

# **Mid-Term Review**

## **UNDP/GEF**

### **Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas Project**

**PIMS 4225**

**GEF ID:3997**

**Albania**

**Peter Whalley**

**October 2014**

## Contents

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Acknowledgements.....  | iii |
| Acronyms and Abbreviations.....  | iv  |
| Executive Summary.....   | v   |
| 1 Introduction .....   | 1   |
| 1.1 Purpose of the evaluation.....   | 1   |
| 1.2 Scope and methodology .....  | 1   |
| 1.3 Structure of the evaluation report.....  | 2   |
| 2 Project description and development context .....                                  | 3   |
| 2.1 Project Start and duration .....   | 3   |
| 2.2 The Project .....  | 3   |
| 2.2.1 Objectives of the project.....   | 5   |
| 2.2.2 Main Components and Outputs.....   | 5   |
| 2.2.3 Baseline indicators .....  | 5   |
| 2.2.4 Project Budget.....  | 6   |
| 2.3 Main stakeholders.....   | 6   |
| 2.4 Expected results .....   | 6   |
| 3 Findings .....   | 7   |
| 3.1 Project design.....  | 7   |
| 3.1.1 Project M&E design.....  | 7   |
| 3.1.2 Assumptions and risks.....   | 8   |
| 3.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects incorporated into the project design..... | 8   |
| 3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation.....   | 8   |
| 3.1.5 Replication approach .....   | 8   |
| 3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage .....   | 8   |
| 3.1.7 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector .....       | 8   |
| 3.1.8 Management arrangements .....  | 9   |
| 3.2 Project implementation .....   | 9   |
| 3.2.1 Adaptive management.....   | 10  |
| 3.2.2 Partnership arrangements .....   | 10  |
| 3.2.3 Feedback from the M&E activities and adaptive management .....                 | 10  |
| 3.2.4 Project Finance.....   | 11  |
| 3.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation .....  | 12  |
| 3.2.6 UNDP Implementation .....  | 12  |
| 3.2.7 Ministry of Environment Execution .....  | 12  |

|       |  |    |
|-------|--|----|
| 3.3   | Project results .....  | 13 |
| 3.3.1 | Overall results (attainment of objectives) .....   | 13 |
| 3.3.2 | Relevance .....  | 17 |
| 3.3.3 | Effectiveness .....  | 17 |
| 3.3.4 | Efficiency .....   | 18 |
| 3.3.5 | Country ownership.....   | 19 |
| 3.3.6 | Mainstreaming .....  | 19 |
| 3.3.7 | Sustainability .....   | 19 |
| 3.3.8 | Communication.....   | 21 |
| 3.3.9 | Impact .....   | 21 |
| 4     | Conclusions, Ratings, Recommendations and Lessons.....   | 22 |
| 4.1   | Overall Conclusions.....   | 22 |
| 4.2   | MTE Ratings .....  | 22 |
| 4.3   | Recommendations .....  | 23 |
| 4.3.1 | Corrective actions for the design, implementation and M&E of the project .....                     | 23 |
| 4.3.2 | Actions to follow-up or reinforce initial benefits from the project .....                          | 24 |
| 4.3.3 | Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives.....                                   | 24 |
| 4.4   | Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success ..... | 25 |
|       | Annexes.....   | 27 |
|       | Annex 1 - Mid Term Evaluation Terms of Reference .....   | 28 |
|       | Annex 2 – Documents reviewed .....   | 46 |
|       | Annex 3 - Inception Report .....   | 47 |
|       | Annex 4 – Persons Met .....  | 65 |
|       | Annex 5 - Financial data.....  | 66 |
|       | Annex 6 - Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form.....                            | 67 |

## Acknowledgements

This independent Mid-Term Evaluation has been prepared by Dr Peter Whalley. The views expressed and comments made are his own.

He would like to express his gratitude to all those who have assisted during the mission by offering their time to present their perspective on the Project's activities and performance. In particular, he would like to thank Ms Violeta Zuna (Project Manager), Mr Eno Doddiba (Project Expert) and Ms Ema Moci (Administration / Financial) from the Project Co-ordination Unit for their assistance in organising and facilitating the mid-term evaluation mission.

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

|        |   |
|--------|---|
| BD     | Biodiversity (GEF Focal Area)                                       |
| CBD    | Convention on Biodiversity  |
| CEO    | (GEF) Chief Executive Officer                                       |
| EA     | Executing Agency (MoE)  |
| EU     | European Union  |
| GEF    | Global Environment Facility   |
| ha     | Hectare   |
| IA     | Implementing Agency (UNDP)  |
| IW     | International Waters (GEF Focal Area)                               |
| M&E    | Monitoring and Evaluation   |
| MCPA   | Marine and Coastal Protected Area                                   |
| METT   | Management and Effectiveness Tracking Tool                          |
| MoE    | Ministry of Environment   |
| MoU    | Memorandum of Understanding   |
| MPA    | Marine Protected Area   |
| MTE    | Mid-Term Evaluation   |
| NGO    | Non-Governmental Organisations                                      |
| NIM    | National Implementation   |
| PA     | Protected Area  |
| PCU    | Programme Co-ordination Unit  |
| PIR    | Project Implementation Review                                       |
| ProDoc | Project Document  |
| PSC    | Project Steering Committee (Project Board)                          |
| SMART  | Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound (targets) |
| SP     | Strategic Programme (GEF)   |
| ToR    | Terms of Reference  |
| UNDP   | United Nations Development Programme                                |
| UNEP   | United Nations Environment Programme                                |
| USD    | United States Dollar  |
| WWF    | Worldwide Fund for Nature   |

## Executive Summary

|                          |   |  |   |   |
|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| <b>Project Title:</b>    | Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas Project |  |   |   |
| GEF Project ID:          | 3997  |  | <u>at endorsement</u><br><u>(thousand US\$)</u> | <u>at completion</u><br><u>(Million US\$)</u> |
| UNDP Project ID:         | PIMS 4255<br>Atlas<br>00060315<br>00075893  | GEF financing:                         | 950   | n/a   |
| Country:                 | ALBANIA   | IA/EA own:                             | 100   | n/a   |
| Region:                  | ECIS  | Government:                            | 1577.5 in kind<br>300 cash                      | n/a   |
| Focal Area:              | Biodiversity  | Other:                                 |   | n/a   |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP):  |   | Total co-financing:                    | 1,977.5   | n/a   |
| Executing Agency:        | Ministry of Environment, (MoEEFWA)  | Total Project Cost:                    | 2,927.5   | n/a   |
| Other Partners involved: | n/a   | ProDoc Signature (date project began): |   | 21/11/2010                                    |
|                          |   | (Operational) Closing Date:            | Proposed:<br>April 31, 2016                     | Actual:<br>n/a                                |

A Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the UNDP/GEF project 'Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas Project' (the UNDP/GEF project) has been undertaken, consistent with the expectations of the GEF and UNDP.

The purpose of the MTE is to enable the Project Co-ordination Unit (PCU), the Executing Agency (the Ministry of Environment) and the Implementing Agency (UNDP) to assess the progress and to take any necessary decisions on the remaining activities and time until project completion, to ensure that the project's objectives are achieved. The MTE is also an ideal opportunity to capture any key lessons learned to-date and to provide a focus for developing sustainability plans for the completed activities within the UNDP/GEF project.

The project is designed to assist the Government of Albania protect the coastal and marine ecosystems, and contribute to the national commitments to the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) and the European Union (EU) accession processes.

The overall objective of this project is: To improve the coverage and management effectiveness of Albania's marine and coastal protected areas. This objective is expected to be achieved through two planned outcomes:

- Improved bio-geographical representation of marine and coastal protected areas (MCPAs).
- Improved management arrangements for MCPAs, clarifying institutional settings and capacity building.

The evaluation was undertaken by an independent consultant and based on: i) available literature; ii) project documents; iii) website material; iv) mission to the region and, v) interviews with key stakeholders. The evaluation was undertaken in August/September 2014.

The project has been well designed and takes account of the priorities expressed by Ministry of Environment and local stakeholders. It will contribute to Albania's obligations under the CBD and will assist with the EU accession process on protected areas and marine conservation. The relevance of this project to Albania is consequentially high and the execution has been professionally undertaken. All the stakeholders referred to the interactive and responsive nature of the PCU. Their willingness to adapt the project to evolving priorities (within the overall scope of the Objective and Outcomes) is to be highlighted as examples of good practice.

Sustainability will be a challenge, as with most GEF projects. The Project recognises this and is devoting significant resources to capacity development to ensure adequacy of skilled staff and by investigating financial and institutional mechanisms to sustain the MPA administration. There is a threat to the environment of the MPA (and coastal areas) if the current military (and heavily controlled access) status of the land is changed and unregulated development encroaches (as is common in other coastal areas in Albania).

### Evaluation Rating Table

| Criterion                                     | Reviewer's Rating |
|---|-------------------|
| M&E design at entry                           | S                 |
| M&E implementation                            | S                 |
| Overall quality of M&E                        | S                 |
| Relevance                                     | HS                |
| Effectiveness                                 | HS                |
| Efficiency                                    | S                 |
| Overall Project Outcome                       | HS                |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation                | S                 |
| Quality of Execution – EA                     | S                 |
| Overall quality of implementation / execution | S                 |
| Financial Sustainability                      | ML                |
| Socio-political Sustainability                | ML                |
| Institutional Sustainability                  | ML                |
| Environmental Sustainability                  | ML                |
| Overall likelihood of sustainability          | ML                |
| <b>Overall Rating</b>                         | <b>S</b>          |

Rating of project objectives and result and M&E

- **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project had no shortcomings .
- **Satisfactory (S):** The project had minor shortcomings;
- **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project had moderate shortcomings.
- **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** The project had significant shortcomings.
- **Unsatisfactory (U)** The project had major shortcomings.
- **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project had severe shortcomings

**Note:** Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results may not be higher than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria.

Ratings on sustainability

- **Likely (L):** There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.
- **Moderately Likely (ML).** There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- **Moderately Unlikely (MU):** There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
- **Unlikely (U):** There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

## Recommendations

The MTE makes the following recommendations (all actions recommended are for consideration by the next PSC meeting unless indicated otherwise).

### Corrective actions for the design, implementation and M&E of the project

- The project's Inception phase and Report undertook a detailed and consultative review of the planned project activities and recommended some adjustments. The MTE suggests that there should be a detailed examination of indicators/targets to confirm that these are still appropriate. In particular, the MTE questions if the effort in monitoring the status of seagrasses *Posidonia Oceanica* or the medio and infralittoral communities in the region appear excessive and should be reconsidered. These should be reviewed by the **PCU** and presented to the PSC.
- The Project Steering Group meetings (Project Board) provide a beneficial forum to inform and, seek advice and approval from this supervisory body. Currently this meeting does not adopt the spend to-date or the budget for the coming year (this material is not in the formal minutes of the session). Action to be considered by **EA/PCU**.
- The project's and MoE goals for MPAs would benefit from the formation of the Inter-Sectoral Forum as proposed by the MoE and formulated in to a terms of reference prepared by the project. Such a forum (inter-ministerial and inter-sectoral) would enable the many competing ambitions for MPA areas to be openly discussed and any potential pressures to be identified and mitigated. Action to be considered by the **EA/MoE** for implementation of the ToR for the Forum.
- There is a need for a surveillance vessel to patrol the MPA that could be used for both data collection on the marine resources and to deter/detect illegal activities for use by the Rangers/Forestry Directorate (responsible for PAs). Action for the **PCU** to investigate options with the support of the **MoE**.

### Actions to follow-up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

Four issues were identified that would further enhance the impact of this project.

- To-date the project has been closely recording the planned cash co-financing from MoE and UNDP and has made an estimate of the in-kind co-financing from the ministry. It is clear that the actions of this project have been attracting other parallel project support or in-kind support from partners and a procedure should be developed by the PCU to collect and collate these additional contributions. Action for the **PCU** to consider and advise the **EA**.
- The potential risks from unregulated developments in the coastal zone present a threat to the MPA. In particular the risk from tourism pressures should be positively addressed by the project. Such work is already been addressed by the activities by other partners, but further interaction with this part of the private sector would be beneficial. Action for the **PCU** to consider and advise the **EA**.

### Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

The emphasis for the post project phase should be directed towards, for example, implementation of the management plan for the MPA, further efforts on ensuring and replication / up-scaling of the approaches developed and agreed. These actions should be considered before the last year (or earlier if possible) of the project to enable time to develop further the concepts in to a full proposal and seek resources.



## Lessons Learned

The project's interaction and involvement with its many stakeholders is generating experiences that would be beneficial to other projects, and the PCU should try to assemble these on their website prior to the completion of this GEF project. Lessons that have been identified at the MTE include:

- The use of formal 'memorandum of understanding' between the project and partner stakeholders creates a constructive reaction amongst the partners.
- All projects recognise the importance of communication with stakeholders in the sectors they are addressing, but this project, and specifically the PCU and local office, have been acknowledged by all parties involved in the MTE as 'listening to the feedback'. There is a clear recognition that communication is a two-way process by the project staff.
- The project's inception phase was highly beneficial to refine the project strategy and to strengthen the linkages/involvement with both institutes and NGOs at a national and local level. This flexibility (with the constraints of the approved objective and outcomes) clearly demonstrates the benefits of adaptive management approach to project execution by addressing evolving needs.
- The project (PCU, UNDP and MoE) has benefited from the use of a roster of approved consultants that was established at the start of the project, providing a flexible approach to undertaking the activities in a timely fashion.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

A Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the UNDP/GEF project 'Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas Project' (the UNDP/GEF project) has been undertaken, consistent with the expectations of the GEF and UNDP.

The purpose of the MTE is to enable the Project Co-ordination Unit (PCU), the Executing Agency (the Ministry of Environment) and the Implementing Agency (UNDP) to assess the progress and to take any necessary decisions on the remaining activities and time until project completion, to ensure that the project's objectives are achieved. The MTE is also an ideal opportunity to capture any key lessons learned to-date and to provide a focus for developing sustainability plans for the completed activities within the UNDP/GEF project.

This evaluation considers the project as a whole, including the roles and actions of the PCU, the IA (UNDP) and the EA (Ministry of Environment).

## 1.2 Scope and methodology

This Mid-Term Evaluation has been undertaken in accordance with the Terms of Reference (ToR) presented in Annex 1 of this report. The MTE used both available material for desk reviews, a mission to Tirana and the project site to prepare this evaluation report. A list of documents consulted is presented in Annex 2. In addition, the project website (<http://mcpa.iwlearn.org/>) was used to research the background and actions of the project.

The MTE was designed to address questions associated with the activities and execution arrangements of the project, and to respond to the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. The evaluation criteria were further elaborated as questions within an evaluation matrix (based on the ToR- Annex 1 of this report) and supplemented by questions to be asked of stakeholders during a mission to the site (presented in the inception report of this assignment - Annex 3).

Through the co-ordination of the PCU a mission programme was developed and implemented including:

- Meetings with PCU and UNDP
- Meetings with the Executing Agency (Ministry of Environment)
- Meetings with key stakeholders
  - Municipality of Orikumi
  - NGOs
  - Forestry Directorate, Vlora
  - Environment Directorate, Vlora
  - Fishermen Association
- Project consultants

The mission was co-ordinated by the PCU and the Project Manager and Project Expert accompanied the MTE. All formal MTE meetings were held without the PCU staff to guarantee anonymity and confidentiality if needed. A list of persons consulted is presented in Annex 4.

### 1.3 Structure of the evaluation report

This Mid-Term Evaluation report is based on the format suggested in the ToR for this assignment (Annex 1) with the following key sections:

- Section 2: Project Description
- Section 3: Findings (addressing project design, implementation and results)
- Section 4: Conclusions, recommendations and lessons.
- Annexes (including ToR for this assignment, inception report, mission programme, co-financing, etc.)

## 2 Project description and development context

### 2.1 Project Start and duration

The project started in January 2011 (following ProDoc signature in November 2010 and CEO endorsement) and is planned for completion in April 2016. The project is funded (950,000 USD) from the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area under the GEF -4 strategic Programme BD-SP2 marine PAs. The project also is expected to receive cash co-financing from the Ministry of Environment (MoE) and UNDP (300,000 and 100,000 USD respectively) and in-kind support (estimated at 1,577,500 USD) that is under the direct management, and contributing to the project's objective, of the MoE.

### 2.2 The Project

The project is designed to improve the coverage and management effectiveness of Albania's coastal areas through initiating the creation of a Marine Protected Area (MPA) supported with an agreed management plan and strategy. The region is summarised in the Project's annual reports as:

'Albania is distinguished for its rich biological and landscape diversity and exceptionally high marine biodiversity. The government has initiated several steps to conserve biodiversity and improve protected area management, however, these have not been fully addressed due to incomplete regulatory and policy framework and lack of capacities. Poor bio-geographical representation and weak institutional framework for marine PA governance and poor capacities are the two main barriers that this project proposes to address. The project will raise the management effectiveness of the marine and coastal protected areas providing effective protection to the hugely diverse ecological mosaic of habitats and biotopes that comprise Albania's coastal and marine zones. Increased effectiveness of institutions and sites will result in removing pressures from unsustainable sand and gravel extraction, unregulated tourism and logging. Investing into cross-sectoral coordination and capacity building will ensure lasting impacts of biodiversity improvements achieved through the project.'

The project is designed to assist the Government of Albania protect the coastal and marine ecosystems, and contribute to the national commitments to the Convention on Biodiversity (CBD) and the European Union (EU) accession processes.

The project's pilot Marine Protected Area (MPA) is shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1 – Extent of Karaburun – Sazani MPA

### 2.2.1 Objectives of the project

The overall objective of this project is: To improve the coverage and management effectiveness of Albania's marine and coastal protected areas. This objective is expected to be achieved through two planned outcomes:

**Outcome 1:** Improved bio-geographical representation of marine and coastal protected areas (MCPAs).

**Outcome 2:** Improved management arrangements for MCPAs, clarifying institutional settings and capacity building.

### 2.2.2 Main Components and Outputs

The project components reflect the outcomes and are to be achieved through planned outputs, including:

- Output 1.1: Strategic Plan for MCPAs is incorporated in the revised National Biodiversity Strategy;
- Output 1.2: Building Karaburuni – Sazani MPA administration capacity based on legal instruments on establishing MPAs;
- Output 1.3: Buffer zones for the MPA are identified and demarcated and management actions integrated into the MPA and local development plans;
- Output 2.1: Cross-sectoral Forum on Protected Area management is created
- Output 2.2 System for joint surveillance and monitoring of the networks of MCPAs to track biodiversity impacts and management effectiveness is piloted;
- Output 2.3: Technical extension services for site managers on cost-effective management and conservation approaches;
- Output 2.4: Management and business planning demonstrated in the Karaburuni - Sazani MPA.

The two technical components are supported by a cross-cutting project management component that will execute a wide range of activities that to deliver the expected outputs, outcomes and objective of this project.

### 2.2.3 Baseline indicators

Baseline targets and indicators were established for the overall project and refined/confirmed in the Inception Report within the Project Results Framework. An Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT), used for both GEF and CBD reporting, was completed in the Project Document and is used for assessing progress and achievements in protected area developments.

The Project Document contained a detailed analysis of the baseline conditions (legal, institutional and protected areas) within Albania

### 2.2.4 Project Budget

A summary of the revised (cash) budget presented in the Project's Inception Report is given below. This budget has been used for the subsequent implementation of the project with no significant changes.

**Table 1 Cash budget approved in the Inception Phase**

|                    | GEF Grant      | Co-Finance     | Total            |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|
|                    | USD            |                |                  |
| Component 1        | 340,060        | 63,000         | 350,768          |
| Component 2        | 515,113        | 286,440        | 775,380          |
| Project Management | 94,827         | 50,560         | 223,852          |
| <b>TOTAL</b>       | <b>950,000</b> | <b>400,000</b> | <b>1,350,000</b> |

The planned co-finance contributions were from the Ministry of Environment (300,000 USD) and UNDP (100,000 USD). In addition the MoE is expected to contribute 1,577,500 USD

### 2.3 Main stakeholders

The Project Document and Project Inception Report indicates the many stakeholders that have been involved or were expected to be involved in the project activities. Primary stakeholders include the Ministry of Environment (who also acted as the Executing Agency), municipalities within the region, regional Directorates of the Environment and Agriculture, and multiple NGOs (including fishermen association). The project was designed to be inclusive of stakeholders and their interests.

### 2.4 Expected results

The main results expected from this project (by completion) includes the establishment of the first MPA in Albania together with a detailed management plan and strategy for its management and monitoring. These results will be supported by many capacity building exercises and awareness raising actions to strengthen the authorities, and the civil society organisations, to better manage and appreciate the values and benefits of this MPA.



## 3 Findings

The findings are based on a review of project documents (see Annex 2), the project web site (<http://mcpa.iwlearn.org/>) and the results of discussions held during the project evaluation mission with stakeholders (see Annex 4).

### 3.1 Project design

The project design was assisted by a previous project that assessed the gaps in both policies and capacity for the establishment and management of MPAs in Albania. The process of developing the Project Document, and the subsequent enhancements that were made in the Inception Phase, were made in co-operation with the Executing Agency (the Ministry of Environment) and other key stakeholders. This highly participatory involvement of stakeholders (and the willingness of the UNDP/PCU to incorporate comments and suggestions) was appreciated by all the stakeholders involved in the evaluation mission.

#### 3.1.1 Project M&E design

The Project Document summarises the range of planned M&E activities, are appropriate for this project. These include: Inception phase and meetings/reports, quarterly reporting to UNDP, annual reporting (risks, PIRs, METT etc.) and periodic site visits by the PCU. In addition provision is made for mid-term and terminal evaluations. However it was not possible to evaluate the budgets/cost of these M&E activities individually. A full list of the management and M&E reports made available to the MTE are presented in Annex 2.

A baseline was established for most of the indicator targets at the start of the project. There were two additional indicators that could have been added and baseline surveys conducted: the status of the marine resources and the awareness of local community members on environmental or MPA aspects. Such baselines would have provided a context for later anecdotal remarks that ‘there were more fish’ or that ‘there was improved awareness’ as a result of the project / MPA.

#### **Analysis of the Results Framework**

The project results framework presented in the Project Document is a clear representation of the expected project activities and together with the METT (and annexes) presents clear and (mostly) SMART<sup>1</sup> indicators and targets expected to be achieved. The project’s inception phase (duration – six months) led to collective agreements between the project and key stakeholders for modifications (respecting the validity of the project’s objective and outcomes). These changes were to give greater clarity and focus to the project’s activities and responded to specific requests (e.g. the establishment of a local project office in Vlora) from stakeholders. This demonstration of adaptive management was welcomed by the partners and stakeholders. The Inception Report provides a clear account of the reasoning behind the changes.

The MTE believes that a review of the indicators and targets would be beneficial to assure all stakeholders that these are still relevant or to modify/delete as required. For example, the effort in monitoring the status of seagrasses *Posidonia Oceanica* or the medio and infralittoral communities in the region appear excessive. Therefore these indicators appear require a disproportionately high level of effort to monitor progress, and do not meet the SMART criteria and could probably be reasonably deleted. The inclusion of mid-term targets in the Results Framework would have benefit the project management and this evaluation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound



### 3.1.2 Assumptions and risks

The risks to the project and mitigations strategies presented in the Project Document were reviewed during the inception phase activities. The assumptions used and the risks identified were considered to be still valid by the inception review, with an extra risk (and mitigations strategy) being added (relating to the risks associated with the first MPA administration). The MTE supports this analysis (and the periodic risk matrix updates provided to UNDP).

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

This project built on the results of a previous programme on *'Supporting Country Action on the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas'* (grant 150,000 USD and additional support from the Ministry of Environment and UNDP, together with local NGOs). This activity, *'PA gap assessment and MPA development in Albania'* generated key recommendations that were incorporated into the design of this current project. This project in addressing both the policy and knowledge bases for marine protected areas, specifically recommended modifications to the 2002 Law on Protected Areas and a Decree on the Administration of Protected Areas, and led to the development of this GEF project on Karaburun – Sazani MPA.

### 3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation

The Project Document and the Inception Report identified the many potential stakeholders and their interests and roles within the MPA and related activities. The Inception workshop included about 30 stakeholders. All those interviewed during this evaluation reported that their concerns and suggestions were well represented and actions taken by the project staff (e.g. in revising the project activities or through the inclusion of a local project office) were very responsive.

The project also included a representative cross-section of interested stakeholders (both government authorities and NGOs) on the Project Steering Committee (Project Board) to ensure their views were continuously reflected in the planned activities.

### 3.1.5 Replication approach

The project has been designed to develop a management plan for the Karaburun – Sazani MPA and to assist with developing a broader strategy for MPA management within Albania. There is an expectation that the project (with the MoE and in consultation with other stakeholders) will identify at least two further sites for MPAs within Albania and to assist the initiation of the process for their establishment. This up-scaling of the tools, training and approaches to the management of MPAs will further assist the reporting to the CBD and the current EU accession process that is underway.

### 3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage

UNDP's main comparative advantages are the experiences they have on MPA projects conducted in different locations (both within the GEF BD and IW Focal Areas) and the presence of a well-established and experienced Country Office in Tirana. The CO has developed a good working arrangement with the Ministry of Environment from previous environment projects (e.g. GEF Lake Prespa, UNDP/MoE Gap assessment on PAs, etc.).

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

The project is designed to encourage the establishment of inter-sectoral committee or forum (following the inception phase) in recognition of the multiple ministries (e.g. Agriculture, Finance, Industry, etc. in addition to the MoE) that are involved in the establishment and management of an MPA. Such a forum will be essential for the on-going administration of an MPA which inevitable will cut across the interests and responsibilities of many ministries and sectors.

The MPA Management Committee and the Project Steering Committee (Project Board) contain a broad range of stakeholders from other sectors (e.g. Municipalities with interests including Tourism, fishing associations, etc.). The project in particular recognises the importance of the Tourism sector on the MPA with a significant increase of hotels in the region and the pressures from inappropriate or lacking waste treatment facilities in the vicinity of the MPA.

The project works closely with a partner NGOs (INCA, WWF and other national NGOs) which is undertaking a parallel project on *'Support the planning, zoning and development of a Marine Protected Area in the Porto Palermo Bay, based on sound scientific and socio-economic knowledge'* (the MPA in Porto Palermo Bay is one of two MPAs that the project is helping the MoE with up-scaling the approaches developed for the current Karaburun – Sazami MPA).

### 3.1.8 Management arrangements

The GEF project is Implemented by UNDP Albania Country Office through a NIM modality. The Ministry of Environment is the Execution Agency. However, at the written request (included in the Letter of Agreement for the provision of support services) from the MoE the more administrative functions of an EA have been transferred back to UNDP. These include: recruitment and management of the PCU, procurement and recruitment of consultants/organisations. However, the UNDP / PCU are working closely and co-operating actively with the EA in these processes, for example in the approval of ToRs, review of selected appointees, etc. The EA receives periodic financial statements from the project and provides monthly statements of the co-finance contributions to the project.

A PCU consisting of a Project Manager, Project Expert and an Administrative/Financial Assistant has been established within UNDP's office in Tirana. Following the participatory inception process the EA and other stakeholders requested that the project establishes a local project office in Vlora near the pilot MPA. The local office is staffed with two part-time experts that are able to interact daily with stakeholders in the region. The local office has been established in the building of the Municipality of Orikumi (this is to be considered additional co-financing as the project does not pay for the office space or for services). All stakeholders met during the evaluation mission considered the creation of this local office, and the flexible (and adaptive management) approach by the PCU to its formation, as highly beneficial to the overall goals of the project and a significant asset in the community at raising awareness on the MPA and environment in general.

A Project Steering Committee has been established, chaired by the Project Director from the MoE and meets approximately twice per year within the pilot region. This was subsequently merged with the Management Committee of the MPA

## 3.2 Project implementation

This section describes the major elements of the project in the implementation phase relating to management, M&E and financial management.

The project undertook a detailed inception phase of about six month, which was used to consult with all key stakeholders including the MoE. This work was assisted by an international consultant and resulted in several changes to the planned outputs and the indicators / targets presented in the Project Document. All changes, together with clear explanation of the rationale for these, are presented in the Inception Report. This highly consultative process was highly appreciated by stakeholders interviewed during this evaluation mission, indicating that the PCU is aware of the need to communicate widely, and as importantly, able and willing to accept changes where possible to the

work programme from stakeholders. No changes were made at the Project Objective or Outcomes level.

The revised project results framework and budget presented in the Inception Report have not been materially changed since August 2011.

### 3.2.1 Adaptive management

The MTE supports the observations on ‘adaptive management’ included in the PIRs and the lessons identified as informative for other projects in Albania and elsewhere. In addition, the following examples were given to the MTE during the mission:

- During the Inception Phase several changes were requested to the work programme at the request of stakeholders.
  - The MoE (and other stakeholders) requested that a local project office be created to facilitate the communication with communities and local stakeholders on the benefits and operation of a MPA;
  - Output 1.1 was adjusted to fulfil the commitments of Albania to the CBD COP 10 decision on Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 -2020 and the Aichi targets. The government was committed to revise its National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and the project accommodated the change to this Output to support this CBD commitment. Support also was given to help the MoE in adapting its regulations and monitoring approaches for the MCPA.
  - Other Outputs were adjusted to accommodate changes in circumstances within Albania and to ensure clarity and ownership in the project amongst stakeholders. These changes and corresponding changes to budgets were all accomplished through open two way communications between the Project and stakeholders, and clearly documented in the Inception Report.
- The project continues to discuss and adapt the planned activities (for example, creating uniforms for Rangers) to the evolving conditions at the project site and responding to the changes in administration at central and local levels.
- The decision to organise the Project Steering Committee Meetings (Project Board) within the Municipality of Orikumi offices (at no cost to the project) benefits from the ease of attending for the many members from the local community/organisations.

### 3.2.2 Partnership arrangements

The project stakeholders are highly involved in the planning and management of the project. The Project Steering Committee (Project Board) is representative of the main groups and interests in the MPA. This meeting covers both ‘authorities’ and interested stakeholders (e.g. NGOs). The MTE mission received many positive comments from stakeholders about their involvement (and ownership) in this project. Through a parallel project involving local NGOs (including WWF, INCA and other local NGOs) the tourism sector are engaged in the work of this project to develop an operational MPA. However, the MTE considers that the potential threat from unregulated tourist developments to the MPA necessitate even greater involvement by the project with this sector.

### 3.2.3 Feedback from the M&E activities and adaptive management

The PCU is closely focused on the project results framework and the agreed indicators/targets as a means of managing the overall project. This focus enables the Project Manager to assign (subject to Project Steering Committee agreement) budgets to new / revised activities in a flexible (‘adaptive’

management) approach. Responses from the PCU to requests for changes are detailed above in section 3.2.1.

### 3.2.4 Project Finance

Prior to the start of the project, the EA (MoE) requested UNDP to perform the day-to-day administrative functions of financial management, procurement and recruitment. The PCU financial assistant maintains the ATLAS budgets and co-ordinates the GEF expenditure. In addition, the cash co-financing from both UNDP and the MoE is recorded and this is presented with an estimate of the in-kind contribution from the MoE in Annex 5, corresponding to expectations presented in the Project Document.

The overall project budget was confirmed in the Inception phase after consultations and adjustments that were confirmed at the PSC.

The current (cash) expenditure per component is shown below in Table 2. At about the mid-point of the project the overall spend is proportionate, indicating that disbursements are proceeding at an appropriate rate. Outcome 2 is expected to accelerate planned activities in the second half of the project and these are more directed towards support for the MoE.

**Table 2: Total (cash) disbursement of GEF funds by outcomes against budget to August 20, 2014 (US\$)**

|              | Budgeted<br>(Prodoc) | Budgeted<br>(Inception report) | Actual         | % (of Inception<br>Report) |
|--------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Outcome1     | 308,900              | 340,060                        | 190,162        | 56                         |
| Outcome2     | 546,100              | 515,113                        | 225,620        | 44                         |
| Outcome3     | 95,000               | 94,827                         | 53,255         | 56                         |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>950,000</b>       | <b>950,000</b>                 | <b>469,037</b> | <b>49</b>                  |

Source: UNDP-CO

The project has undergone an external independent audit where there were no reported significant issues.

### Co-financing

The project has effectively monitored the cash co-financing contributions from the MoE and the UNDP. The MoE has disbursed their expected cash co-financing in support of this project for this year. However it has not yet begun to account in detail for the 'in kind' contributions (planned 1.5 M\$) from the MoE. The project has prepared an estimate that is included in Annex 5 of the approximate in-kind contribution from the MoE (190,481 USD) In addition, the project has been successful at attracting additional in-kind co-financing from a variety of partners; again there has been no attempt at quantifying these contributions to-date and it would be beneficial to develop a mechanism to quantify these contributions as soon as possible. Additional co-financing was indicated to the MTE including:

- Municipality of Orikumi: Provision of local project office and services; meeting facilities for Project Steering Committees;
- WWF funded activities undertaken by INCA related to the MPA;
- Private sector: Tourist related organisations e.g. 'Shën Vasil' bay – restaurant), tour boat 'Teuta', supporting awareness raising of MPA with tourists;

- Rangers: The project is providing a uniform and training but the rangers are contributing their time to monitoring and reporting of illegal activities and status of the environment to the Management Committee for the MPA

### 3.2.5 Monitoring and evaluation

The project benefits from a clear M&E plan and Results Framework (with detailed indicators and targets) presented in the Project Document (explained above). These were adjusted in the Inception Phase, but has been adhered to by the PCU (as evidenced by the documents available for this evaluation – Annex 2). The M&E plan at design and during implementation are both considered **satisfactory** by this MTE.

The M&E routine monitoring and reporting are supported by an inclusive Project Steering Group (Project Board), chaired by the MoE, with representatives of many local organisations and institutes. The PSC meetings have been integrated with the Management Committee Meetings for the MPA, further aligning the work of the project with the ambitions of the MoE for the MPA. Detailed minutes of these meetings are provided as a record.

Discussions with stakeholders during this MTE have indicated that the M&E would have benefit from (if technically feasible) greater knowledge on the baseline of fish stocks within the MPA and the level of ‘awareness’ amongst the community on environmental issues. This issue came from anecdotal comments that ‘fish stocks’ were improving and that there was greater awareness as a result of this project. Both observations would have benefit from a baseline study or survey against which improvements could have been monitored.

In the spirit of openness the PSC meetings would have benefited from a presentation (and inclusion in the minutes) of the budget and spend to-date. It is understood that the PCU worked closely with the MoE on the budget and their co-finance contributions but a simple summary would enhance the ‘ownership’ and involvement of all in the project.

At an operational level the Rangers supported by the project provide a weekly report on observations and if a means to support these post-project is determined these reporting processes will serve as a beneficial addition to the MPA administration’s M&E procedures.

The project provides detailed reports to the IA/EA on a quarterly and annual basis. These include both financial reports and technical reports (quarterly, annual, PIRs etc.) that also provide an assessment of the overall implementation, results and impacts. In addition the risk logic for the project is periodically reviewed and updated annually. (See Annex 2 listing periodic project reports)

### 3.2.6 UNDP Implementation

UNDP is undertaking its role as an Implementing Agency in an effective manner. It is has also taken on some responsibilities (on request) from the Ministry of Environment (see below). The project has been independently financial audited with no significant issues raised. Stakeholders interviewed by the MTE expressed satisfaction with UNDP’s role and activities. The MTE rates UNDP implementation as **satisfactory**.

### 3.2.7 Ministry of Environment Execution

The Ministry of Environment is a key contributor and beneficiary to the project’s activities. They are acting as a the Executing Agency but have requested that UNDP provides some administrative functions (PCU, procurement, recruitment, etc.) but they maintain actively involved in these functions. The MoE provides the Project Director and the Chair of the Project Steering Committee. The PSC has been combined with the Management Committee meetings of the MPA, giving an

overall benefit to the effectiveness and the efficiency of these common meetings. The MoE is clearly facing resourcing challenges with the future requirements of EU accession process and the resourcing of the administration of the MPA, apart from the necessity to conduct other functions. Despite these challenges the active involvement of the MoE and their clear interest in the project / MPA and has disbursed their expected co-financing this year of the project. The MTE rates their role as Executing Agency as **satisfactory**.

### 3.3 Project results

#### 3.3.1 Overall results (attainment of objectives)

The PCU (together with the IA/EA and PSC) monitors the project progress towards the intended outcomes and objective, based on the achievement of activities that address the results framework indicator and targets. From the information provided (progress reports, PIRs, inception reports, etc. – see Annex 2 for the list of documents consulted) and from the discussions with stakeholders, the MTE has assessed the progress of the project towards the overall goal as **highly satisfactory**. Table 3 indicates the activities and results that are towards the agreed indicator targets. Additional information is also provided below in Table 4 against the specific results expected from this project.

The Project Document did not explicitly provide details of the results expected by the mid-term, however, the project was consider to be on target and delivering beneficial results according to the stakeholders met during the MTE. Moreover, there was great appreciation (from stakeholders) of the outputs and activities being undertaken, and the quality of these products.

**Table 3 Project Progress on Indicators and Targets.**

| Indicator   | Baseline Level   | Target Level at end project  | Level at July 2014   |
|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Project Objective: To improve coverage and management effectiveness of Albania's marine and coastal protected areas.</b> |  |  |  |
| Area under protection as Coastal and Marine PA  | 100,236 ha<br>(existing coastal protected areas - mainly coastal wetlands)         | An additional 12,570.82 ha declared as Albania's first MPA (Karaburun – Sazani)<br>An additional 3,500 ha in the process of being declared as MPAs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The first MPA (Karaburun-Sazani) declared tby a Decision of Council of Ministers no. 289 date 28 April 2010. The surface of MPA is 12,570.82 ha.</li> <li>The MoE supported to designate two other MCPA, Porto Palermo (approx. 6,100 ha) and Cape of Rodoni (approx. 27,700 ha)</li> </ul>   |
| Enabling environment for MPAs   | Weak capacities for revising MCPAs status  | At least 2 MoE experts capable for conducting revision of MCPA according the international standards.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project is developing curricula and training modules on marine biodiversity conservation and management.</li> <li>workshops have been organized involving local specialists, MCPA administration, as well as experts from the Ministry of Environment.</li> </ul>   |
| Management effectiveness of Karaburun - Sazani  | Baseline METT Score as percent of Total Possible Score is 17%                      | Target is 45-55%   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No change for MPA Karaburun Sazani for 2012.</li> <li>Adjacent coastal areas: Llogara National Park 34%; National Managed Reserve Karaburuni 19 %; Sea Landscape Narta 27 %.</li> </ul>   |
| Increased systemic, institutional and individual capacity for establishing and managing and MCPA                            | Systemic - 37%<br>Institutional - 29%<br>Individual - 38%                          | Systemic - 90%<br>Institutional - 87%<br>Individual - 95%  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In 2013, UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard for MCPA, shows an increase with 6% for institutional capacity levels (vs. two other capacity levels, systematic and individual).</li> <li>In 2014, scores as a % of Total Possible: systematic 40%, institutional 36% and individual 43%</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Outcome 1: Improved bio-geographical representation of marine and coastal protected areas (MCPA)</b>                     |  |  |  |
| Strategic Plan for Albania's MCPA   | No Strategic Plan has been developed for this sub-system of the national PA system | SPMCPA is developed and approved by the Inter-ministerial Council or the Council of Ministers  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The process of updated Strategy of Biodiversity and Action Plan is under leadership of the Ministry of Environment. The SPMCPA is being taken into consideration.</li> <li>Awareness campaign on the values and needs of CMPA</li> <li>International Environmental Days celebrated and covered through the media</li> <li>Photo exhibition from Coastal and Marine PAs</li> </ul>                           |
| Legal instrument establishing MPA at Karaburun - Sazani   | No Legal Instrument  | Legal Instrument is approved by the Council of Ministers   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The first Marine Protected Areas (Karaburun-Sazani) was declared through a Decision of Council of Ministers no. 289 date 28 April 2010.</li> <li>The law on biodiversity is revised establishing the legal frame for the EU Natura 2000 network</li> <li>Legal opinion regarding the management of the MPA (institutional, legal and financial aspects) considering the EU approximation process</li> </ul> |

| Indicator  | Baseline Level   | Target Level at end project   | Level at July 2014  |
|--|--|---|---|
| Legal Environment for MCPA management  | There are no MPAs in Albania and, therefore, no examples of a legal instrument establishing an MPA | Legal Instrument for Karaburuni-Sazani MPA is developed as a model for future MPAs  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legal expert and others have prepared analysis submitted to MoE.</li> <li>The strategic plan for MCPAs has been developed</li> <li>The park administration structure proposal and job description has been developed (still to be adopted by the MoE)</li> <li>The new government (MoE), has reviewed the law on biodiversity (approved by the Parliament) and after a legal analyses on PAs and MPAs (conducted by the project), it has concluded to proceed with the revision of the law on PAs including the MPAs.</li> </ul> |
| Adequate management of buffer zones for MPA  | No buffer zones defined  | Buffer zones and permissible activities defined   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report on marine and coastal areas buffer zone assessment is prepared.</li> </ul>  |
| Guidelines for adequate management of buffer zones in MCPA   | No buffer zones defined  | Buffer zones and permissible activities defined   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Guidelines/ recommendations on setting up buffer zones for MPAs prepared</li> </ul>  |
|  | Currently the adjacent areas have a protection status as CPAs only.                                | Technical and scientific work for realizing designation of these areas is complete, and political consultation process has been initiated | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The process of consultation has started for the additional MPAs.</li> <li>The project is assisting preparation of the strategic plan for the MCPAs.</li> <li>The designation of two additional MPAs: Porto Palermo (approx. 6,100 ha) and Cape of Rodoni (approx. 27,700 ha) is proceeding</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Outcome 2: Improved management arrangements for MCPAs based on clear institutional responsibilities and development of capacities</b> |  |   |   |
| Management boards at MCPAs   | 0  | At least 2 MCPAs have Management Boards   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MoE has established the Management Committees for all PAs as an advisory and decision support body</li> </ul>  |
| No. of agreements or MoUs on MPAs/PAs issued   | 0  | At least 2 official agreements or memorandum of cooperation/ understanding between relevant ministries/institutions                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A MoU signed between UNDP, Ministry of Environment and Orkumi Municipality (control and supervise the illegal activities)</li> <li>A MoU signed between UNDP, Ministry of Environment and Forestry Service in Vlora (to patrol the buffer zone).</li> <li>A MoU signed with the Fishery Management Organization (FMO).</li> </ul>  |
| Management effectiveness of CPAs   | Baseline METT Scores as percent of Total Possible Score to be estimated by the end of 2nd year     | Progress in METT scores assessed annually thereafter  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>METT assessments undertaken annually</li> <li>2 training sessions has been conducted in Vlora and Lezha with the PAs administrator on METT preparation.</li> <li>METTs for 9 Coastal PAs are prepared: Sea Landscape Vjose-Narte 27%; National Park Llogara 34%; Managed Reserve Karaburun 19 %; National Park Divjake – Karavasta 28%; Managed Reserve RNM Velipoje 49% ; Kune Vain Tale PA 48% ; Sea landscape Bune river Velipoje 39%; Managed Natural Reserve Shkodra lake 45%; Patok - Fushe-Kuqe PA 35%</li> </ul>         |



| Indicator   | Baseline Level  | Target Level at end project   | Level at July 2014   |
|---|---|---|--|
| Number of manuals/guidelines prepared as a resource for imparting further training          | Very limited  | 6 training modules  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training needs assessment and development training modules for MCPA personnel has been completed and the final workshop was conducted on August 2014.</li> <li>• 32 questionnaires completed by participant and assessed.</li> <li>• Study visit is conducted in 3 MPA in Croatia. 15 participants from the Ministry of Environment, National Agency for Coastal Protection, NGOs, Municipality, etc. participated</li> </ul> |
| Funding of Karaburn – Sazani MPA  | Gap to be assessed by end of 1st year   | At least 50% of funding needs are being met.  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Financial resources for the administration of Karaburun – Sazani are not yet identified – the project is working with MoE to address this issue</li> <li>• The MPA logo has been approved by the Management Committee.</li> <li>• Uniforms with logo and equipment are provided for the MPA staff and rangers.</li> </ul>   |
| Status of seagrass <i>Posidonia oceanica</i> along the Karaburun and Albanian Ionian coast* | 4-6 meadows (2837 ha) of <i>Posidonia oceanica</i> along the Ionian coast, with patches along the whole Albanian coast. | At least 5 % increase of surface in the Ionian coast  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No change observed at mid-point</li> </ul>  |
| Status of medio and infralittoral communities in Karaburun – Sazani*                        | Limited data on several populations   | Information provided, ecological state assessed and framework monitoring programme prepared | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline still to be established</li> </ul>   |

Source: Based on Project reports and input from the PCU

The lack of monitoring information /data renders these indicators not 'SMART'. The MTE recommends that these indicators should be reassessed and modified/deleted as appropriate.

### 3.3.2 Relevance

The Karaburun – Sazania Marine Protected Area, supported by this project, is the first experience of a National MPA. Albania has had a law on Protected Areas since 2002 for terrestrial sites, but this project extends the concepts to marine locations. The project is assisting with the legal and institutional reforms to assist with the extension to MPA and aiding the revision of the National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan for 2020 (for the MCPA).

The project has involved the MoE (as EA), and responds to the needs and wishes of the Municipality of Orikumi and the local fishermen through their association. The importance and relevance of this project was emphasised by all of the stakeholders that participated in this MTE.

Albania is a signatory to the CBD and this project is consistent with COP 10 decision on Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 -2020 and the Aichi targets. This project, the capacity development, awareness raising exercises and legal/policy reforms will also assist with the EU accession process. The project is aligned with the GEF Biodiversity Strategy and will also contribute beneficial experiences to the GEF International Waters Focal Area.

This MTE rates the relevance of this project as **highly satisfactory**.

### 3.3.3 Effectiveness

The project design was for 60 months which has been widely consulted on during the Inception Phase. These consultations were reflected in some changes to project outputs and indicators/targets. The project has been implemented effectively to the satisfaction of the national and local stakeholders. Overall the project is rated as **highly satisfactory** on the effectiveness.

Both technical outcomes are progressing well with slightly more activities still to be undertaken within Outcome 2 which is more directed at co-ordination/support for the MoE, and thus more dependent on their timeline.

Table 4 indicates the progress (extracted from PIRs) that the project has achieved towards the expected results.

**Table 4 Progress on Outputs**

| <b>Outcome 1: Improved bio-geographical representation of MCPAs</b> |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Output  | Description of output  | Progress (based on PIR 2013 and 2014)  |
| 1.1   | Support to revision of National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan for 2020 (For MCPAs)  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Draft SPMCPA prepared</li><li>• 2 additional MPAs are under consideration</li></ul>  |
| 1.2   | Building Karaburnuni – Sazani MPA administration capacity  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Management Committee for the MPA has been established</li><li>• MoUs between the project Ministry of Environment and local organisations on the MPA established</li><li>• Awareness raising activities initiated</li><li>• Review of legal framework and management options for MPAs completed</li></ul> |
| 1.3   | Buffer zones for the MPA are identified and demarcated, and management actions integrated into MPA and local development plans | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Roadmap on scope, financial sustainability, buffer zone designation etc. completed</li><li>• Capacity building interventions undertaken including 'train the trainer'</li></ul>  |

| <b>Outcome 2: Improved management arrangements for MCPAs based on clear institutional responsibilities and development of capacities</b> |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Output</b>  | <b>Description of output</b>   | <b>Progress (based on PIR 2013 and 2014)</b>  |
| 2.1  | Cross-Sectoral Forum on protected area management created  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MoUs with Municipalities and Forestry Services established to control and supervise illegal activities.</li> <li>• Draft ToR prepared for Ministry of Environment on Forum (this came from the interviews)</li> <li>• Corporate identity of MPA has been developed and awareness raising increased</li> <li>• Logo for the Marine Park approved by the Management Committee</li> <li>• A documentary film produced and distributed to the main stakeholders</li> </ul> |
| 2.2  | System for joint surveillance and monitoring of the network of MCPAs to track biodiversity impacts and management effectiveness is piloted | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data for METT collected</li> <li>• Synergies with the EEF/INCA project on the MPA agreed on the buffer zones</li> <li>• The conceptual model for Management Plan (including business / financial plan) has been widely discussed with all stakeholders</li> </ul>  |
| 2.3  | Technical extension services for site managers on cost-effective management and conservation approaches                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logos for Karaburun – Sazani prepared and agreed</li> <li>• Local capacities strengthened</li> <li>• MoU with Fishery Management Organisation</li> <li>• Engaging 7-8 rangers patrolling marine area and buffer zone</li> <li>• 2 national workshops with representatives from all PAs and MPAs on the application of METT methodology to estimate performance on site administrations and management of PAs.</li> </ul>   |
| 2.4  | Management and business planning demonstrated at the Karaburun – Sazani MPA  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Equipment enabling monitoring and field observations have been procured contributing to the successful establishment of the park administration</li> </ul>   |

### 3.3.4 Efficiency

The EA (MoE) requested that UNDP (as the IA) undertake key administrative functions on its behalf (specifically: the PCU, recruitment and procurement). These functions, and the process of project initiating and implementing activities, have been executed efficiently and this MTE rates the efficiency of this project as **satisfactory**.

The project was approved by the Government of Albania in November 2010, endorsed by the GEF CEO in November 2010 and approved by UNDP (effectively the start of operations) or in January 2011. The project became operational in March 2011 with the anticipated completion date of April 2016. This Medium Sized Project (MSP) receives a GEF grant of 950,000 USD from the Biodiversity Focal Area (Strategic Programme 2 – Marine Protected Areas) and is co-financed by the Ministry of Environment (300,000 USD cash and 1,577,500 in-kind) and UNDP (100,000 USD).

The project had an inception phase of about six months involving detailed consultations with stakeholders with culminated in an Inception Report and Workshop. This report reflected changes made to the project's outputs and activities to respond more to the current situation in Albania and the evolving needs of the Ministry of Environment for MPAs.

The project has been implemented with no significant delays since the inception phase and the budget utilised and as planned (effectively 50% of the budget has been disbursed by the mid-point of the project). The efficiency and effectiveness of the project (with respect to delivery of activities) was praised by many of the stakeholders met during the MTE.

### 3.3.5 Country ownership

Due to the high relevance of this project to the government of Albania (see above) and the high involvement of the Ministry of Environment and other stakeholders in the design, there is a considerable ownership of this project by the national stakeholders.

The PCU has adopted a highly participatory approach to the design and management of this project that has had a significant benefit on the level of ownership on the project and the work on the MPA. Many stakeholders interviewed for this MTE have commented that the PCU recognised the importance of communication and that this is a two way process: – in addition to the PCU's role in disseminating information about the project, issues of interest or concern raised by stakeholders were acted upon where possible by the project. Examples can be seen with the changes requested at the inception phase (formation of local office, more capacity building emphasis, etc.), the rangers uniform, etc. Frequently comments were made that indicated that stakeholders really believed they were a part of this project and that their views were valued.

This highly responsive approach (within the constraints of the project objective and outcomes) by the PCU is to be commended and should be considered as a beneficial lesson for other projects.

### 3.3.6 Mainstreaming

Climate change issues are central to this MPA and this is acknowledged in the Project Document and the activities of the project, whilst acknowledging climate change will be difficult to detect because of the lack of baseline data. The project has worked (as expected in the Project Document) to consider gender issues in general terms (for example on the Project Steering Committee) but is not specifically targeting gender concerns within project activities. The project is also, through its work with assisting the MoE with administrative and operational activities (and through capacity building) addressing environmental governance and the principles of inclusiveness of all stakeholders. By encouraging a MPA the project is assisting with protecting fish spawning grounds and improving the resources available for later fishing thus helping to alleviate poverty amongst artisanal fishermen.

### 3.3.7 Sustainability

The overall sustainability of the actions are considered by the MTE to be with **moderately likely**. As with most GEF actions the ability of countries to support the activities, post-project, are considered to be a risk. The overall sustainability is presented as an analysis of the Institutional, Political, Financial and Environmental Sustainability.

#### **Institutional Sustainability**

The MoE is the organisation that is tasked with the management responsibility for the Marine Protected Areas that are planned for creation in Albania. The operational structures (and resources) are still to be finalised and approved, but the project is assisting with reviews of options on potential mechanisms through Outcome 2. At the local level, the operational management is provided by the

Forestry Directorate (also responsible for terrestrial protected areas) and with the Environmental Directorate's. In addition, the Municipality of Orikumi is an active partner (the MPA is within its jurisdiction) and is supportive of the activities. These local authorities have insufficient resources (financial, equipment and trained personnel) to support the expectations of a MPA administration as presently configured. The project has provided significant training in the form of workshops for technical and managerial issues, and has supported delegates on study tours to Croatia and France. The project is continuing to provide capacity development and awareness raising support for the local institutions and communities. The private sector (tourism, fisheries, etc.) offer the potential, through small-scale support, to assist with the maintenance of the MPA awareness and information activities. With the willingness of all institutions to see a successful MPA implemented, the MTE rates the institutional sustainability as **moderately likely**.

### **Political Sustainability**

The Government of Albania is a signatory to the CBD and is in the process of seeking accession to the EU. This project supports obligations / expectations to both these processes and consequently the risk from political sustainability is considered low to the MPA. The political sustainability is considered assessed by the MTE as **moderately likely**.

### **Financial Sustainability**

Funds to support the administration and maintenance of the MPA post project are not yet identified or in the budget of the MoE. However discussions with MoE staff indicated that resources will be made available. In addition to further international resources (including funds that could be available to assist with the EU accession process) further work is needed by all parties (where possible supported by the project) to identify sustainable funding arrangements for the MPA (administration and maintenance). Although the financial sustainability is considered a potential risk, the sustainability is rated by the MTE as **moderately likely** as actions are being undertaken to address the financial sustainability by the MoE and the project.

Anecdotal evidence given to the MTE has indicated that there has been a significant increase in tourism and the construction of hotels in the regions and these could offer a potential local revenue stream. In addition comments made by the Forestry Directorate and Fishers Association suggested that there has been a decrease of illegal activities (e.g. fishing with explosives) within the MPA and this will lead to an increase fish stock. Potentially this may also be a means to collect resources to support the MPA. Also the Environmental Directorate based in Vlora is involved in the prosecution of illegal activities in the coastal and marine areas, and this again may be a source of an 'environmental fund' to assist the sustainability of a MPA administration.

### **Environmental Sustainability**

Climate change is acknowledged as a risk to the MPA. However a risk also exists from a potential change to the current ownership and use of the land on Karaburun – Sazani. At present these are military locations and strict restrictions are in place (and adhered to) regarding visits or approaches to the land from the sea. (These were heavily defended locations from the previous regime). Concern exists if there is a withdrawal of the military status and development of the land by 'entrepreneurs' is not closely monitored and/or restrictions enforced. Examples of unregulated tourism developments are plentiful in the city of Vlora and along the coast. Such unregulated developments on the Karaburun peninsular or Sazani Island would have serious consequences to the MPA and constitute a potential risk to the environmental sustainability. With suitable mechanisms

(institutional, political and enforcement of policies) in place, for which the project is supporting procedure developments, the MTE evaluates the sustainability as **moderately likely**.

### 3.3.8 Communication

The project is supporting a number of communication / awareness raising activities with local schools, NGOs and communities, and providing technical capacity building for the authorities involved. The project also partners with INCA (an NGO) working on zoning activities around the MPA and hasa jointly producing material for restaurants (paper table mats with maps and description of the protected areas) that help to increase awareness especially within the tourism sector. The project maintains a web site (on the GEF International Waters IW:LEARN project, which demonstrates good linkages between GEF Focal Areas) which assists in sharing information across the Focal Areas and making this information on MPAs available within the IW community of projects.

### 3.3.9 Impact

At the time of the MTE, impacts of the project's activities are already being cited by stakeholders. These anecdotal examples of impacts include:

- Increase in fish resources
- Decrease in illegal fishing, especially through the use of explosives
- Improved awareness of ecosystem concerns, fish resources, MPAs within communities
- The Director of the Environment Directorate in Vlora identified that that the capacity building training received was a benefit to 'general management' as well as the technical elements
- The presence of the Rangers (and their uniforms) provided an identity for the MPA and acted as a deterrent to illegal activities

## 4 Conclusions, Ratings, Recommendations and Lessons

### 4.1 Overall Conclusions

The project has been well designed and takes account of the priorities expressed by the Ministry of Environment and local stakeholders. It will contribute to Albania's obligations under the CBD and will assist with the EU accession process on protected areas and marine conservation. The relevance of this project to Albania is consequentially high and the execution has been professionally undertaken. All the stakeholders referred to the interactive and responsive nature of the PCU. Their willingness to adapt the project to evolving priorities (within the overall scope of the Objective and Outcomes) is to be highlighted as examples of good practice.

The project has adhered to the M&E plan presented in the Project Document and utilise the Results Framework, and particularly the indicators/targets, on a daily basis to manage the project execution. The Project Steering Committee has merged with the Management Committee overseeing the MPA and this was considered by all as beneficial and leading to improved efficiency on meetings.

Sustainability will be a challenge, as with most GEF projects. The Project recognises this and is devoting significant resources to capacity development to ensure adequacy of skilled staff and by investigating financial and institutional mechanisms to sustain the MPA administration. There is a threat to the environment of the MPA (and coastal areas) if the current military (and heavily controlled access) status of the land is changed and unregulated development encroaches (as is common in other coastal areas in Albania).

Anecdotal impacts from the project's interventions have been identified by stakeholders, and all stakeholders (including the Ministry of Environment) had positive statements about the project (and the need for this intervention), the method of execution (highly participatory) and the project staff (both the PCU based in Tirana and the local project office).

### 4.2 MTE Ratings

The ToR for this assignment (Annex 1) requested that the following criteria should be evaluated and rated. Explanation and justification is presented in Section 3.3 (Project Results).

| Criterion                                     | Reviewer's Rating |
|---|-------------------|
| M&E design at entry                           | S                 |
| M&E implementation                            | S                 |
| Overall quality of M&E                        | S                 |
| Relevance                                     | HS                |
| Effectiveness                                 | HS                |
| Efficiency                                    | S                 |
| Overall Project Outcome                       | HS                |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation                | S                 |
| Quality of Execution – EA                     | S                 |
| Overall quality of implementation / execution | S                 |
| Financial Sustainability                      | ML                |
| Socio-political Sustainability                | ML                |
| Institutional Sustainability                  | ML                |
| Environmental Sustainability                  | ML                |
| Overall likelihood of sustainability          | ML                |
| Overall Rating                                | S                 |

## Explanation of ratings

Rating of project objectives and results

- **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- **Satisfactory (S):** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- **Unsatisfactory (U):** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.
- **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Note:** Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results may not be higher than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

Ratings on sustainability

- **Likely (L):** There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.
- **Moderately Likely (ML):** There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- **Moderately Unlikely (MU):** There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
- **Unlikely (U):** There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings.

Ratings of project M&E

- **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- **Satisfactory (S):** There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- **Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- **Unsatisfactory (U):** There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.
- **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The Project had no M&E system.

All other ratings will be on the GEF six point scale (HS – HU).

## 4.3 Recommendations

All actions recommended are for consideration by the next PSC meeting unless indicated otherwise.

### 4.3.1 Corrective actions for the design, implementation and M&E of the project

- The project's Inception phase and Report undertook a detailed and consultative review of the planned project activities and recommended some adjustments. Since then there has been no significant changes to project outputs or activities. The MTE suggests that there should be a detailed examination of indicators/targets to confirm that these are still appropriate. In particular, the MTE questions if the effort in monitoring the status of seagrasses *Posidonia Oceanica* or the medio and infralittoral communities in the region appear excessive and should be reconsidered as these do not meet the 'SMART' criteria. The areas that could have been strengthened are to improve the baseline understanding of the fish resources of the MPA and the level of awareness on environment issues within the population adjacent to the MPA. These two points were raised by stakeholders who stated that there had been 'a reduction of illegal fishing activities and hence resources had increased' and 'there had been an increase in awareness' on the MPA without there being, unfortunately, any baseline for comparison. These should be considered by the **PCU** and presented to the PSC.
- The Project Steering Group meetings (Project Board) provide a beneficial forum to inform and, seek advice and approval from this supervisory body. Currently this meeting does not



adopt the spend to-date or the budget for the coming year (this material is not in the formal minutes of the session). While it is clear that this information is available to many stakeholders it would be a good practice to ensure that this information is presented and that a record is attached to the minutes of the meetings. Action to be considered by **EA/PCU**.

- The project's and MoE goals for MPAs would benefit from the formation of the Inter-Sectoral Forum as proposed by the MoE and formulated in to a terms of reference prepared by the project. Such a forum (inter-ministerial and inter-sectoral) would enable the many competing ambitions for MPA areas to be openly discussed and any potential pressures to be identified and mitigated. Action to be considered by the **EA/MoE** for implementation of the ToR for the Forum.
- There is a need for a surveillance vessel to patrol the MPA that could be used for both data collection on the marine resources and to deter/detect illegal activities for use by the Rangers/Forestry Directorate (responsible for PAs). Whilst it is unlikely that the project would have sufficient resources to procure a vessel, the PCU could assist with training. Action for the **PCU** to investigate options with the support of the **MoE**.

#### 4.3.2 Actions to follow-up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

Four issues were identified that would further enhance the impact of this project.

- To-date the project has been closely recording the planned cash co-financing from MoE and UNDP and has made an estimate of the in-kind co-financing from the ministry (Annex 5). It is clear that the actions of this project have been attracting other parallel project support (e.g. co-ordination with WWF through their local partner on the preparation of a Tourism Management Plan) or in-kind support from partners (e.g. provision of local office space / services by the Municipality of Orikumi) and a procedure should be developed by the PCU to collect and collate these additional contributions. This will help to substantiate the interest in this project and be beneficial information for the baseline of subsequent activities. Action for the **PCU** to consider and advise the **EA**.
- The potential risks from unregulated developments in the coastal zone present are a threat to the MPA. In particular the risk from tourism pressures should be positively addressed by the project. Such work is already been addressed by the activities (in partnership with the Project) by INCA, but further interaction with this part of the private sector would be beneficial. Action for the **PCU** to consider and advise the **EA**.
- The replication work to identify and initiate other MPAs and with regards to the overall National Strategy on PAs, is to be encouraged in the remaining activities of this project. Implementation focus on follow on activities and for remainder of this project (see below)

#### 4.3.3 Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives

The emphasis for the post project phase should be directed towards, for example, implementation of the management plan for the MPA, further efforts on ensuring and replication / up-scaling of the approaches developed and agreed. These actions should be considered before the last year (or earlier if possible) of the project to enable time to develop further the concepts in to a full proposal and seek resources. These include:

- The concept for MPAs and the management plans that have been developed should be evaluated through the practical management of an MPA (currently in a pilot phase with the project's support). The current site is a possible test location but there would be greater interest and it would test the applicability of the approach by demonstrating practically and

sustainably the operationalization of the Management Plan. Not only does this validate the methodology but assist with replication and meeting CBD and EU accession obligations. The practical demonstration could also obtain significant data on the marine resources in the MPA and understand the logistics required for managing an MPA. The lead on this action should be the **PCU/EA**.

- To support future up-scaling/replication of MPAs and practical implementation of an administrative structure at a national level, the current project should continue its focus on capacity building and supporting the local organisations with appreciating the requirements of the marine ecosystem. This should include the two new sites being targeted by the MoE and the project – Porto Palermo and Cape of Rodoni. The lead on this action should be the **PCU/EA**
- Whilst there are parallel projects investigating the coastal development and the MPA from a zoning perspective, it would be beneficial to further engage the tourism sector and develop joint plans for the protection of the marine and coastal ecosystem and strengthening their businesses. This would assist to ensure a sustainable and reduced environmentally impacting business sector. Such activities should consider the activities that could be undertaken to reduce the impact on the MPAs, for example wastewater collection and treatment facilities, solid waste collection and disposal, agriculture (i.e. addressing land-based activities) and ensuring awareness raising and involvement with both the visitors and the tourism businesses. The lead on this action should be the **PCU/EA**

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

The project's interaction and involvement with its many stakeholders is generating experiences that would be beneficial to other projects, and the PCU should try to assemble these on their website prior to the completion of this GEF project. Lessons that have been identified at the MTE include:

- The use of formal 'memorandum of understanding' (MoUs) between the project and partner stakeholders creates a constructive reaction amongst the partners. This engenders an ownership and formalises involvement with the project's activities and goals.
- All project's recognise the importance of communication with stakeholders in the sectors they are addressing, but this project, and specifically the PCU and local office, have been acknowledged by all parties involved in the MTE as 'listening to the feedback'. There is a clear recognition that communication is a two-way process by the project staff, and this communication is noted (by stakeholders) as almost a daily contact. This again reinforces the sentiments of ownership and involvement by the stakeholders in the project's activities, which is likely to encourage the delivery of the results and assist the sustainability post project.
- The project's inception phase was highly beneficial to refine the project strategy and to strengthen the linkages/involvement with both institutes and NGOs at a national and local level. Again this highly interactive consultative process (and responding to the feedback) undertaken by the PCU is highly beneficial to the overall project which can be seen in the lack of a need to revise the work programme and results framework subsequently. This flexibility (with the constraints of the approved objective and outcomes) clearly demonstrates the benefits of adaptive management approach to project execution by addressing evolving needs. The result of the discussions and revisions is a project that is well suited to the political and institutional environment in Albania.

- The project (PCU, UNDP and MoE) has benefited from the use of a roster of approved consultants that was established at the start of the project. This has enabled activities to be executed and consultants appointed in a more reactive manner to evolving priorities.

## Annexes

Annex 1 – ToR for this assignment

Annex 2 – Documents reviewed for the MTE

Annex 3 - MTE Inception Report (containing mission programme, evaluation matrix, etc.)

Annex 4 – Persons met

Annex 5 - Co-financing table

Annex6 – Signed Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

## Annex 1 - Mid Term Evaluation Terms of Reference

### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a Mid Term evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) of the project entitled:

*“Improving Coverage and Effectiveness Management of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas Project (PIMS 4255)”*

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

### Project Summary Table

|                          |  |  |   |   |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Project Title:           |  |  |   |   |
| GEF Project ID:          | 3997                                       |  | <u>at endorsement</u><br><u>(thousand US\$)</u> | <u>at completion</u><br><u>(Million US\$)</u> |
| UNDP Project ID:         | PIMS 4255<br>Atlas<br>00060315<br>00075893 | GEF financing:                         | 950   | n/a   |
| Country:                 | ALBANIA                                    | IA/EA own:                             | 100   | n/a   |
| Region:                  | ECIS                                       | Government:                            | 1577.5 in kind<br>300 cash                      | n/a   |
| Focal Area:              | Biodiversity                               | Other:                                 |   | n/a   |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP):  |  | Total co-financing:                    | 1,977.5   | n/a   |
| Executing Agency:        | Ministry of Environment, (MoEEFWA)         | Total Project Cost:                    | 2,927.5   | n/a   |
| Other Partners involved: | n/a  | ProDoc Signature (date project began): |   | 21/11/2010                                    |
|                          |  | (Operational) Closing Date:            | Proposed:<br>April 31,2016                      | Actual:<br>n/a                                |

### Objective and Scope

*(provide a project summary including project goal and outcomes. Also, in cases where the GEF funded project forms part of a larger programme, specify if the TE is to cover the entire programme or only the GEF component).*

The long term goal to which the project will contribute is securing the protection of Albania’s unique coastal and marine biodiversity for current and future generations. The immediate objective is to improve the coverage and management effectiveness of Albania’s network of marine and coastal protected areas as an essential complement to its network of terrestrial PAs .

The project objective will be achieved through two outcomes:

Improved bio-geographical representation of marine and coastal protected areas (MCPA)

Improved management arrangements for MCPAs, clarifying institutional settings and capacity building.

The immediate global biodiversity benefits include expanded protection coverage (by at least 13,000 ha) for unique marine, lagoon, wetland, and cape habitats hosting critically endangered, threatened and near-threatened species such as Loggerhead and Leatherback turtles, Mediterranean seal, Dalmatian pelican, threatened birds-of-prey and fish species, corals, sponges, sea-grasses and other important habitats and species.

Albania is committed to the CBD's Programme of Work on Protected Areas, which has the objective of supporting the establishment and maintenance of comprehensive, effectively managed, and ecologically representative national and regional marine protected areas by 2012. To realize this target, it is critical that the above identified barriers to establishing a representative and effectively managed network of marine and coastal PAs are removed.

The project is fully aligned with the priorities of the National Biodiversity Conservation Strategy and Action Plan (BSAP), which put priority on establishing marine protected areas to conserve the unique marine biodiversity of Albania. The Albanian Government intends to double the PA surface and expand the MPA coverage, ensuring better biogeographical representation, as well as higher management effectiveness, and diversification of revenue sources. Thus, project outcomes will feed into the MEFWA policies aimed at the expansion and improvement of the network of MPAs.

The MTE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

### **Evaluation approach and method**

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

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to target *locations ii.e* Vlorë region, including the following project sites: Karaburun-Sazani, Porto Palermo and Cape of Stillo; Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Orikumi municipality, OMP, Department of forestry service, and other local NGOs.

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

### **Evaluation Criteria & Ratings**

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

---

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

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

### Project finance / co-finance

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

| Co-financing<br>(type/source) | UNDP own financing<br>(mill. US\$) |        | Government<br>(mill. US\$) |        | Partner Agency<br>(mill. US\$) |        | Total<br>(mill. US\$) |        |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|
|                               | Planned                            | Actual | Planned                    | Actual | Planned                        | Actual | Actual                | Actual |
| Grants                        | 100                                |        | 300                        |        |                                |        |                       |        |
| Loans/Concessions             |                                    |        |                            |        |                                |        |                       |        |
| • In-kind support             |                                    |        |                            |        |                                |        |                       |        |
| • Other                       |                                    |        | 1,577,500                  |        |                                |        |                       |        |
| Totals                        |                                    |        |                            |        |                                |        |                       |        |

### Mainstreaming

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

### Impact

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

### Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

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

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

### Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in *Albania*. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

### Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 13 days according to the following plan:

| Activity                | Timing | Completion Date |
|-------------------------|--------|-----------------|
| Preparation             | 2 days | 10 June 2014    |
| Evaluation Mission      | 4 days | 21 June 2014    |
| Draft Evaluation Report | 6 days | July 2014 (tbc) |
| Final Report            | 1 day  | July 2014(tbc)  |

### Evaluation deliverables

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following:

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

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

### QUALIFICATION

The Evaluation Consultant shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with GEF financed projects is an advantage. The selected evaluator should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Evaluation Consultant must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 15 years of relevant professional experience
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies;
- Technical knowledge in the targeted focal area(s)
- Successful and acknowledged experience with similar evaluations
- Excellent knowledge of English language. Excellent writing skills.

### Evaluator Ethics

The evaluation consultant will be held to the highest ethical standards and is required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

### Payment modalities and specifications



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

| %   | Milestone  |
|-----|--|
| 10% | Upon submission of the inception report  |
| 50% | Following submission and approval of the 1 <sup>st</sup> draft Mid Term evaluation report        |
| 40% | Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final Mid Term evaluation report |

**Application process**

## Annex A: Project Logical Framework

### Project Results Framework

|  |
|--|
| <b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in the CPD for Albania (2006-2010):</b> 2 - Policies developed and implemented that support the achievement of MDGs  |
| <b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b> 2.1.3 National Development plans reflect regional priorities  |
| <b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area:</b> Improve management effectiveness of Albania's marine and coastal protected areas  |
| <b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b> Strategic Objective 1 (SO-1) Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at national levels; and Strategic Priority 2: Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems  |
| <b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b> Increase in surface coverage of marine protected areas within the national protected area system that enhances marine ecosystem representation; Enhanced management effectiveness of the new MPA and existing 10 coastal PAs as measured by METT.   |
| <b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b> Increase in coverage of MPAs by at least 12,570.82 hectares; achievement of METT target scores for Karaburun MPA and for the existing 9 coastal PAs. (Note: In the PPG stage, the METT was only completed for the Karaburun MPA pilot site to determine baseline and target METT scores. During the early stages of project implementation, the METT will be applied to all 9 coastal PAs to get baselines and targets.) |

| Project Strategy  | Objectively Verifiable Indicators                           | Baseline  | Target <sup>4</sup>   | Sources of verification                               | Risks and Assumptions  |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| To improve coverage and management effectiveness of Albania's marine and coastal protected areas. | Area under protection as Coastal and Marine Protected Areas | 100,236 ha (existing coastal protected areas – mainly coastal wetlands) | An additional 12,570.82 ha <sup>5</sup> declared as Albania's first MPA (Karaburun – Sazani)<br><br>An additional 3,500 ha in the process of being declared as MPAs (Rodoni Cape-Lalzi Bay and Pagane-Kepi i Stillos) | Maps, technical reports and studies, official gazette | Continued overall institutional reform in Albania may necessitate revision of project approaches to policy- and decision-making on MCPAs |
|   | Enabling environment created for                            | Weak capacities for   | At least 2 MoE experts  |   | Insufficient financial resources raised to   |

<sup>4</sup> THE TARGET TIMEFRAME FOR ALL INDICATORS IS BY PROJECT END I.E., 2016, UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED.

<sup>5</sup> DURING THE PPG PHASE, THE GOVERNMENT OF ALBANIA WAS CLOSE TO DECLARING A MPA AT KARABURUNI-SAZANI TOTALING AN AREA OF 12,570.82 HA. THE PROJECT WILL NOT ONLY SUPPORT THE GOVERNMENT IN FINALIZING AND DECLARING THIS AREA AS PROTECTED BUT ALSO EXPAND THE AREA OF THE MPA BY AN ADDITIONAL ABOUT 3,500 HA, BRINGING THE TOTAL AREA TO 16,070.82 HA.

| Project Strategy   | Objectively Verifiable Indicators  | Baseline   | Target <sup>4</sup>   | Sources of verification  | Risks and Assumptions  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
|  | revision of the existing MCPA status, facilitated by the project   | revising MCPAs status  | capable for conducting revision of MCPA according the international standards.                |  | implement the Strategic Plan on Marine and Coastal Protected Areas   |
|  | Improvement in management effectiveness of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA measured through change in METT scores  | Baseline METT Score as percent of Total Possible Score is 17%                                      | Target is 45-55%  | METT score sheets for Karaburuni-Sazani MPA  |  |
|  | Increased Systemic, Institutional and Individual capacities for establishing and managing an MCPA system (measured by the <a href="#">UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard in Annex 5</a> ) | See <a href="#">UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard in Annex 5</a> for baseline                    | See <a href="#">UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard in Annex 5</a> for target                 | Updates to CD Scorecard by project team; findings of external evaluations                                      |  |
| Outcome 1. Improved bio-geographical representation of marine and coastal protected areas (MCPA) | Strategic Plan for Albania's Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (SPMCPA)   | No Strategic Plan has been developed for this sub-system of the national PA system                 | SPMCPA is developed and approved by the Inter-ministerial Council or the Council of Ministers | Minutes of meetings and other records of the Cross-sectoral Forum; Final Independent Evaluation of the project | Political will of the relevant Albanian authorities to support and implement the SPMCPA is sustained<br><br>Conflicts with other sectors related to socio-economic development |
|  | Legal Instrument establishing MPA at Karaburuni-Sazani (12,570.82 ha.)   | No Legal Instrument  | Legal Instrument is approved by the Council of Ministers                                      | Official gazette   |  |
|  | Legal Instrument incorporates best practice in design of such an instrument and can serve as a model for declaration of future MPAs  | There are no MPAs in Albania and, therefore, no examples of a legal instrument establishing an MPA | Legal Instrument for Karaburuni-Sazani MPA is developed as a model for future MPAs            | Mid-term and/ or Final Independent Evaluation of the project   |  |
|  | Clearly demarcated buffer zones in Karaburuni-Sazani MPA, with specific guidance on permissible activities included in the Management Plan   | No buffer zones defined  | Buffer zones and permissible activities defined   | Approved Management Plan of the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA  |  |
|  | Clearly demarcated buffer zones in existing 9 coastal PAs, with specific   | No buffer zones defined  | Buffer zones and permissible activities   | Technical reports and maps available to  |  |

| Project Strategy  | Objectively Verifiable Indicators  | Baseline   | Target <sup>4</sup>   | Sources of verification   | Risks and Assumptions  |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
|   | guidance on permissible activities for inclusion in the Management Plan                                    | No Management Plans in place.  | defined   | MEFWA   |  |
|   | Process of identification of additional MPAs at Rodoni Cape-Lalzi Bay and Pagane-Kepi i Stillos has begun. | Currently the adjacent areas have a protection status as CPAs only.  | Technical and scientific work for realizing designation of these areas is complete, and political consultation process has been initiated | Minutes of meetings of public hearings  |  |
| 2. Improved management arrangements for MCPAs based on clear institutional responsibilities and development of capacities | Management Boards at MCPAs   | 0  | At least 2 MCPAs have Management Boards   | Official decision for the establishment and structure of the Management Boards.                       | Cross-sectoral and inter-institutional dialogue can be established   |
|   | Inter-institutional agreements on management of marine and land-based threats to MCPAs                     | 0  | At least 2 official agreements or memorandum of cooperation/ understanding between relevant ministries/institutions                       | Minutes and records of the meetings of the Cross-sectoral Forum. Official agreement (MOU/Cooperation) | Political support and interest in piloting marine protected areas (with the 1 <sup>st</sup> at Karaburuni-Sazani) in Albania is maintained |
|   | Management effectiveness of existing 9 CPAs is being tracked   | Baseline METT Scores as percent of Total Possible Score to be estimated by the end of 2 <sup>nd</sup> year | Progress in METT scores assessed annually thereafter  | METT score sheets for 9 CPAs.   | Local communities are supportive of an MPA at Karaburuni-Sazani  |
|   | Number of manuals/ guidebooks prepared as a resource for imparting further training                        | Very limited   | 6 training modules  | Publication record of the manuals, Project Annual Reports   | Marine and coastal ecosystems are susceptible to climate change impacts  |
|   | Gap between funding needs of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA and available funds                                     | Gap to be assessed by end of 1 <sup>st</sup> year  | At least 50% of funding needs are being met.  | Annual financial records of the MPA   |  |
|   | Status of the seagrass <i>Posidonia oceanica</i> along Karaburuni and Albanian Ionian coast improved.      | 4-6 meadows (2837 ha) of <i>Posidonia oceanica</i> along the   | At least 5 % increase of surface in the Ionian coast  | Scientific data, technical reports, monitoring program.   |  |

| Project Strategy | Objectively Verifiable Indicators   | Baseline  | Target <sup>4</sup>   | Sources of verification                                 | Risks and Assumptions |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|-----------------------|
|                  |   | Ionian coast, with patches along the whole Albanian coast. <sup>6</sup> |   |   |                       |
|                  | State of medio and infralittoral communities in Karaburun - Sazani is improved (mainly focused on species richness and abundance of species of international concern) | Limited data on several populations                                     | Information provided, ecological state assessed and framework monitoring programme prepared | Scientific data, technical reports, monitoring program. |                       |

---

<sup>6</sup> Data from a 2008 study: Mapping of *Posidonia*, INCA (Albanian association) & GOA (Italian association)

**Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluator**

*Available with the project office and be delivered in appropriate electronic format and via internet transfer means*

- Project document
- Annual progress reports PIR
- Annual working plans
- Minutes of meetings of Project Board
- GEF management tracking tools - evaluator is supposed to give comments to the tracking tools, that should be incorporated and addressed in the final TT version.
- Draft Strategy on MCPA in Albania (including respective thematic mapping of the MCPA themes)
- Experts reports on tourism development trend in MCPA, buffers zone development, legal assessment for the MCPA management system and recommendation, socio economic profile of the targeted area of MCPA Karaburun - Sazani
- Working document /report for establishment of the MCPA administration
- Working document for setting up the cross sectorial forum
- Different awareness and training reports

## Annex C: Evaluation Questions

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

| Evaluative Criteria   | Questions   | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
|---|---|------------|---------|-------------|
| <b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b> |   |            |         |             |
|   | • Are the main challenges in establishing the MPA in Albania properly addressed   | •          | •       | •           |
|   | • What is the actual level of knowledge and information (including research and studies) about the marine biodiversity of Albania               | •          | •       | •           |
|   | • Is the Project relevant to UNCBD and GEF objectives?  | •          | •       | •           |
|   | • Is the Project relevant to UNDP objectives?   | •          | •       | •           |
|   | • Is the Project relevant to Albania's environmental objectives, policies and strategic documents?  | •          | •       | •           |
|   | • How is the Project complementary to activities of other stakeholders and donors activity in the region?                                       | •          | •       | •           |
| <b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>  |   |            |         |             |
|   | • Provide a list with the management planning and respective demonstration actions used for the targeted marine protected area?                 | •          | •       | •           |
|   | • To what extent are the outputs and activities of the project consistent with the intended project objective and goal?                         | •          | •       | •           |
|   | • What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the Project in order to improve the achievement of the Project' expected results? |            | •       | •           |
|   | • To what extent have implemented outputs produced or contributed to attaining the expected outcomes?   |            | •       | •           |
|   | • How was risk and risk mitigation being managed?   |            | •       | •           |
|   | • What lessons have been learnt for the Project to achieve its  |            | •       | •           |

|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| outcomes?   |   |   |   |
| <b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>  |   |   |   |
| • Has there been drafted a strategic document for the development of the marine biodiversity management and conservation programs in Albania for the forthcoming 10 -15 years?  | • | • | • |
| • Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?  | • | • | • |
| • Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for Project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?   | • | • | • |
| • Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and respond to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?  | • | • | • |
| • Was Project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)?   | • | • | • |
| • Was the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happening as planned?  | • | • | • |
| • Were the findings, lessons learned and recommendations shared among Project stakeholders, UNDP and GEF Staff and other relevant organizations for ongoing Project adjustment and improvement?                                       | • | • | • |
| • Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Can be considered sustainable?  | • | • | • |
| • Did the Project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the Project?   | • | • | • |
| <b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>  |   |   |   |
| • Is the actual situation of marine biodiversity conservation and management in Albana at a stage to follow and apply the elements of the Marine Strategy European Directive in the implementation of the relevant projects/programs? | • | • | • |
| • Is there enforcement and control mechanism introduced ?   | • | • | • |



|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are the key / concerned stakeholders involved to influence the management / planning of the site?</li> </ul>   | • | • | • |
| <b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>                       |   |   |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there main principles for the management of a MPA in Albania, established?</li> </ul>  | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How has the MCPA protected areas changes with the project start?</li> </ul>  | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there MCPA management implementing arrangements in place ?</li> </ul>  | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in Project design?</li> </ul>  | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there evidence that Project partners will continue their activities beyond Project support?</li> </ul>  | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are laws, policies and frameworks being addressed through the Project, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?</li> </ul> | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date?</li> </ul>              | • | • | • |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are Project activities and results being replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up?</li> </ul>   | • | • | • |

## Annex D: Rating Scales

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

## Annex E: Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

### The Evaluator:

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

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>7</sup>

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

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

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

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

Signed at *placeon date*

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

---

<sup>7</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## **Annex F: Evaluation Report Outline<sup>8</sup>**

- i.** Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii.** Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii.** Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>9</sup>)
- 1.** Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2.** Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results
- 3.** Findings  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>10</sup>)
- 3.1** Project Design / Formulation
  - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
  - Planned stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Management arrangements
- 3.2** Project Implementation
  - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
  - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

<sup>8</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

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

<sup>10</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues

### 3.3 Project Results

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

### 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

### 5. Annexes

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

**Annex G: Evaluation Report Clearance Form**

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

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

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

UNDP GEF RTA

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

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

## Annex 2 – Documents reviewed

1. Mid-term GEF Tracking Tool
2. Delegation of Authority
3. UNDP Project Document
4. Inception Report
5. Annual Plan 2012
6. Annual Plan 2013 Q2
7. Annual Plan 2013
8. Annual Plan 2014
9. Capacity Development Score Card (July 2014)
10. PIR 2013
11. PIR 2014 (draft)
12. Management Committee Minutes December 2012
13. Risk table 2012
14. Risk table 2014
15. PSC (Project Board) Meeting Minutes July 2013
16. PSC (Project Board) Meeting Minutes March 2014
17. PSC (Project Board) Meeting Minutes June 2014
18. Workplan 2012 Q3
19. Workplan 2013 Q1
20. Workplan 2013 Q2
21. Workplan 2013 Q3
22. Workplan 2013 Q4
23. Workplan 2014 Q1
24. ATLAS Overall budget
25. UNDP Combined Delivery Report (2011/2012)
26. UNDP Combined Delivery Report 2013
27. Indicator progress - 2014

## Annex 3 - Inception Report

### Mid-Term Review of:

#### UNDP/GEF

#### Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas Project (PIMS 4255)

August 2014

#### Background

A mid-term evaluation (MTE) of the Medium-Sized UNDP/GEF project '*Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protect areas*' is planned, consistent with the requirements of the GEF and UNDP, with an immediate objective as the title of this project.

The objective of this MTE is assess the criteria of *relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact* in addition to the achievements of project results and identifying lessons that will be beneficial to the stakeholders (including civil society, local, regional and national administrations, partner organisations, UNDP and the GEF).

#### The Project

The project has two main components:

- Component 1: Improving bio-geographical representation of marine and costal protected areas (MCPAs) (where three key outputs are expected); and,
- Component 2: Improved management arrangements for MCPAs, clarifying institutional settings and capacity building (where four key outputs are expected).

The project has prepared a range of technical and management reports as outputs, and has website to assist with dissemination and awareness raising.

#### Proposed Approach

The Terms of Reference (ToR) for this MTE laid out clear elements to be completed by the reviewer and these will be complied with. A total of 13 days for this assignment has been specified and this has been allocated by the MTE as follows:

- Background review in preparation to the Mission (2 days);
- Mission to selected project sites (4 days);
- Preparation of the draft MTE report and subsequent revisions leading to an accepted final report (7 days)

The mission is planned between the 26<sup>th</sup> August and 1<sup>st</sup> September 2014. (a draft programme is included in Annex 1). A debriefing will be held with the PCU staff and the UNDP in Tirana as a conclusion of the mission.

#### Information gathering

The review will be based on information gathered by:



- Desk review – including background documents (Project Documents), progress reports (PIRs, PSC minutes, technical project reports), project website, etc.
- Mission to selected project sites and to meet stakeholders (Annex 1).
- A draft evaluation matrix, provided in outline in the ToR has been adapted for this evaluation and will serve as a guide for interviews and discussion with stakeholders and in particular UNDP and the PCU (Annex 2). This matrix needs further discussion with UNDP/PCU;
- Interviews with project stakeholders/partners and the project teams will be supported with a questionnaire/interview guide (presented in Annex 2). The MTE will be guided by the PCU on the overall scope and depth of these questions to stakeholders and the appropriate means of distribution to ensure that stakeholders are given the opportunity to comment on the project's performance and related issues.

#### **Planned MTE Report**

A draft Table of Contents for the MTE report is presented in Annex 4. A draft report will be prepared within two weeks of the Mission. Finalisation will be completed within one week of comments received from UNDP/PCU.

## **Annex 1 Programme for the Mid-term Evaluation Mission**

(Prepared by the PCU)

| <b>Date</b> |                            | <b>Activities</b>   |
|-------------|----------------------------|---|
| Tuesday     | 26 <sup>th</sup><br>August | pm: Meeting with project staff. Document review (Peter Whalley)   |
| Wednesday   | 27 <sup>th</sup><br>August | am: Initial MTE team meeting<br>Meeting with UNDP Country Director and UNDP environment program analyst;<br>Meeting with Project Director / Ministry of Environment<br>am. Meeting with project consultants/ associations (INCA, RCDC, experts)<br>travel to Vlora<br>evening: arrival and welcome form local staff |
| Thursday    | 28 <sup>th</sup><br>August | am. Meeting with local staff<br>Meeting with local stakeholders / beneficiaries (PA staff, Forestry Directory, Orikum Municipality, NGOs, Fishery Associations)   |
| Friday      | 29 <sup>th</sup><br>August | am. Site visit<br>pm. Departure to Tirana. Debriefing and wrap up with project team on the way back   |
| Saturday    | 30 <sup>th</sup><br>August | Review of the mission<br>Departure  |

### **Persons to meet/ interview**

#### **UNDP / GEF**

|                      |                             |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| Yesim Oruc           | Country Director            |
| Elvita Kabashi       | Program Analyst             |
| <b>Project Staff</b> |                             |
| Violeta Zuna         | MCPA Project Manager        |
| Eno Dodbiba          | Project Expert              |
| Ema Moci             | Admin. / Finance Assistance |

#### **Project Consultants**

|                |                              |
|----------------|------------------------------|
| Zamir Dedej    | INCA NGO                     |
| Andri Vaso     | Marine biodiversity expert   |
| Sulejman Sulce | RCDC NGO                     |
| Saimir Beqiraj | Marine biologist – APAWA NGO |

#### **Ministry of Environment**

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Pellumb Abeshi                | MoE, General Director, Project Director                                |
| Odeta Cota                    | MoE, Director of Biodiversity, Chairman of MC of MCPA Sazan-Karaburuni |
| Neihat Dragoti / Elvana Ramaj | MoE. Biodiversity senior experts                                       |

#### **Local stakeholders / beneficiaries**

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
| Gezim Capoj    | Mayor of Orikumi Municipality                         |
| Nexhip Hyslako | Vice mayor, Director of env. and territorial planning |

|                       |                              |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| Mario Calus           | Director of Forestry Service |
| Rangers (7)           |                              |
| Fisherman association | Mezan Mezani – Chairman      |
| NGO                   | Simo Ribaj, Chairman of SEEP |

**Local staff**

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| Petrit Dervishi  | Local project moderator                                |
| Doreid Petoshati | Local stakeholder support and communication specialist |

## Annex 2 Draft Evaluation Matrix

(To be discussed and approved with UNDP/PCU)

| Evaluation Criteria  | Question   | Indicator  | Source   | Methodology   |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| <b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of national/regional/international authorities and the GEF Focal Area for Biodiversity?</b> |  |  |  |   |
| Is the project relevant to the GEF BD Focal Area and UNCBD?  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the project support the BD Focal Area?</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existence of clear relationship between the project objective and GEF BD Focal Area</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ProDoc</li> <li>GEF BD strategy</li> <li>CBD</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Doc analysis</li> <li>Interviews with PCU, UNDP and National Stakeholders</li> </ul>   |
| Is the project relevant to Albania environment and sustainability objectives with the establishing and maintaining MPAs?                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of Albania?</li> <li>Is the project 'country driven'?</li> <li>What is the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation?</li> <li></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree to which project supports national environmental objectives</li> <li>Degree of coherence between project and national priorities etc.</li> <li>Appreciation from national stakeholders to project design and implementation</li> <li>Level of government involvement in the design of project</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ProDoc</li> <li>National Policies, priorities and strategies</li> <li>Project partners</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analyses</li> <li>Interviews with UNDP</li> <li>Interviews with project partners and national stakeholders</li> </ul> |
| Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at local/national level?   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders?</li> <li>Has the</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project partners and stakeholders</li> <li>ProDoc</li> <li>Needs assessment</li> </ul>            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analyses</li> <li>Interviews with partners &amp; stakeholders</li> </ul>  |

| Evaluation Criteria                           | Question  | Indicator  | Source   | Methodology  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
|   | <p>implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?</li> </ul>   | <p>stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation</li> </ul>   | <p>studies</p>   |  |
| Is the project internally coherent in design? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners, structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc)?</li> <li>Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic</li> <li>Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ProDoc</li> <li>Project stakeholders</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analyses</li> <li>Interviews with partners &amp; stakeholders</li> </ul> |

| Evaluation Criteria  | Question   | Indicator   | Source   | Methodology  |
|--|--|---|--|--|
|  | project outcomes?  |   |  |  |
| How is the project relevant to other donor-supported activity?                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors?</li> <li>How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?</li> <li>Is there coordination and complementarity between donors?</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Donor representatives and documents</li> <li>ProDoc</li> </ul>                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analyses</li> <li>Interviews with partners &amp; stakeholders</li> </ul> |
| What lessons and experiences can be drawn regarding relevance for other BD projects?               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects?</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collected from MTE</li> <li>Information from PCU, UNDP and Stakeholders/ Partners</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data analyses</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Effectiveness: To what extent have/will the expected outcomes and objectives been achieved?</b> |  |   |  |  |
| Has the project been effective in moving   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the project been effective in</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(indicators from results framework)</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ProDoc</li> <li>PCU, UNDP</li> <li>Stakeholders</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analyses</li> <li>Interviews with</li> </ul>                             |

| Evaluation Criteria  | Question  | Indicator   | Source   | Methodology   |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| towards achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?                  | achieving outcomes?   |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PIR/APRs</li> <li>Tracking Tool</li> </ul>                                  | <p>project, EA and IA staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interviews with partners &amp; stakeholders</li> </ul>   |
| How is risk and risk mitigation managed?                                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed? f</li> <li>What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? f</li> <li>Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design f</li> <li>Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</li> <li>Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</li> <li></li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ProDoc</li> <li>PCU, UNDP</li> <li>Stakeholders</li> <li>PIR/APR</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analyses</li> <li>Interviews with project, UNDP (as both IA and EA)</li> <li>Interviews with partners &amp; stakeholders</li> </ul> |
| What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other BD projects? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?</li> <li>What changes</li> </ul>  |   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collected through MTE</li> </ul>                                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data analysis</li> </ul>   |

| Evaluation Criteria  | Question   | Indicator   | Source  | Methodology   |
|--|--|---|---|---|
|  | could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?  |   |   |   |
| <b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently in-line with international standards?</b> |  |   |   |   |
| Was project support provided in an efficient way?  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?</li> <li>Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?</li> <li>Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Availability and quality of financial and progress reports</li> <li>Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided</li> <li>Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures</li> <li>Planned vs. actual funds leveraged</li> <li>Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations</li> <li>Quality of results-based management reporting</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ProDoc</li> <li>UNDP</li> <li>PCU</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analyses</li> <li>Interviews with partners</li> </ul> |



| Evaluation Criteria | Question   | Indicator   | Source | Methodology |
|---------------------|--|---|--------|-------------|
|                     | <p>t and producing accurate and timely financial information ?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? f</li> <li>• Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual) f</li> <li>• Did the leveraging of funds (cofinancing ) happen as planned? f</li> <li>• Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? f</li> <li>• Was procurement</li> </ul> | <p>(progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation) f</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency</li> <li>• Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives</li> </ul> |        |             |

| Evaluation Criteria   | Question  | Indicator   | Source  | Methodology   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|   | <p>t carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? f</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How was results-based management used during project implementation?</li> </ul>  |   |   |   |
| How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported?</li> <li>• Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable? f</li> <li>• What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? f</li> <li>• Which</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners, f</li> <li>• Examples of supported partnerships f</li> <li>• Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained f</li> <li>• Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ProDoc</li> <li>• Project partners and stakeholders</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document analysis</li> <li>• Interviews</li> </ul> |

| Evaluation Criteria   | Question  | Indicator  | Source  | Methodology   |
|---|---|--|---|---|
|   | <p>methods were successful or not and why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li></li> </ul>   |  |   |   |
| Did the project efficiently utilise local capacity in implementation? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?</li> <li>Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?</li> <li>Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts</li> <li>Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ProDoc</li> <li>UNDP</li> <li>Beneficiaries</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document analysis</li> <li>Interviews</li> </ul> |
| What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other BD projects? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?</li> <li>How could the project have more</li> </ul>  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data analysis</li> </ul>                         |

| Evaluation Criteria   | Question  | Indicator | Source   | Methodology   |
|---|---|-----------|--|---|
|   | <p>efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?</li> <li>•</li> </ul>              |           |  |   |
| <b>Sustainability:</b>  |   |           |  |   |
| To what extent are/will financial, institutional, socio-economic and/or environmental risks to the long-term sustainability of the project being addressed? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the actual situation of marine biodiversity conservation and management in Albania at a stage to follow and apply the elements of the Marine Strategy European Directive in the implementation of the relevant projects/ programs?</li> <li>• Is there</li> </ul> |           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis</li> </ul> |

| Evaluation Criteria  | Question   | Indicator | Source   | Methodology   |
|--|--|-----------|--|---|
|  | <p>enforcement and control mechanism introduced?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the key / concerned stakeholders involved to influence the management / planning of the site?</li> </ul>   |           |  |   |
| <b>Impact</b>  |  |           |  |   |
| Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there main principles for the management of a MPA in Albania, established?</li> <li>• How has the MCPA protected areas changes with the project start?</li> <li>• Are there MCPA management implementing arrangements in place ?</li> <li>• Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in Project design?</li> <li>• Is there</li> </ul> |           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data collected throughout evaluation</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data analysis</li> </ul> |

| Evaluation Criteria | Question  | Indicator | Source | Methodology |
|---------------------|---|-----------|--------|-------------|
|                     | <p>evidence that Project partners will continue their activities beyond Project support?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are laws, policies and frameworks being addressed through the Project, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?</li> <li>• Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date?</li> <li>• Are Project activities and results being replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up?</li> </ul> |           |        |             |

### Annex 3: Stakeholder and demonstration project questions

#### Stakeholder Questions

|  | Question   | Response |
|--|--|----------|
|  | Respondent's name, organisation and contact details  |          |
|  | Role in the project (& which activities involved with)   |          |
|  | General impression on how the project is being implemented   |          |
|  | Key impacts of the project so-far  |          |
|  | Are there any project activities that should be modified – and if so what and why?                                       |          |
|  | Have there been any problems (including delays) in the project implementation? If so what and how have they been solved? |          |
|  | Has information about the project activities and progress reached its target audiences?                                  |          |
|  | How does the project assist countries with meeting MDG goals?  |          |
|  | How will the project's activities be supported after the project ends?   |          |
|  | What more could be done to encourage replication of the project's activities?  |          |
|  | How will you use the information from the project?   |          |
|  | What is your estimate of the success of the project (high, medium, low)  |          |
|  | Please give some examples of the important achievements and benefits of the project from your perspective                |          |

## **Annex 4          Draft Table of Contents of MTE Report**

Acknowledgements

Abbreviations

Executive Summary

### **1          Introduction and Background**

1.1      Project Context

1.2      Relevance to GEF Programmes

1.3      The Project

1.3.1   Project Activities

1.3.2   Project Budget

1.3.3   Executing Arrangements

### **2          Scope, Objective and Methods**

### **3          Project Performance and Impact**

3.1      Attainment of objectives and planned results (progress to-date)

3.1.1   Achievement of outputs and activities

3.1.2   Effectiveness

3.1.3   Relevance

3.1.4   Efficiency

3.2      Assessment of the progress towards sustainability of project outcomes

3.2.1   Financial resources

3.2.2   Socio-political sustainability

3.2.3   Institutional framework and governance

3.2.4   Environmental

3.3      Catalytic role

3.4      Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

3.4.1   M&E design

3.4.2   M&E plan implementation

3.4.3   Budgeting and funding for M&E activities

3.4.4   Long-term monitoring

3.5      Assessment of processes that affected attainment of project results

3.5.1   Preparation and readiness

3.5.2   Implementation approach and adaptive management

3.5.3   Country ownership/drivenness

3.5.4   Stakeholder involvement and public awareness

3.5.5   Financial planning and management

3.5.6   UNDP supervision and backstopping

### **4          Conclusions and Rating**

### **5          Lessons Learned**

### **6          Recommendations**

### **Annexes**

Annex 1 – Mid-Term Review Terms of Reference

Annex 2 – Mid-Term Review Mission programme



Annex 3 – List of persons met

Annex 4 – Documents reviewed

Annex 5 – Interview questionnaire/guide

Annex 6 – Summary of project expenditure and co-financing

## Annex 4 – Persons Met

|              |           |   |
|--------------|-----------|---|
|              |           |   |
| Elvita       | Kabashi   | UNDP, Programme Officer for Environment   |
| Violetta     | Zuna      | PCU / UNDP, Project Manager   |
| Eno          | Dodbiba   | PCU / UNDP, Project Expert  |
| Ema          | Moci      | PCU / UNDP, Administration and Finance Assistant  |
| Petrit       | Dervishi  | PCU Vlora, Project Moderator  |
| Doreid       | Petoshati | PCU Vlora, Local stakeholder support and communication specialist   |
| Simon        | MONCELON  | Project volunteer / the French MSc student  |
| Sulejman     | Sulce     | Professor, Research Centre for Rural Development /Consultant  |
| Nihat        | Dragoti   | Ministry of Environment/ head of the PA section   |
| Elvana       | Ramaj     | Ministry of Environment / Head of the biodiversity conservation section   |
| Silvamina    | Alshabani | Ministry of Environment / specialist  |
| Shpresa      | Harasani  | Ministry of Environment / specialist  |
| Ermal        | Halimi    | Ministry of Environment / specialist  |
| Odet         | Cato      | Ministry of Environment, Director of Biodiversity, Chairman of the Management Committee of MPA Sazan-Karaburuni |
| Andri        | Vaso      | Marine biodiversity expert  |
| Fatos        | Bundo     | Former Director of Biodiversity   |
| Zamir        | Dedej     | INCA, NGO   |
| Abdyl        | Cuca      | Forestry Service, Vlora, Head of PA department  |
| Lavdosh      | Shkurta   | Forestry Service, Vlora, Deputy Head of PA department   |
| Kujtim       | Sulce     | Regional Environment Directorate, Vlora, Director   |
| Gezim        | Capoj     | Municipality of Orikumi, Mayor  |
| Nertila      | Perrallaj | Municipality of Orikumi, Head of Tourism  |
| Tatiana      | Mehillaj  | Municipality of Orikumi   |
| Simo         | Ribaj     | SEEP (NGO), Vlora   |
| Niko         | Dumani    | Environmental Protection and Conservation of Nature (NGO) Vlora   |
| Mendim       | Baci      | Agriculture Protection (NGO), Vlora   |
| Mezan        | Mezani    | Chair of Fishermen Association, Vlora   |
| Arben (Beni) | Balla     | Ranger / Skipper of fishing boat 'ERIGELI'  |
| Bledar       | Mezani    | Ranger  |
| Fatmiri      | Iljazi    | Ranger  |
| Artan        | Jazo      | 'Shën Vasil' bay (St. Vasili – restaurant)  |
| Jasim        | Habibaj   | Tour operator – St.Vasil –Boat 'Teuta'  |

## Annex 5 - Financial data

Total disbursement of (cash) funds by outcomes to August 20, 2014 (US\$) against total project budget and estimate of in-kind contribution from the Ministry of Environment

|              | GEF funds      |                |    | Government       |                |    | UNDP Albania   |               |    | Total            |                |    |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----|------------------|----------------|----|----------------|---------------|----|------------------|----------------|----|
|              | Budget         | Actual         | %  | Budget           | Actual         | %  | Budget         | Actual        | %  | Budget           | Actual         | %  |
| Outcome 1    | 343,708        | 190,162        | 55 | 43,170           | 19,509         | 45 |                | 5,000         |    | 386,878          | 214,671        | 55 |
| Outcome 2    | 511,342        | 225,620        | 44 | 216,960          | 35,133         | 16 | 33,008         | 30,949        | 93 | 761,310          | 291,702        | 38 |
| Outcome 3    | 94,950         | 53,255         | 56 | 39,870           | 30,055         | 75 | 66,992         | 44,615        | 66 | 201,812          | 127,925        | 63 |
| Cash         |                |                |    | 300,000          | 84,695         |    |                |               |    |                  |                |    |
| In-kind      |                |                |    | 1,577,500        | 190,481        |    |                |               |    |                  |                |    |
| <b>Total</b> | <b>950,000</b> | <b>469,037</b> |    | <b>1,877,500</b> | <b>275,176</b> |    | <b>100,000</b> | <b>80,565</b> |    | <b>1,350,000</b> | <b>634,298</b> |    |

Source: UNDP-CO

## Annex 6 - Evaluation Consultant Code of Conduct and Agreement Form

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

#### The Evaluator:

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

#### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>6</sup>

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

Name of Consultant: PETER WHALLEY

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

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

Signed at place on date Brussels, 5<sup>th</sup> September 2014

Signature: Peter Whalley

<sup>6</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)