mitigación al Cambio Climático. Dirección de Estrategias de Cambio Climático. CONANP
		Verónica Mendieta	Analista de Estrategias de Cambio Climático. CONANP

Annex D – Protected Areas targeted by the Project

1. R.B. Archipiélago de Revillagigedo
2. R.B. Mariposa Monarca Edomex y Michoacán
3. P.N. Arrecife de Puerto Morelos, Quintana Roo
4. 4.P.N. Costa Occidental de Isla Mujeres, Punta Cancún y Punta Nizuc, Quintana Roo
5. A.P.F.F. Manglares de Nichupté, Quintana Roo
6. R.B. Pantanos de Centla, Campeche y Tabasco
7. A.P.F.F. Laguna de Términos, Campeche y Tabasco
8. P.N. Cañón del Sumidero, Chiapas 9.R.B. Selva El Ocote, Chiapas
9. P.N. Sierra de San Pedro Mártir, Baja California
10. P.N. Constitución de 1857, Baja California
11. R. B. Bahía de los Ángeles, Baja California
12. R. B. El Vizcaíno, Baja California Sur
13. A.P. F. F. Islas del Golfo de California –Sonora
14. R.B. Janos Chihuahua y Sonora
15. R.B. Mapimí, Durango, Chihuahua y Coahuila
16. A.P.R.N.C.A.D.N.R. 004 Don Martín, porción del Río Sabinas, Coahuila
17. R.B Tehuacán-Cuicatlán, Oaxaca y Puebla