



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

## Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas (PIM 4255)

### TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Alessandra Pomé

January 2017

UNDP/GEF project  
 "Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas"

Project Title:	Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas			
GEF Project ID:	3997		at endorsement (thousand US\$)	at completion (thousand US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 4255 Atlas 00060315 00075893	GEF financing:	950	860
Country:	ALB	IA/EA own:	100	100
Region:	ECIS	Government:	1577.5 in kind 300 in cash	1618.6 in kind 276 in cash
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:		
FA Objectives (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	1877.5	1894.6
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment	Total Project Cost:	2927.5	2854.6
Other Partners involved:	n/a	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		21/11/2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: April 31 2016	Actual: December 31 2016

**Brief Description**

The goal of the project was to secure the long-term protection of Albania's unique coastal and marine biodiversity for current and future generations. The immediate objective was 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 was designed to remove systemic regulatory and knowledge barriers to realizing this objective, through two outcomes: i) Improved bio-geographical representation of marine and coastal protected areas (MCPA) and ii) 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.

**Evaluation timeframe**

December 2016 – January 2017

**Independent evaluator**

Alessandra Pomé  
 alessandra.pome@gmail.com

**Acknowledgement**

This report was prepared by the independent evaluator Alessandra Pomé following project document review and data analysis, consultations with stakeholders and a field mission. The evaluator would like to express gratitude and appreciation to government representatives, UNDP staff and all stakeholders interviewed. Their contribution, through the opinions they openly shared with the evaluator were crucial in conducting the evaluation. The evaluator would like to extend special thanks to the staff of the Project (both in Tirana and Vlora), who were readily accessible throughout the evaluation process and supplied the information and contacts, which made it possible to formulate conclusions on the success of the project.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of a Terminal Evaluation (TE) conducted between December 2016 and January 2017 by the independent evaluator Alessandra Pomé for the UNDP/GEF Medium-Sized Project “*Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas (MCPAs)*” in Albania.

The project was conceived in 2009 to respond to the request of the Government of Albania to remove the main barriers to the establishment and management of MCPAs and put in place a long-term strategic plan for MCPAs expansion accompanied with the necessary policy reform and institutional strengthening activities necessary to ensure management effectiveness. To this end, UNDP and the Ministry of Environment of Albania (MoE), the Executing Agency (EA), built on the findings of the UNDP/GEF “*Protected Areas gap assessment and MPA development in Albania*” project, which helped identifying the main gaps and barriers to the establishment and management of MCPAs in Albania.

The project was approved by GEF CEO in November 2010. It lasted 5 years, from April 2011 to December 2016. A 5-months inception phase was conducted to kick-start the project. UNDP Albania Country Office led the implementation of the project through a National Implemented Modality, with a letter of support for UNDP provision of services (HR and procurement). The MoE and UNDP Project Coordination Unit (PCU) have worked in close cooperation throughout project implementation.

The project has been funded (950 000 USD) from the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area under the GEF-4 strategic Programme BD-SP2 marine PAs. The project also received cash co-financing from the Ministry of Environment (MoE) and UNDP (218 223 and 99 947 USD respectively) and leveraged in-kind support from a variety of parallel projects.

The TE was commissioned by UNDP Albania to assess the achievement of the project results, to draw lessons learned that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming, and to make recommendations to promote the advancement in coastal and marine resource management in Albania after the conclusion of the project.

The evaluation is structured around the GEF five major evaluation criteria: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Results/Impacts and Sustainability, which the evaluator rated in accordance with the guidance provided by GEF and UNDP and through an evidence-based methodology which included document review, interviews conducted on a field mission to the project site from 9-11 of January 2017, and an analysis. The ratings for the project under the specific criteria requested are summarized in the table below.

Criterion	Scale	Evaluator’s Rating
M&E design at entry	(rate 6 pt. scale)	Satisfactory
M&E implementation	(rate 6 pt. scale)	Highly Satisfactory
1. Overall quality of M&E		Highly Satisfactory
Relevance	(rate 2 pt. scale)	Relevant
Effectiveness	(rate 6 pt. scale)	Highly Satisfactory
Efficiency	(rate 6 pt. scale)	Highly Satisfactory
2. Overall Project Outcome		Highly Satisfactory
Quality of UNDP Implementation	(rate 6 pt. scale)	Highly Satisfactory
Quality of Execution – EA	(rate 6 pt. scale)	Highly Satisfactory
3. Overall quality of implementation / execution		Highly Satisfactory
Financial Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	Moderately Likely
Socio-political Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	Likely
Institutional Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	Likely
Environmental Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	Likely

Criterion	Scale	Evaluator’s Rating
4. Overall likelihood of sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	Likely
Overall Rating	(rate 6 pt. scale)	Highly Satisfactory

The project was successful in contributing to Albania’s obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and assisting with the EU accession process on protected areas and marine conservation<sup>1</sup>. The project has marked progress towards the achievement of the long-term objective of improving the coverage and management effectiveness of Albania’s MCPAs, by supporting and promoting:

- ✓ an enabling environment to MCPA designation and management through:
  - the updating of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). The Action Plan included a comprehensive Strategic Plan for Albania’s Marine and Coastal Protected Areas<sup>2</sup> (SPMCPA), outlining a ten-year strategy for enhancing coverage and management effectiveness of MCPAs system. The NBSAP was approved by the MoE and officially submitted to the CBD Secretariat in 2015. By-laws and regulations necessary for effective management and enforcement of MCPAs were also developed;
  - the definition of the new MPA management structure, through the revision of the “Law on Protected Areas”, including clear mandate and responsibilities of MCPA Administrations, recommendations on financial mechanisms for MCPAs, based on the lessons from the project;
- ✓ the effective management and monitoring of MCPAs through:
  - technical and financial support to the Administration Unit of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA;
  - the development of management and financial plans for Karaburuni-Sazani MPA, which are now officially approved and implemented;
  - the institutionalization of METT as a system-level tool for measuring and monitoring management effectiveness for the national system of PAs in Albania. METT is today used on a regular basis;
  - extensive capacity and institutional strengthening;
- ✓ the understanding and the awareness on the role and values of MCPA among local communities, tourists and the public in the Vlora region.

The UNDP performed its role as an Implementing Agency (IA) in an effective manner. It not only took on further administrative responsibilities, but it timely addressed the concerns of the MoE and established a field project team that further enhanced the effectiveness of project implementation at site level. It also proved successful in relying on lasting partnerships with international and national organizations, such as WWF and INCA, Conservatoire du Littoral, to lead and realise complex technical processes. UNDP has been often praised for the participatory approach applied at all stages of project implementation, and for its readiness in listening to and considering comments and concerns from partners and stakeholders. UNDP has proved successful in seizing the positive momentum in support to MCPAs in Albania and already secured a set of new actions that will build off of the achievements of the UNDP/GEF MCPA project, secure the financial resources and expand UNDP efforts in support to the creation of an ecologically representative network of MPAs.

The M&E routine monitoring and reporting have been supported by the Project Steering Committee (Project Board), chaired by the MoE and including representatives of national and local organisations and institutions. The Project Board was finally integrated with the Management Committee of the Karaburuni- Sazani MPA further aligning the work of the project with the ambitions of the MoE for this MPA.

Overall, partner reflections on the project indicate success in terms of the participatory process to create a model Karaburuni-Sazani MPA and establishing the enabling environment for effective management of MCPAs in Albania. There is strong interest in replicating the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA model and expanding it to an ecologically representative network of MCPAs, starting with Porto Palermo MPA and Cape of Rodoni MPA.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> INCA 2013 “Strategic Plan for Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (SPMCPAs)” developed with the support of UNDP in the frame of the Project “Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas”.

Through the project, important steps were made towards the removal of the main barriers to effective management of MCPAs in Albania. However, more has to be done for an ecological representative and effectively managed MCPAs network is in place and realizes successful conservation benefits. Amongst others, the TE has identified the following areas of improvement:

- a) *Poor bio-geographical representation of marine biodiversity.*
- Albania has almost reached the 6% target of marine areas protected as required by the CBD/Aichi target: however, the identified MCPAs system in the SPMCPA is not ecologically representative nor fully implemented;
  - good and reliable scientific data on species and habitats of concern are still scarce: data are not yet centrally and systematically recorded and processed for management purposes;
  - monitoring of environmental indicators is still fragmented and poorly managed;
  - the first and only MPA in Albania, Karaburuni-Sazani Marine National Park, is still far from being an exemplary model for future MPAs;
  - despite an increased interest in coastal and marine areas among Albanians, the understanding of these fragile ecosystems is still limited and the negative impacts of human activities ignored;
- b) *Weak institutional framework for marine and coastal PA governance and poor capacities at institutional and individual levels.*
- cross-sectorial dialogue has not been effectively established: no national platform exists to address conflicts among sectors related to conservation and socio-economic development;
  - inter-institutional coordination is still limited and undermining the possibility to effectively address the complex interactions between human activities and coastal and marine ecosystems;
  - short-term profits are still the main driver of most of the investments along the Albanian coast, particularly in the tourism and real estate sectors;
  - despite being recognized as an emerging tourist destination, Albania is still unprepared to host international visitors and provide them with quality tourism services and infrastructures;
  - human resources and capacities of relevant institutions and administrations are still largely insufficient to ensure effective MCPA management;
  - high turnover rates at all governance level, particularly following political elections, impede PA staff capacity building and undermine the sustainability of any conservation efforts;
  - financial resources for marine and coastal resource management are still limited and largely dependent on state budget and international projects donors.

There is general agreement among interviewed stakeholders (including the MoE) on the need of securing a proper follow up to the UNDP MCPA project. The emphasis for the post project phase should be directed towards:

- the implementation of the management plan of the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA, demonstrating practically and sustainably its operationalization. Not only this will validate the methodology, but it will assist with replication and meeting CBD and EU accession obligations. The practical demonstration could also gather significant data on the marine resources in the MPA and understand the logistics required for managing an MPA,
- the replication and up-scaling of the approaches developed and agreed in Karaburuni-Sazani to other priority areas (Porto Palermo, Cape of Rodoni),
- the design of an ecologically representative network of MCPA along the Albanian coast,
- the continuous investment into building the capacity of both individuals and institutions to manage MCPAs,
- the engagement of all economic sectors and Ministries with interest and authority on the coastal and marine areas and the development of marine and coastal spatial plans, starting with the Vlora bay,
- the strengthening of the PA Steering Committees to ensure they become decision-making bodies and, at the same time, UNDP needs to keep working with the MoE for the establishment of a national Cross-Sectoral Forum to ensure the much needed inter-sectorial and inter-ministerial dialogue that is at the basis of effective management of MCPAs.

## TABLE OF CONTENT

Executive Summary	3
Table of content	6
Acronyms and Abbreviations	8
1. Introduction	9
1.1. Purpose of the evaluation	9
1.2. Scope and methodology	9
1.3. Structure of the evaluation report	10
2. Project Description and development context	11
2.1 Project start and duration	11
2.2 Problems sought to be addressed by the project	12
2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project	12
2.4 Indicators Baselines and Targets	13
2.5 Project stakeholders	14
2.6 Expected results	14
3. Findings	15
3.1 Project logic, strategy and design	15
3.1.1. Analysis of the Project Results Framework (PRF)	16
3.1.2. Assumptions and Risks	18
3.1.3. Lessons from other projects incorporated into project design	21
3.1.4. Planned stakeholder participation	21
3.1.5. Replication approach	22
3.1.6. UNDP comparative advantage	22
3.1.7. Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector	23
3.1.8. Management arrangements	23
3.2 Project Implementation	24
3.2.1 Adaptive Management	24
3.2.2 Partnership arrangements	26
3.2.3 Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management	27
3.2.4 Project finance	28
3.2.5 M&E: design at entry and implementation	28
3.2.6 IA implementation and EA execution	29
3.3 Project results	30
3.3.1 Attainment of objectives	31
3.3.2 Relevance	37
3.3.3 Effectiveness and efficiency	39
3.3.4 Country ownership	40
3.3.5 Mainstreaming	40
3.3.6 Sustainability	40
3.3.7 Impact	42
4 Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons	43
4.1 Overall Conclusions	43
4.1.1 MTE Ratings	44
4.2 Recommendations	44
4.2.1 Corrective actions for the design, implementation and M&E of the project	44
4.2.2 Actions to follow-up or reinforce initial benefits from the project	45
4.2.3 Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives	46

4.3	Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success	47
5	Annexes	49
	Annex 1: ToR of the Terminal Evaluation	49
	Annex 2: Field Mission Agenda	62
	Annex 3: List of documents reviewed	64
	Annex 4: Project stakeholders	66
	Annex 5: Co-financing, at January 2017	69
	Annex 6: List of Persons interviewed	71
	Annex 7: Project Results Framework	74

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACCOBAMS	Agreement on the Conservation of Cetacean of the Black Sea Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area
BD	Biodiversity Directorate within the MoE
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
COP	Conference of the Parties
DCM	Decision of Council of Ministers
DFP	Directorate of Fishery Policy
DFS	Directorates of Forestry Service
EIA	Environment Impact Assessment
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FMO	Fisheries Management Organisation
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GoA	Government of Albania
G&O	Gas and Oil
IMOC	Inter-institutional Maritime Operational Centre
IPA	Instrument for Pre-accession Assistance
IPA CBC	IPA Cross-border Cooperation
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
MAP	Mediterranean Action Plan
MCPAs	Marine and Coastal Protected Areas
MEFWA	Ministry of Environment Forest and Water Administration
METT	GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
MPA	Marine Protected Area
MoE	Ministry of Environment
NAPA	National Agency for Protected Areas
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PA	Protected Area
RAC/SPA	Regional Activity Center/Specially Protected Areas (Tunis)
RAPA	Regional Administration for Protected Areas
SPMCPAs	Strategic Plan for Marine and Coastal Protected Areas
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Program
UNEP/MAP	United Nations Environmental Program/Mediterranean Action Plan
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WB	World Bank
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The report outlines the findings of the Terminal Evaluation (TE) conducted by the independent evaluator Alessandra Pomé of the UNDP/GEF Medium-sized Project "*Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas*" (UNDP/GEF MCPA Project) implemented in Albania.

### 1.1. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The objectives of the evaluation as described in the Terms of Reference (ToR) in Annex 1 can be defined as follows:

- To evaluate the relevance performance and success of the project in the achievement of its objective;
- To identify and document the lessons learned that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming;
- To make recommendations with a view to inform stakeholders and decision-making and promote the advancement in coastal and marine resource management in Albania after the conclusion of the project.

### 1.2. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The TE was conducted following the guidance rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF and reflected in the "*Guidance for conducting terminal evaluation of UNDP-supported GEF-Financed Projects*". A participatory and consultative approach was applied throughout the process to ensure evidence-based information that that is credible reliable and useful.

The TE focused in three areas:

- i) *Evaluating Management/Institutional Conditions* – to draw an overall consideration of the basic operational infrastructure administration management and political setting that supports and ensures the successful implementation of a conservation project in Albania.
- ii) *Evaluating Project Design and Implementation Effectiveness* – to define the effectiveness of the design of the project its strategy its reporting its monitoring and evaluation system the use of technical assistance relationships with partners and effective use of financial resource
- iii) *Evaluating Outcomes and Impacts* – to identify early signs of any impacts and the sustainability of project outcomes. The evaluation considered also the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities.

The following methods were used to collect information and data:

1. *Quantitative and qualitative data gathering review and analysis* through:
  - a. the review of existing and related documentation. An in-depth documentation review was conducted following the evaluation indicators to answer the evaluation questions. 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.
  - b. a field mission: A field mission was organized to meet with the government counterparts, the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, the project team and key stakeholders. The visit of the project site also allowed to seek evidence of project impacts. A restitution meeting with the project team was organized the last day of the mission to review the draft report.

The evaluator relied extensively on the work, conducted in the summer 2016, to assess the status of the UNDP/GEF MCPA Project. The purpose of the assessment was to identify major achievements challenges lessons learned and project needs and gaps. The assessment was also to inform on the strengthen of the outcomes achieved to date as well as provide direction for future projects aimed at continuing to strengthen and improve coastal and marine resource management in Albania. An Exit Strategy was

prepared and four project proposals were developed for securing the long-term protection of Albania's unique coastal and marine biodiversity for current and future generations. The recommendations outlined in the Strategic Concept Note were informed by a combination of the results that emerged from consultations with project stakeholders, an Authorities and Interested Stakeholders Assessment Survey and extensive analytical work.

2. *De-briefing and addressing comments:* The third day of the mission was devoted to a de-briefing and presentation of initial findings and recommendations. The evaluator took note of comments made by the project team.

### 1.3. STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

The report follows the structure provided in the ToR, whereby:

- Section 2 includes the project description and development context;
- Section 3 details the findings of the evaluation, which are divided into findings on: i) project design/formulation; ii) project implementation and iii) project results;
- Section 4 outlines the conclusions recommendations and lessons learned.

Relevant Annexes, including the ToR of this assignment, the evaluation matrix and ratings, the field mission agenda, complete the report.

## 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

Albania is well known for its high diversity of ecosystems and habitats and its coastal area (427 km long) is one of the hot spots for biodiversity in the Mediterranean Sea. This diversity is attributable to the unique country's geographical position as well as to its geological hydrological climatic soil and relief characteristics. Stretching along the Strait of Otranto, which links the Adriatic Sea to Ionian and Mediterranean Sea and encompassing the three bio-geographical sectors of the Mediterranean (Western Eastern and Adriatic) the Albanian marine and coastal areas are particularly rich in species and habitats and highly heterogeneous including lagoons wetlands sand dunes and river deltas.

In the last 20 years, however, Albania has undergone profound transformation in terms of spatial distribution of human activities and in the standard of living in urban areas especially for those areas that are growing rapidly<sup>3</sup>. Migration towards coastal areas, combined with rapid and largely unregulated urban tourism and industrial development, have led to water pollution soil erosion drainage of wetlands extensive solid waste dumping and over fishing threatening marine and coastal biodiversity and the sustainability of ecosystem goods and services. This has resulted in one of the highest rates of biodiversity loss in Europe.

Since the late 90's, Albanian government has initiated several steps to conserve and sustainably manage its coastal and marine biodiversity. It has developed a Coastal Zone Management Plan (prepared in 1996 and approved in 2002) a Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan (prepared in 1999 and approved in 2002) and a National Environmental Action Plan (updated in 2002) as part of its obligations towards the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the European Union accession process. Albania is also committed to the CBD's Programme of Work on Protected Areas which has the objective of supporting the establishment and maintenance of a comprehensive effectively managed and ecologically representative network of marine protected areas (MPA) by 2012.

In 2009, the Government of Albania requested GEF support to put in place a long-term strategic plan for MCPA expansion accompanied with the necessary policy reform and institutional strengthening activities necessary to ensure MCPA management effectiveness. The project strategy built on the recommendations of the UNDP/GEF "Protected Areas Gap assessment and MPA development in Albania" (2009-10) the findings of in-depth assessments conducted through Project Preparation Grant (PPG) and consultations with stakeholders. The project strategy was conceived to address major barriers to MCPA designation and governance at national level and to "ground truth" the new legal and policy frameworks and test and develop new tools for enhancing MCPA management effectiveness at site level.

### 2.1 PROJECT START AND DURATION

The UNDP/GEF project "Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas" was approved by GEF COE in November 2010. It was a 5-year project and its original starting date was February 2011. A 5-months inception phase was conducted to kick-start the project, including an inception workshop held on July 15th 2011. The Inception Phase allowed to review the project strategy, the implementation partners and co-financers, the project performance measurement, its risks and assumptions, to collect and integrate into the project all relevant parties' comments and to finalize the ToRs for key personnel and experts.

In early 2016, an extension of the project was approved by the Project Board and the MoE to complete pending activities, allow for the necessary legal changes to be accommodated into the designation processes of the new MPA in Porto Palermo, as well as for a set of priority actions, identified in the management plan of Karaburuni-

---

<sup>3</sup> World Bank (2016) website: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/albania>

Sazani MPA, to be implemented and the MPA administration to become operational.

## 2.2 PROBLEMS SOUGHT TO BE ADDRESSED BY THE PROJECT

Albania is well known for its high diversity of ecosystems and habitats and its coastal area is one of the hot spots for biodiversity in the Mediterranean Sea. During the PPG phase the UNDP identified the following 3 major barriers to effective marine and coastal biodiversity conservation in Albania:

<b>1. Poor Bio-geographical Representation of Marine Biodiversity</b>	In 2009, Albania featured only 9 coastal PAs and no marine PAs. Data on species and habitats distribution and conservation status were limited. The available information did not allow for prioritizing sites for designation as MCPAs. In addition, there was little knowledge of what a marine park should be like what the protection regimes should be for its core areas and how buffer areas should be managed. There was the need to finalize the legislative improvement process and translate ecological gap analysis into a system plan for MCPA expansion.
<b>2. Weak Institutional Framework for MCPA Governance</b>	In 2009, inter-sectoral coordination among relevant institutions was poor and responsibilities and reporting lines between all PA institutions remained ambiguous. The staffing profile of the former Ministry of Environment (MEFWA) made it difficult to ensure good communication horizontally (with sister ministries) as well as vertically (between MEFWA as a central institution regional branches and site administrations).
<b>3. Capacities at the Individual and Institutional Levels</b>	In 2009, the MEFWA despite being the main environmental authority lacked capacities to plan for the expansion of MCPAs enforce legislation increase ecological representation and conservation effectiveness of the network of PAs and monitor site performance. At the site and regional levels knowledge and capabilities to develop and implement site management plans and business plans were very limited.

## 2.3 IMMEDIATE AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The UNDP/GEF MCPA Project was designed to improve the coverage and management effectiveness of Albania’s network of MCPAs as an essential complement to its network of terrestrial protected areas and contribute to Albania’s obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and to assist with the EU accession process on protected areas and marine conservation.

### Overall project objective:

To improve the coverage and management effectiveness of Albania’s marine and coastal protected areas.

### Expected 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.

### Expected outputs<sup>4</sup>:

- 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: A 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

<sup>4</sup> As per last modification following the recommendations of the Inception Phase in 2011.

approaches;

Output 2.4: Management and business planning demonstrated in the Karaburuni - Sazani MPA.

#### 2.4 INDICATORS BASELINES AND TARGETS

Indicators were established and their baselines and targets clearly defined in the Project Document. During the Inception Phase several project outputs were revised: relevant indicators and their baselines were modified accordingly and target level streamlined and time bound to better track project performance as depicted in the table below.

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators
<b>Overall objective: To improve coverage and management effectiveness of Albania’s marine and coastal protected areas.</b>		
	Develop SPMCPA 10-years plan to expand the MPA network including specific action plan for each new area	Area (in ha) under protection as Coastal and Marine PA
	Legislative/Regulatory framework: - amendments PA law to remove legal barriers to effective MPA management - stipulations on funding sources: i) budget allocations ii) revenue raised by PAs iii) donor funding - promotion and communications on new legal framework - review of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)	Enabling environment for MCPAs
	Legal instruments for new MPAs gazetted/official declaration	Management effectiveness of Karaburuni - Sazani MPA
	Increased systemic institutional and individual capacity for establishing and managing and MCPA	Increased Systemic Institutional and Individual capacities for establishing and managing an MCPA system (measured by the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard in Annex 5)
<b>Outcome 1: Improved bio-geographical representation of marine and coastal protected areas (MCPA)</b>		
1.1	Strategic Plan for Albania’s MCPAs is incorporated in the revised National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) for 2020	Strategic Plan for Albania’s MCPAs
1.2	Building Karaburuni-Sazani MPA administration capacity based on legal instruments on establishing MPAs	# of proposals for new MPAs establishment
		Legal instrument establishing MPA at Karaburuni-Sazani
		Legal environment for MCPA management
1.3	Buffer zones for the MPA is identified and demarcated and management actions integrated into MPA and local development plans	Adequate management of buffer zones for MCPA
		Guidelines for adequate management of buffer zones in MCPA
<b>Outcome 2: Improved management arrangements for MCPAs based on clear institutional responsibilities and development of capacities</b>		
2.1	Cross-sectoral Forum on PA management is created	Management boards at MCPAs
		# of agreements or MoUs on MPA/PA issued+++ The latest forum organized with NAPA / Coordination Forum “Protected areas network a model of future sustainable development - Towards next steps for a better management”, December 6, 2016
2.2	System for joint surveillance and monitoring of the networks of MCPAs to track biodiversity impacts and management effectiveness is piloted	Management effectiveness of CPAs +++ MoU among MoE/NAPA for joint patrolling and surveillance; rangers hired and equipped

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators
2.3	Technical extension services for site managers on cost-effective management and conservation approaches	Number of manuals/guidelines prepared as a resource for imparting further training (in addition two other publications on touristic guide and rangers information support are produced to facilitate the daily work of the rangers and tourists/ operators access. (Ref. 'Orik guide' and 'In Blue').
2.4	Management and business planning demonstrated in the Karaburuni - Sazani MPA.	Funding of Karaburni – Sazani MPA
		Increased understanding of the fish resources of the MPA
		Aware inhabitants and stakeholders adjacent to the MPA (and countrywide) of MBD values +++ The methodology on ESV for the MCPA and ecosystems is applied and delivered through specific training workshop

A Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) used for both GEF and CBD reporting was completed in the Project Document and is now used for assessing progress and achievements of all protected area in Albania.

### 2.5 PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS

Extensive consultations during the PPG and then during the Inception Phase allowed to identify all major stakeholders and clarify their involvement in the proposed project. Since 2011, stakeholders have evolved as well as their roles and contributions to the project. A final list of project stakeholders and their mandate can be found in the table in Annex 3.

### 2.6 EXPECTED RESULTS

The main results expected from this project included:

- ✓ improved designation and management arrangements for MCPAs clarifying the institutional and legal setting;
- ✓ the establishment of the first MPA in Albania together with a detailed management plan and strategy for its management and monitoring.

These results were supported by targeted capacity building exercises to strengthen the management capacity of relevant authorities, as well as awareness raising actions to increase the appreciation of the values and benefits of the MCPA in Albania.

### 3. FINDINGS

#### 3.1 PROJECT LOGIC, STRATEGY AND DESIGN

The project was conceived in 2009 to respond to the request of the Government of Albania to remove the main barriers to the establishment and management of MCPAs and put in place a long-term strategic plan for MCPAs expansion accompanied with the necessary policy reform and institutional strengthening activities necessary to ensure management effectiveness.

To this end, UNDP and the Executing Agency, the Ministry of Environment of Albania, built on the findings of the UNDP/GEF “Protected Areas gap assessment and MPA development in Albania” project (PoWPA project), which helped identifying the main gaps and barriers to the establishment and management of MCPAs. In 2011, during the Inception Phase, the project strategy was not modified from its initial design. However, to facilitate the project to achieve its objective and outcomes the associated outputs indicators and target levels were simplified streamlined and time bound. Moreover, as the Karaburuni-Sazani marine area (Vlora region) was designated as an MPA in 2010 it became evident that project activities had to be piloted in this first and to date only MPA in Albania.

Project activities at the systemic level have been suitably conceived to secure the enabling environment for progressive expansion of the country’s MCPA network. Project actions at the site level provided the technical and financial support to stakeholders to pilot the new legal and policy frameworks and test and develop new tools for enhancing MPA management effectiveness.

The project design and strategy did address the original request of the Government of Albania and effectively contributed to Albania’s obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD)<sup>5</sup> and the EU accession process on protected areas and marine conservation.

UNDP applied a fully participatory process throughout the design and implementation of the project. The engagement of all interested parties, coupled with the ability of UNDP to take fully into account all comments and suggestions, was highly appreciated by interviewed partners and contributed to build a sense of ownership and buy-in. Moreover, partner reflections on the project indicate success in terms of the participatory process to create a model Karaburuni-Sazani MPA and securing the enabling environment for the establishment and management of MCPAs. However, as detailed in the coming chapters, there is still work to be done for MCPAs and any other resource management efforts to realize successful conservation benefits.

---

<sup>5</sup> Albania is committed to the CBD’s Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) 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.

### 3.1.1. ANALYSIS OF THE PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (PRF)

The Project Results Framework (PRF) in the original Project Document of 2009 did clearly represent the expected project objective and outcomes and together with the METT (and annexes) provided (mostly) SMART outputs indicators and targets expected to be achieved.

Nonetheless following consultation with key stakeholders and considering the evolving political and institutional context the PRF was further improved and streamlined during the Inception Phase in 2011 and following the Mid-term Evaluation (MTE) in 2014.

The main changes in the PRF are summarized in the Table below:

Initial Outputs	Revised Outputs
<b>Outcome 1: Improved bio-geographical representation of marine and coastal protected areas (MCPAs)</b>	
Output 1.1 Strategic Plan for Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (SPMCPA)	Output 1.1 Support to revision of National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan for 2020 (for Marine and Coastal Protected Areas part)
Justification for changes:	To fulfil its commitment to COP 10 decision on Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011- 2020 and Aichi target <sup>6</sup> , the Albanian government has committed to revise its National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan first prepared in 1999. This exercise would result in revised biodiversity strategy and action plan that fully incorporate Aichi targets including the increasing marine PA coverage. Therefore, the project output 1.1 will be contributing to the revision of National Biodiversity Strategy and action plan avoiding duplications and fragmentations of national plans. In parallel the output will also help government drafting and enacting by-laws and regulations necessary for effective management of the Albania’s first MPA
Output 1.2 Legal instrument establishing an MPA in the Karaburuni-Sazani area	Output 1.2 Building Karaburuni-Sazani MPA Administration capacity
Justification for change:	In April 2010, the government has established the Marine area near Karaburuni peninsula and Sazani island as MPA using the existing legal framework provisions. Therefore, the project support needs to be re-focused to support the government in establishing adequate PA Administration and build the PA Administration capacity. This support will also assist the anticipated new changes in PA administration and management proposed by the amendment of Law on Protected areas with the establishment of a National Agency of Protected areas under the MoE that would coordinate and supervise all PA Administrations in Albania as well as the development and implementation of PA management plans.
Output 1.3 Buffer zones for the existing coastal PAs identified and demarcated and additional most sensitive coastal and marine areas are identified.	Output 1.3 Buffer zones for the MPA is identified and demarcated and management actions integrated into MPA and local development plan.
Justification for change:	Since Karaburuni–Sazani MPA is the first marine PA in the country the project will need to find the most appropriate mechanisms for identifying demarcating and setting management arrangements for buffer zone around marine PA. This support will be fully in line with the proposed amendments for the “Law on Protected areas” that foresee increased roles of buffer zone in effective management of protected areas by limiting some of the economic development activities in the buffer zone. Lessons and best practices gained from this support will be fed into relevant by laws and regulations. It is expected that this

<sup>6</sup> The new target is 30% by 2030 (WCC-IUCN, 2016).

Initial Outputs	Revised Outputs
	innovative action will require substantial time and technical inputs from the project. Considering the fact that future expansion of marine protected areas are covered under output 1.1 the second set of activities dealing with identification of most sensitive coastal and marine areas are incorporated accordingly.
<b>Outcome 2: Improved management arrangements for MCPAs based on clear institutional responsibilities and development of capacities.</b>	
Output 2.1 Cross-Sectoral Forum for marine and coastal protected area management is created	Output 2.1 Cross-Sectoral Forum on Protected area management is created
Justification for changes	In order to avoid confusion among PA management board, which are operational body at PA level and especially newly established Inter-institutional Operational Marine Center, which focuses on integrated approaches to regulating fishing shipping and border patrolling the cross-sectoral forum with advisory function will be established at the Ministry level.
Output 2.2: System for joint surveillance and monitoring of the network of MCPAs to track biodiversity impacts and management effectiveness	Output 2.2: System for joint surveillance and monitoring of the network of MCPAs to track biodiversity impacts and management effectiveness is piloted
Justification for changes	The development of monitoring system is carried out under output 1.1. Hence this output is focused on piloting and documenting the lessons and best practices for the replication.
Output 2.3 Technical extension services for site managers on cost-effective management and conservation approaches.	Output 2.3 Technical extension services for site managers on cost-effective management and conservation approaches.
Justification for change	No changes
Output 2.4 Management and business planning demonstrated at the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA.	Output 2.4 Management and business planning demonstrated at the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA.
Justification for change/Added activities	In order to ensure integrity between PA and it buffer zone management the outputs is linked up with the output 1.3. Implementation of priority actions is also incorporated into planning exercise enabling the stakeholders to practice and embed participatory decision making

Moreover, following the MTE recommendations two indicators were modified as follows:

Indicator	Justification	New indicator
The effort in monitoring the status of seagrass <i>Posidonia Oceanica</i>	This indicator (and associated target) resulted inappropriate for technical reasons (it is difficult to measure any variance within the project timeframe (5 years max) and monitoring efforts require technical capacity and funding that were not yet available). The new indicator reflected the need to have a baseline for fish abundance within the newly established MPA of Karaburuni-Sazani to allow for monitoring of its management effectiveness in the following years. the	The baseline understanding of the fish resources of K-S MPA
The medio and infralittoral communities	For the same reasons listed above this	Awareness of inhabitants and

Indicator	Justification	New indicator
in the region	indicator was amended. The analyses for the selection of a new indicator considered the Albanian NGO knowledge/ information the status of the information (communication tools websites or advocacy and education work plan available or local media approached to this issue) on MCPAs. In 2011 none of the local media had run programme on issues linked with MBD and /or MCPA and were not acquainted with MCPAs and environmental issues more in general. In this respect the project believed that involving local media and collaborating with them would have a positive impact on their attitude toward pro-active MBD conservation including Karaburun-Sazani ecosystem.	stakeholders adjacent to the MPA (and countrywide) of MBD values.

As also highlighted during MTE the inclusion of mid-term targets in the PRF would have greatly benefited the project management and the mid-term and terminal evaluation.

### 3.1.2. ASSUMPTIONS AND RISKS

The risks identified in the Inception Phase are all relevant and do reflect the major threats to the long-term sustainability of the project. Risks have been analysed, reviewed and reported annually. The critical risks have been reported in UNDP system ATLAS. The project team applied adaptive management approaches to address any institutional risks: however, no significant risks occurred and required major adaptation.

Detailed comments on the risk level and associated risk mitigation strategies:

Risk	Level	Risk Mitigation strategy	Comments TE
Continued overall institutional reform in Albania may necessitate revision of project approaches to policy and decision-making on MPAs	M	The project will put in place the Cross-sectoral Forum as a lasting sustainable institutional network of agencies engaged in MPA decision-making. Representation on the Forum will be “function”-based (vs. “person”-based) thus it will ensure that whatever institution obtains responsibilities for MPA decision making it is included in the Forum. This will prevent any disruption of national-level policy-making and decision-making on MPAs. The project management will also apply adoptive management approaches, to respond and address any institutional risk	Over the lifespan of the project, Albania has gone through important political, institutional and legal reforms. However, no major revision to the project proved necessary, underlining the appropriateness of the project strategy and design. The Cross-sectoral Forum proved harder to establish mainly due to lack of political will. Instead, the Management Committee of Karaburun-Sazani MPA was established as a cross sectoral body through Ministerial order: it hosts representatives of the main central and local authorities, NGOs, user groups and other stakeholders. Since its establishment, several of the functions of the Cross-sectoral forum have been taken over by NAPA. More recently, in 2016, a Coordination Forum was established and set

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

Risk	Level	Risk Mitigation strategy	Comments TE
			operative by NAPA including all donors and projects concerning PAs. However, neither the Steering Committee of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA nor the Coordination Forum can fully replace the Cross-sector Forum. Moreover, once the project end, it is still unclear who will lead the organization and facilitation of the existing Steering Committee’s meetings.
Insufficient financial resources raised to implement the Strategies on MCPAs approved as part of Albania's National biodiversity strategy and action plan for 2020	M	For the first time in PA governance in Albania the MCPA will create proper legal and operational basis for diversification of funding sources for MPAs and protected areas more broadly. Three main funding sources will be stipulated: (a) budget allocations (b) revenue raised by PAs themselves (c) donor funding. It is recognized that budget funding may remain limited in the current economic situation. The project therefore will put special emphasis on allowing PAs to earn and retain own income. The project will show-case business planning in the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA and pilot revenue-generation mechanisms under the business plan. At the same time Albania enjoys continued flows of Official Development Aid and the project will maintain close contacts with donors and Government to ensure that more ODA incorporates integrated coastal zone management including support to MCPAs.	This risk has been duly addressed by the project through: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the development of the legal instruments for PA to raise and retain their own income (new “Law on PAs”);</li> <li>- the show-casing of business / financial planning and ecosystem services analysis in the project sites;</li> <li>- the development of a new UNDP/GEF project on sustainable financing of PAs.</li> </ul> However, the draft “Law on PAs” has not being approved yet.
Political will of the relevant Albanian authorities to support and implement the MCPA is sustained	L	Establishing MCPAs has been identified as a national priority as articulated in the NBSAP. The PoWPA project already created a good baseline level of awareness and interest in national institutions on coastal and marine PAs. The project will build on the consultative approach developed under the PoWPA project and maintain the good working relationships established. The project will stress win-win opportunities and in the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA will demonstrate possibilities for meeting ecological objectives while also generating socio-economic benefits for local populations.	The proposed risk mitigation strategy has been pursued throughout project implementation. Project results have been further supported by a favourable political momentum following the last political elections. However, the project has not been able to show-case the possibility for Karaburuni-Sazani MPA to generate socio-economic benefits for local communities while meetings conservation objectives. The MPA is still in an early stage of development and further support will be needed in the coming years for the area to reach a self-sufficient phase. Moreover, the political instability which will follow the coming elections in 2017 might jeopardized the results achieved so far, if such momentum and support is not maintained.
Conflicts with other sectors related to socio-economic development; Cross-sectoral and inter-institutional dialogue can be established	M	Recognizing the need for inter-institutional and cross-sectoral collaboration for effective management of MCPAs the project will support the establishment of a Cross-sectoral Forum under the umbrella of the Inter-Ministerial Council being established by the Albanian government. By establishing cross-sectoral	As mentioned above, the lack of the Cross-sectoral Forum, established under the umbrella of the Inter-Ministerial Council, largely undermines the long-term sustainability of project results. Even though the Cross-sectorial dialogue has not been effectively established, there is a

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

Risk	Level	Risk Mitigation strategy	Comments TE
		dialogue at this high level the project aims to broker agreements and memorandums of understanding between relevant Ministries and institutions to manage marine and land-based threats to MCPAs.	platform to address conflicts among sectors related to conservation and socio-economic development, namely the Management Committee froK-S MCPA. Inter-institutional coordination is still limited and undermining the possibility to effectively address the complex interactions between human activities and coastal and marine ecosystems.
Political support and interest in piloting MPA (with the 1 <sup>st</sup> at Karaburuni-Sazani) in Albania is maintained	L	The process of declaration of the Karaburuni MPA is very close to completion and is a testament to the political will for establishing Albania’s first MPA. It is expected that by successfully demonstrating win-win opportunities in this area the project will help increase support for the establishment of additional MCPAs.	Stakeholders are unanimous in considering the results achieved in Karaburuni-Sazani MPA as a success. There is today strong interest in replicating this model and expanding it to an ecologically representative network of MCPAs starting with Porto Palermo MPA and Cape of Rodoni MPA. However, there are indications that institutionally and operationally there is still work to be done. And for this to be a truly replicable model lessons learned and best practices should be well documented and made easily accessible.
High turnover of PA Administration staff impeding PA staff capacity building	M	Ministry of Environment Forestry and Water Administration has already developed a draft law Protected areas which would ensure more vertical management of PA Administration. Such step coupled with increased financial independence of PA will help the PAs retain skilled staff. The project through PA forum and on the ground pilot demonstration will provide the Ministry with any additional support in improving and lobbying the revised PA.	This is and remains one of the major risks in any conservation project in Albania. The associated mitigation strategy is still valid though the draft law on PAs has not yet being approved.
Local communities are supportive of an MPA at Karaburuni-Sazani	M	A former GEF/UNDP program (2000-2006) that intended to proclaim the terrestrial part as a PA has contributed to some improvement of attitude and behaviour towards integrated coast management. In developing the Management Plan and Business Plan for Karaburuni local stakeholder involvement will be ensured. A Management Board will be established that will include local community representatives and entrepreneurs.	The Management Committee (CE) of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA proved effective. Awareness has been raised and more involvement at local level is today a reality as a result of the participatory approach applied to the MPA management planning.
Marine and coastal ecosystems are susceptible to climate change impacts	L	Project activities aimed at establishing the Karaburuni MPA and planning for its expansion will take full account of climate change risks. Proposed new MPAs and extension of coastal PAs will factor in climate change risk data and conservation recommendations for each site will include measures to account for climate change risks and increase ecosystem resilience. Further demonstration activities within Outcome 2 will support concrete conservation efforts at the	The management plan of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA did consider climate change risks, though few data are available in Albania. Moreover, the main drivers to changes in coastal and marine ecosystems along the Albania coasts as identified in the original project document are still relevant today and new ones (e.g. on-shore O&G drilling recreational fishing) are emerging at an alarming pace, further reducing the resilience of these areas to climate change.

Risk	Level	Risk Mitigation strategy	Comments TE
		Karaburuni-Sazani MPA that will remove anthropogenic loads (unsustainable fishing infrastructure development) and this will lower the overall pressure on marine ecosystems increasing their resilience to climate change.	The project did not directly address these anthropogenic drivers (namely, unregulated tourism and urban development and unsustainable harvest of natural resources), but it helped making important steps forward in ensuring a more effective management of priority coastal and marine areas. Moreover, the project helped build the capacity of the newly established National Coastal Agency, which is the relevant authorities for coastal areas in Albania.

### 3.1.3. LESSONS FROM OTHER PROJECTS INCORPORATED INTO PROJECT DESIGN

This project was conceived by building on the recommendations and lessons learned of the “Protected Areas Gap assessment and MPA development in Albania” (PoWPA Project)<sup>7</sup> related to the country’s participation in the CBD’s Program of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA). The PoWPA project accomplished a comprehensive ecological gap assessment for the protected area system in Albania started a process of establishment of a policy environment and knowledge base on MPAs developed recommendations for modifications to the 2002 “Law on PAs” and a Decree on the Administration of Protected Areas.

The project benefitted also from the synergies and knowledge transfer with other complementary actions implemented by UNDP partners, such as INCA, WWF, UNEP/MAP RAC-SPA and Conservatoire du Littoral.

### 3.1.4. PLANNED STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

Stakeholders participation was carefully planned and fully integrated in the original project design. During the Inception Phase extensive consultations were carried out with each stakeholder groups to clarify their involvement in the proposed action. In the Inception Report a review of key stakeholders was presented along with their roles and possible contributions to the project. Two key stakeholder groups were identified as having a pivotal role in sustainable protected area management and administration. These two groups were (a) the private sector mainly the fishery sector and hotel and tour operators and (b) local communities that live coastal areas in vicinity of the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA.

The project has reached out to both groups of stakeholders and has sought maximum engagement in its activities mainly through training and by adopting a participatory approach to the development of the Management Plan of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA.

The project also included a representative cross-section of stakeholders (both government authorities and NGOs) on the Project Steering Committee (Project Board) to ensure their views were continuously reflected in the planned activities. In 2015, the Project Board was combined to the Management Committee of the MPA Karaburuni-Sazani National Park Llogara and Natural Complex Karaburuni-Reza e Kanalit-Orikum-Tragjas-Dukat (Project Board/Management Committee of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA) and expanded to include representatives of the private sector. Interviewed stakeholders agreed on the importance of a Cross-sectoral Forum, particularly when it comes to the management of coastal and marine areas. The Steering Committee did take over some of the planned functions of the Forum, however, major management decisions could not be taken as they depended on the national Ministries. Moreover, the private sector seemed involved only marginally in the Committee. This involvement needs

<sup>7</sup> Under GEF Program “Supporting Country Action on the CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas” financed by GEF with USD 150000 and cash/kind of UNDP Ministry of Environment Forestry and Water Administration WWF and local NGO INCA

to be sustained and the organization and facilitation of the Committee’s meetings need to be ensured following the completion of the project. The Steering Committee is considered a success of the project: however, if broader integrated management of coastal and marine areas is to be pursued in the future, a national level inter-ministerial and inter-sectoral body is required.

All stakeholders interviewed during the MTE 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. Furthermore, local authorities and administrative bodies in the Vlora region proved particularly supportive of the project and provided support in making the case for the establishment of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA. There was general agreement that the coordination and communication of this project were well managed and of some mutual benefit to each participating organization.

The analysis of the minutes of the Project Board/Management Committee meetings and the interviews carried out within the project assessment in the summer 2016, however, revealed that key actors with vested interests in marine and coastal areas were not actively engaged in/contributing to the project (though reportedly invited by UNDP), amongst others the National Agency for Coastal Areas and representatives of the fisheries and tourism sectors. Moreover, the Territorial and Administrative reform pursued by the Government of Albania since 2014, coupled with the chronic high turnover of Albanian institutions, further constrained the project’s effort to achieve full stakeholder participation.

#### *3.1.5. REPLICATION APPROACH*

The replicability of the project is built into its design and has been further by UNDP’s efforts to coordinate and engage the MoE and all relevant authorities in the scaling up of project-inspired actions.

Capacity of project partners has been enhanced and tools have been developed at all levels for best practices in MPA management to be replicated. Governance and management approaches for MPAs have been tested in Karaburuni-Sazani MPA and two new sites have already advanced in the designation process. At the systemic level, a policy and legal framework has been shaped for more effective coastal and marine biodiversity conservation through effective PAs, further facilitating the gradual replication of the site level experience to the remaining 7 MPAs that have been recommended for designation. Scaling up is already occurring as lessons and experiences from Karaburuni-Sazani MPA are integrated into laws policies and programmatic priorities.

Replication will be fully achieved once UNDP and its partners will be able to access resources that are sufficient to support replication of project best practices and lessons learned.

#### *3.1.6. UNDP COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE*

Few organizations in Albania have the experience and the presence of a full team dedicated to MPA projects. UNDP’s comparative advantage is the capacity of its national staff to co-design and co-manage program outputs with national and local partners, including civil society. This holds particularly true when it comes to the UNDP/GEF MCPA project, which paved the way to important legal institutional and policy reforms for the conservation of marine and coastal biodiversity in Albania. It addressed the priorities of country strategic plans, as the improvement of the biogeographical representation of MCPAs and their management arrangements. It is worth also recalling that the UNDP-GEF project proved also particularly flexible in adapting to changing situations. This flexibility allowed for adjustments in collaboration and partnership strategies, estimated inputs and individual activities to achieve the objective and outcomes for which the project was designed.

### 3.1.7. LINKAGES BETWEEN PROJECT AND OTHER INTERVENTIONS WITHIN THE SECTOR

The project was originally designed to encourage exchanges and coordination with the wide range of ministries, authorities and sectors that are involved in the establishment and management of an MPA, through the establishment of a Cross-sectorial forum. By including national and local stakeholders (e.g. NAPA, RAPA, Municipalities fishing associations etc.), the Project Board/Management Committee of the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA did ensure the basic coordination needed for the on-going administration of an MPA. Moreover, NAPA has recently established a Coordination Forum aimed at ensuring coordination and maximising synergies among all projects and organizations dealing with PAs in Albania. However, full inter-ministerial and inter-sectoral coordination at national level is still far from achieved and a national forum allowing for MCPA management issues to be addressed by all concerned parties is still needed.

The project team proved particularly effective in seeking collaborations and maximising synergies with other actions within the sector. Particularly MoUs and agreements were signed and joint activities were organized with the following projects:

- the SEA-Med project, led by WWF Mediterranean Programme and implemented in Albania by INCA, which helped further tourism sector involvement in Karaburuni-Sazani MPA management planning process;
- the "Mediterranean Small Islands" initiative of Conservatoire du Littoral (CdL), which conducted a series of marine assessments and marine habitats mapping efforts in the marine area around the Sazani island.
- the Regional Project for the Development of a Mediterranean Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (MPAs) Network through the boosting of MPA creation and management (MedMPAnet project), led by UNEP-MAP RAC/SPA, which contributed to the assessment of the ecological values of the area of Porto Palermo. Findings of these assessments informed the development of a preliminary management plan of this future MPA<sup>8</sup>.

### 3.1.8. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

UNDP Albania Country Office led the implementation of the project through a National Implemented Modality. The MoE (former MEFWA) was the Executing Agency (EA). At the written request from the MoE, the more administrative functions of an EA were transferred back to UNDP. The MoE and UNDP Project Coordination Unit (PCU) have worked in close cooperation throughout project implementation: periodic financial statements from the project were timely sent to the MoE and monthly statements of the co-financing contributions were provided to the project.

The project organization structure consisted of:

- Project Coordination Unit (PCU), including a National Project Manager (NPM), one permanent technical staff (National Technical Expert) and an Administrative/Financial Assistant, all based in Tirana.
- Field project staff, including a part-time field moderator and a part-time Local Expert, who supported the PCU in day-to-day liaison with MPA Administration and local stakeholders in the Vlora region.

The presence of field personnel was not planned in the original project document. The field project staff greatly contributed to enhance collaboration with local stakeholders and beneficiaries and to raise awareness on project activities and MPAs more in general.

A Project Board was originally established to advise and take management decisions for the project, when guidance was required by the Project Manager, as well as monitor and evaluating project performance. The Project Board also considered and approved the annual work-plan and budget and any essential deviations from the original plans. It consisted initially in 7 members representing the diverse stakeholders of the project (MoE UNDP local government

---

<sup>8</sup> UNEP-MAP 2015. Management Plan of "Porto-Palermo-Llamani Bay" Protected Area in Albania. By Zamir DEDEJ Genti KROMIDHA and Nihat DRAGOTI. Ed. RAC/SPA - MedMPAnet Project Tunis: 84 p + annexes.

private sector universities CSO) and met at least twice a year. This was subsequently merged with the Management Committee of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA.

## 3.2 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

### 3.2.1 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

The UNDP/PCU proved capable to anticipate challenges and adapt to an evolving political and institutional context throughout project duration.

Since the Project Inception Phase in 2011, Albania has gone through important institutional political and legal reforms: amongst others, the local elections in 2011 led to the establishment of the Ministry of Environment (MoE) (former Ministry of Environment Forest and Water Administration) and of two new National Agencies dedicated to Protected Areas and the coastal zones. The *Administrative-Territorial Reform*<sup>9</sup>, which re-organized 373 Local Government Units into 61 municipalities, had also a major impact on the UNDP/GEF MCPA project implementation at site level. The UNDP/PCU adapted quickly and well to the new context and make the most out of the new institutional setting.

Based on the Inception report and the management response from the MTE, the following changes were pursued to the work programme following the requests of the MoE and other project stakeholders:

- a local project office under the auspices of the Orikum Municipality was created to facilitate the communication with communities and local stakeholders on the benefits and operation of a MPA;
- in 2011, 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;
- in 2011, other Outputs were adjusted to accommodate changes in circumstances within Albania and to ensure clarity and ownership in the project amongst stakeholders (as shown in Chapter 3.1.1. above). These changes and corresponding budget adaptations were all accomplished through a transparent process, clearly documented in the Inception Report;
- as the Project Steering Group meetings (Project Board) provided a beneficial forum to inform and seek advice and approval from key project stakeholders supervisory body, the spend to-date and the budget for the coming year were presented and a record was attached to the minutes of the meetings;
- The meetings of the Project Steering Committee (Project Board) were hosted by the Municipality of Orikumi, as main partner to the project, at no cost to the project. This decision proved particularly successful as it helped strengthening the relationships and increasing the support of many members from the local community/organisations to the project;
- as the Inter-Sectoral Forum, proposed by the MoE and planned in the original project document, could not be setup, the UNDP/PCU relied on the combination of the Project Board and the management committee of

---

<sup>9</sup> The Albanian Parliament approved on July 31 2014 Law 115/2014 “On the Administrative and Territorial Division” of local government units in the Republic of Albania” and with the new map of 61 Municipalities certified also in December 2014 by the Constitutional Court.

Karaburuni-Sazani MPA, at least to enable the many competing ambitions for the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA to be openly discussed and adaptive measures to be identified;

- following the MTE recommendations, the effort in monitoring the status of seagrass *Posidonia Oceanica* and of the medio and infralittoral communities in the Karaununi-Sazani area were reviewed as considered to claim excessive monitoring resources and efforts. Two new indicators were adopted that allowed 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 indicators were proposed by stakeholders who were concerned by the lack of baseline data on fish abundance and awareness level of local communities to demonstrate the MPA effectiveness;
- soon after the establishment of National Agency for Protected Areas (NAPA) and its Regional Administrations (RAPA), an official agreement was signed to enhance synergies and cooperation. This collaboration concerned mainly the project activities at Karaburuni-Sazani MPA. Amongst others, the 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 at sea became evident as soon as the RAPA office and team (which is responsible for the administration and management of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA) were established in Vlora. The project budget was adapted to provide RAPA with the most needful logistic and equipment to support MPA patrolling and supervision, as well as to secure 6 rangers dedicated to the area. Joint patrolling missions were conducted periodically with the participation of Guard Coast Delta Force (border policy) and other inspection bodies;
- as the project has been particularly successful in attracting the support of parallel actions (e.g. co-ordination with WWF through their local partner on the preparation of a Tourism Management Plan) and of local partners (e.g. provision of local office space / services by the Municipality of Orikumi), the UNDP/PCU developed a procedure to gather and collate these additional contributions and help to substantiate the interest in the project. Since 2015 onward, co-financing data were thus regularly recorded;
- following the official approval of the Management Plan of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA, the Project started the implementation of the following high priority and visible actions identified during the consultative process (in cooperation with RAPA and local partners, such as INCA):
  - Information Centre of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA (construction and equipment)
  - Design production and setting-up of information boards and their maintenance
  - Communication and information
  - Purchase of equipment for tagging the sea turtle and of a speed boat
  - Preliminary assessment design and deployment of underwater and terrestrial trials for diving sites and hiking itinerary
  - Set up of buoys to delimit the MPA borders
  - Repair and maintenance of existing docks.
- over the last months of project implementation, the UNDP/PCU gave priority to the activities promoting the up-scaling and replication of the project best practices. The MPA management planning approach adopted in Karaburuni-Sazani MPA was encouraged in the other priority areas of Cape of Rodoni and Porto Palermo; training material and publications were completed and widely distributed and a strategic concept note and 4 new project proposals were developed to secure proper follow up to project achievements;
- moreover, to further engage the tourism sector, a set of preliminary activities were also identified and implemented in collaboration with NAPA, RAPA and local NGOs, such as the publication of a tourist guide on the Karaburuni-Sazani area and of information tools for MPA rangers.

### 3.2.2 PARTNERSHIP ARRANGEMENTS

The UNDP/PCU has been particularly successful in networking and establishing good partnerships with a wide range of national and local actors, as well as with parallel/ongoing projects on MCPAs in Albania. The project did not confine itself to the partners defined in the original project document and a participatory approach was applied at each step of its implementation to ensure that all interested parties were fully engaged into the action.

There is general agreement among interviewed stakeholders and partners that the coordination and communication of the project were well managed: the project’s responsiveness to their needs was greatly appreciated and some mutual benefit stemming from the collaboration with UNDP was often cited by most of the interviewed partners.

The good relationship between UNDP/PCU and the National Agency for PAs (NAPA) and its regional agency in Vlorë contributed to create a positive momentum and expanding the project achievements to accelerate the operationalization of the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA.

The field project team further strengthened UNDP’s collaboration with the Municipality of Vlorë (including the former Municipality of Orikumi) and reached out to all interested groups, raising their awareness and interest in the project and the new Karaburuni-Sazani MPA.

A Letter of Agreement / Framework for project implementation was signed at the beginning of the project with the MoE (former MEFWA). Memoranda of Understanding (MoUs) or other more informal partnership agreements, outlining the nature of the collaboration, were also contracted with the following institutions and organizations:

a. NGOs and associations:

- INCA, a national association, on the development of sustainable tourism management plan of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA (within WWF’s SEA-Med project). This collaboration allowed for a greater engagement of the tourism sector in the UNDP/GEF MCPA project than what was planned in the original document. However as already stressed by the MTE the potential threats from unregulated tourism development to the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA necessitate even greater involvement of this sector to be considered in any follow up action;
- the University of Tirana (Faculty of Natural Science) and the association APAWA, on ecological assessments of Sazani island and the Karaburuni peninsula (within the Small Islands in the Mediterranean PIM Initiative of Conservatoire du Littoral);
- APAWA, in cooperation with local stakeholders in Vlorë (namely fisherman groups and local University) and the Italian organization MedReAct, on promoting fish restoration in the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA (project supported by the Waitt Foundation, USA);
- SEEP, a local NGO, on raising public awareness mainly at local level
- ECAT Tirana, an Albanian organization, on assisting with the organization of public hearing for the designation process of Cape of Rodoni as MPA;
- Blue expedition, a local association, on photo documents for the Albanian sea;
- WWF, on the development of the management plan of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA (within WWF’s SEA-Med project);
- RCRD – on training needs assessment and training curricula.

b. Relevant authorities:

- The National Agency for Protected Areas, which is the main partner in all project activities;
- The Municipality of Vlorë, which after the recent territorial reform in Albania is the local authority responsible also for Orikumi area, including the marine and terrestrial territories adjacent to the MPA. The Mayor of Vlorë is also co-opted as MB member and actively involved in project implementation;

- The Albanian National Coastal Agency, which represents the main state institution for the protection, preservation, and promotion of the coastlines in Albania. The project is cooperating on different project activities, mainly concerning the proclamation of new MPAs;
  - The Fishery Management Organization (FMO) in Vlora, which contributed to the baseline assessment and monitoring of fish abundance in Karaburuni-Sazani MPA and the monitoring of illegal activities in the area;
- c. International organizations
- UNEP/MAP RAC-SPA, which is cooperating under MedMPAnet on capacity building for preparation of the strategy to achieve Aichi targets;
  - The Conservatoire du Littoral France, which implements a program on capacity building of MPAs. It is the main actor of PIM initiative for biodiversity assessment of Sazani and Karaburuni coast. It was cooperated on preparation of the Management Plan of Sazani Island integrating with the Management Plan of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA;
  - The EU Delegation in Albanian, which is the main organiser of the Albanian Environmental Film Festival.

Since the establishment of NAPA in 2015, any partnership/collaboration on MCPAs was centrally coordinated by NAPA with which UNDP had signed a framework agreement.

As for the private sector, UNDP developed partnerships with the following two main groups:

- The fisherman group of Vlora, who has taken over the project activities that were formerly carried out by the Organisation of Management Fishery. This group actively contributed to the management planning process of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA and are still providing support with the surveying and patrolling of the MPA. There are 500 small scale vessels and nearly 1,000 persons involved in this activity. Its representative is member of the Project Board.
- Tour and Hotel Operators in the Vlora area. They have been involved in the management planning process of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA and the development of the tourism plan.

### 3.2.3 FEEDBACK FROM M&E ACTIVITIES USED FOR ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

The original project document had a clear Project Results Framework (with detailed indicators and targets) and a M&E plan, which were only marginally revised during the Inception Phase. The GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) was also included to monitor progress on increasing the management effectiveness of MCPAs in Albania, with initially data collected only for the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA. The MTE considered the M&E plan both at design and during implementation as satisfactory. However, a set of corrective actions were put forward, which were duly addressed by the UNDP/PCU through ad hoc adaptive management responses as detailed in section 3.2.1.

The TE considers that the project would have benefited from the follow two adjustments to the PRF and the M&E plan:

- the inclusion of mid-term targets, which would have facilitated the MTE;
- greater knowledge on a set of baseline data for the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA to allow for more meaningful assessment of its management effectiveness. Without a well-structured M&E plan as part of the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA management plan, it is not possible to evaluate, in a structured way, the management effectiveness over the long term. The METT approach does not allow for a deep evaluation of progresses in the management effectiveness. The introduction of two new indicators on fish stocks abundance and the level of 'awareness' amongst the community on MPAs issues came only at a later stage of project implementation (consequently to the MTE) and from anecdotal comments that 'fish stocks' were improving and that there was greater awareness as a result of this project. Both observations would have benefited from a baseline study or survey against, which improvements could have been monitored.

As detailed in section 3.2.1, the UNDP/PCU has proved capable to respond to the evolving requests of the Project Board and the MTE. It also seized any new opportunity arising throughout project implementation. Project activities and budgets were revised in a timely manner (adaptive management) to accommodate to the new queries and ensure the successful achievement of the project objectives.

### 3.2.4 PROJECT FINANCE

#### *Project expenditure*

The project budget was confirmed in the Inception phase after consultations and adjustments that were defined at the Project Steering Committee (Project Board). As the EA (MoE) requested UNDP to perform the day-to-day administrative functions of financial management procurement and recruitment the UNDP/PCU financial assistant maintained the ATLAS budgets and co-ordinated the GEF expenditure. The accounting and financial systems in place were adequate for project management and produced accurate and timely financial information as required by the M&E plan.

The project has been funded (950 000 USD) from the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area under the GEF-4 strategic Programme BD-SP2 marine PAs. The project also received cash co-financing from the Ministry of Environment (MoE) and UNDP (218 223 and 99 947USD respectively) and in-kind support.

The project has undergone two external independent audits where there were no reported significant issues.

During the MTE, at about the mid-point of the project, the overall spend was proportionate indicating that disbursements were proceeding at an appropriate rate. At January 2017, 94% of the total budget has been disbursed.

#### **Total disbursement of (cash) funds by outcomes to January, 2017 (US\$) against total project budget per donor.**

	GEF funds			Government			UNDP Albania			Total		
	Budget	Actual	%	Budget	Actual	%	Budget	Actual	%	Budget	Actual	%
Outcome 1	376 266	344 841	92%	73 849	68 275	92%	0	5 000		450 115	418 116	93%
Outcome 2	516 657	503 772	98%	103 929	76 103	73%	49 360	49 477	100%	669 946	629 353	94%
Outcome 3	93 877	94 827	101%	72 101	73 845	102%	50 910	45 470	89%	216 888	214 142	99%
<b>Total</b>	<b>986 800</b>	<b>943 440</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>249 879</b>	<b>218 223</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>100 270</b>	<b>99 947</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1 336 949</b>	<b>1 261 610</b>	<b>94%</b>

#### *Project Co-financing*

Following the recommendations of the MTE, in 2015 the UNDP/PCU started to account in detail for the ‘in kind’ contributions from the MoE, as well as from other partners. The project has been particularly successful at attracting co-financing from a variety of partners. Additional co-financing is detailed in Annex 4.

### 3.2.5 M&E: DESIGN AT ENTRY AND IMPLEMENTATION

Throughout project implementation, the UNDP/PCU has provided detailed reports to the IA and EA on a quarterly and annual basis. These included both financial reports and technical reports (quarterly annual project review and PIRs) which allowed to track the overall project progresses against its objectives outcomes and outputs. In addition, the risk logic for the project has been periodically reviewed and updated annually in ATLAS. The UNDP/PCU has also accomplished as planned the Inception phase periodic visits and meetings to the project site and the MTE.

The M&E routine monitoring and reporting have been supported by the Project Steering Committee (Project Board) chaired by the MoE and including representatives of national and local organisations and institutions. The Project

Board was finally integrated with the Management Committee of the Karaburuni- Sazani MPA further aligning the work of the project with the ambitions of the MoE for this MPA.

As planned in the project document the METT has been institutionalized as a system-level tool for measuring and monitoring management effectiveness for the national system of PAs in Albania and it is today used by NAPA on a regular basis.

Together with the rangers the local team had to report on a weekly basis and then all together on a quarterly basis in the ATLAS. For the renewal of the contract on a yearly basis the team had to go through performance evaluation.

The METT system did try to monitor project impacts in the field (at MPA level). However, the information inputted in the system are still largely subjective and the MPA staff is not yet fully capable to exploit the system properly.

Monitoring and Evaluation	TE’s rating
M&E design at entry	Satisfactory (S)
M&E Plan Implementation	Highly Satisfactory (HS)
Overall quality of M&E	Highly Satisfactory (HS)

### 3.2.6 IA IMPLEMENTATION AND EA EXECUTION

#### *UNDP implementation*

The UNDP performed its role as an Implementing Agency (IA) in an effective manner. It not only took on further administrative responsibilities (e.g., procurement, recruitment, etc.), following an official request from the MoE, but it timely addressed the concerns of the MoE and established a field project team that further enhanced the effectiveness of project implementation at site level. It also rapidly adapted to the evolving political and institutional context, proving capable to seize opportunities and expand the project reach and activities accordingly.

UNDP proved also successful in relying on lasting partnerships with international and Albanian organizations, such as WWF and INCA, to lead and realise complex technical processes, such as the management planning of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA. Due to the specificity of the competencies required and the rigidity of procurement rules and procedures, a roster of experts was established to lighten the access to short-term experts.

UNDP/PCU has been often praised for the participatory approach applied at all stages of project implementation, and for its readiness in listening to and considering comments and concerns from partners and stakeholders. UNDP reached out to key partners and interested parties to ensure that all institutions with authority on the marine and coastal areas had the opportunity to be part of the process. Through the field project team, UNDP ensured lasting and positive collaborations with the local administration and political instances at project site: it was instrumental in raising their knowledge and understanding of the area, and in engaging them in the MPA planning processes. The field project team was also successful in federating and mobilizing local associations and private actors from key economic sectors with vested interest in the area. The UNDP/PCU was also successful in associating other parallel projects run by national and international organizations and ensure that they all contributed to the effective establishment of the MPA in Karaburuni-Sazani area.

Finally, UNDP has seized the positive momentum in support to MCPAs in Albania and already secured a set of new actions that will build off of the achievements of the UNDP/GEF MCPA project, secure the financial resources and expand UNDP efforts in support to the creation of an ecologically representative network of MPAs.

The TE rates the IA implementation as **HIGHLY SATISFACTORY (HS)**.

*Ministry of Environment execution*

The Ministry of Environment has been the key driver, contributor to and beneficiary of the project’s activities. As focal point for the CBD and key reference for the EU accession process on the environmental European acquis, it had a direct interest in the successful completion of the project.

The MoE has been responsible for preparing the enabling legislative and regulatory documents produced within the project and ensuring that they were presented to the Council of Ministers for approval. Since the establishment of NAPA, it has been facilitating the establishment, staffing and resourcing of the Agency and its Regional Administrations.

In 2012, with a Minister Order (nr. 225 14.5.2012), the MoE officially established the Project Board. Based on the DCM nr. 86 (date 11.2.2005) on the establishment of the Management Committees for Protected Areas as advisory and supporting decision making bodies, the MoE established the first Management Committee for Karaburuni-Sazani MPA, with the order nr. 446, date 16.8.2012. As the Project Board had the same membership, the MoE decided to merge both structures into one. The Management Committee/ Project Board had functioned regularly as an advisory body for both the project and the new MPA. The MoE effectively presided and chaired the Management Committee/Project Board. The Management Committee/ Project Board supported decision-making processes on the project and the MPA, related mainly to project annual plan and budget approval, as well as the MPA management and administration.

In 2016, the MoE approve the updated National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan with decision no. 31, date 20.01.2016, and the management plan of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA (2016).

The representatives of the MoE interviewed demonstrated great knowledge of the project and a strong appreciation of its contribution to the MoE’s obligations vis à vis the CBD and the EU accession process. The ownership of the outcomes generated also seemed high due to the relevance of the ongoing legal reforms concerning Biodiversity and specifically the Protected Areas in Albania. Furthermore, the direct involvement of the MoE in the follow up projects, developed in collaboration with UNDP, on a national monitoring system and the sustainable financing of PAs, is clear evidence of the commitment from the part of the Ministry representatives to build off of the achievements of the UNDP/GEF MCPA project.

The TE rates the EA execution as **HIGHLY SATISFACTORY (HS)**.

IA& EA Execution	TE’s rating
Quality of IA Implementation	Highly Satisfactory (HS)
Quality of EA execution	Highly Satisfactory (HS)
Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	Highly Satisfactory (HS)

**3.3 PROJECT RESULTS**

The Terminal Evaluation of project results is structured around the following GEF five major evaluation criteria (which are also the five internationally-accepted evaluation criteria set out by the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development):

- *Relevance* relates to an overall assessment of whether the project is in keeping with its design and in addressing the key priorities to ensure that the obligations under the relevant UN Conventions are met and in keeping with the donors and partner policies, as well as with local needs and priorities.

- *Effectiveness* is a measure of the extent to which formally agreed outcomes have been achieved, or can be expected to be achieved.
- *Efficiency* is a measure of the productivity of the project intervention process, i.e. to what degree the outcomes achieved derive from efficient use of financial, human and material resources. In principle, it means comparing outcomes and outputs against inputs.
- *Results/Impacts* are the long-term results of the project and include both positive and negative consequences, whether these are foreseen and expected, or not.
- *Sustainability* is an indication of whether the outcomes (end of project results) and the positive impacts (long term results) are likely to continue after the project ends.

### 3.3.1 ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVES

The project has marked progress towards the achievement of the long-term objective of improving the coverage and management effectiveness of Albania's marine and coastal protected areas (MCPAs), by supporting and promoting:

- ✓ the establishment of a clear institutional and legal framework for MCPA designation and management;
- ✓ the identification of priority marine and coastal areas to be protected and the advancement in the designation process of two areas as MPAs, allowing the Government of Albania to progress towards meeting its commitment vis à vis the CBD's PoWPA/Aichi Targets;
- ✓ the establishment and development/operationalization of the first MPA in Albania, as a model standard for future MCPAs;
- ✓ the building of institutional capacity and the awareness about the values and benefits of the MCPA in Albania.

Partner and stakeholder reflections on the project indicate success in terms of the participatory process to create a model Karaburuni-Sazani MPA. There is strong interest in replicating this model and expanding it to an ecologically representative network of MCPAs, starting with Porto Palermo MPA and Cape of Rodoni MPA. For this to be a truly replicable model, lessons learned and best practices should be well documented and made easily accessible.

Despite the many successes, many of the barriers identified at the beginning of the project could not be fully removed, yet they are key for MPAs and any other resource management efforts, to realizing successful conservation benefits. These are:

#### c) *Poor bio-geographical representation of marine biodiversity.*

- Albania has almost reached the 6% target of marine areas protected as required by the CBD/Aichi target: however, the identified MCPAs system in the SPMCPA is not ecologically representative nor fully implemented;
- good and reliable scientific data on species and habitats of concern are still scarce: data are not yet centrally and systematically recorded and processed for management purposes;
- monitoring of environmental indicators is still fragmented and poorly managed;
- the first and only MPA in Albania, Karaburuni-Sazani Marine National Park, is still far from being an exemplary model for future MPAs;
- despite an increased interest in coastal and marine areas among Albanians, the understanding of these fragile ecosystems is still limited and the negative impacts of human activities ignored;

#### d) *Weak institutional framework for marine and coastal PA governance and poor capacities at institutional and individual levels.*

- cross-sectorial dialogue has not been effectively established: no national platform exists to address conflicts among sectors related to conservation and socio-economic development;

- inter-institutional coordination is still limited and undermining the possibility to effectively address the complex interactions between human activities and coastal and marine ecosystems;
- short-term profits are still the main driver of most of the investments along the Albanian coast, particularly in the tourism and real estate sectors;
- despite being recognized as an emerging tourist destination, Albania is still unprepared to host international visitors and provide them with quality tourism services and infrastructures;
- human resources and capacities of relevant institutions and administrations are still largely insufficient to ensure effective MCPA management;
- high turnover rates at all governance level, particularly following political elections, impede PA staff capacity building and undermine the sustainability of any conservation efforts;
- financial resources for marine and coastal resource management are still limited and largely dependent on state budget and international projects donors.

This TE rates the achievement of project objectives and outcomes as **SATISFACTORY**.

A detailed analysis of project progresses against its outcomes and outputs follows.

### **Outcome 1: Improved bio-geographical representation of MCPAs.**

#### Output 1.1

*Support to revision of National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan for 2020 (Strategic Plan for Marine and Coastal Protected Areas - SPMCPA).*

To avoid duplications and fragmentations of national plans, a comprehensive Strategic Plan for Albania's Marine and Coastal Protected Areas<sup>10</sup> (SPMCPA) was developed, outlining a ten-year strategy for enhancing coverage and management effectiveness of MCPAs system. The SPMCPA was integrated to the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), which was originally developed in 1999 and recently revised to respond to the Albanian Government's commitments to the CBD/Aichi Targets and EU policies. The final document was approved by the Government DCM No 31, date 20.01.2016, and delivered to the Convention of Biodiversity. By-laws and regulations necessary for effective management and enforcement of MCPAs were also developed.

The National Agency of Protected Areas (NAPA) has operationalized the SPMCPA through the development of a "Short- and mid-term Strategic Program" (2015-2020) outlining NAPA's vision, goal, objectives and priority actions for the next 5 years.

Two additional MPAs are under consideration, namely Porto Palermo and Cape of Rodoni, and preliminary assessments and habitat maps were completed in the other priority areas identified in SPMCPA. The Natural Park status is foreseen for Porto Palermo for a surface of 2,067.75 ha (under proclamation process).

The establishment of the National Agency for Protected Areas (NAPA)<sup>11</sup> has been the most important institutional development over the course of project implementation. NAPA has the status of a General Directorate in the MoE

---

<sup>10</sup> INCA 2013 "Strategic Plan for Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (SPMCPAs)" developed with the support of UNDP in the frame of the Project "Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas".

<sup>11</sup> The Government of Albania gazetted a 'Decision on establishing and organisation and functioning of the national agency for protected areas and regional administration for protected areas'. The Decision (No. 102, dated 4/2/2015) envisaged the establishment of a National Agency of Protected Areas (NAPA) as a public state budgeted entity subordinate to the Ministry of Environment (MoE). MoE established as well the National Environment Agency and the National Environment Inspectorate and their regional branches.

and is organised with Regional Protected Area Administrations (RAPA) at the regional level. The first General Director of NAPA and key staff were appointed in February 2015. The agency currently employs approximately 200 staff, including support and logistic staff, and it is rapidly expanding. Both the central office and the regional branches will have conservation management and monitoring functions as well as legal, financial management and communications capacity. NAPA is a state budget dependent institution but it is empowered to supplement its budget through donations as well as other legal sources of income such as generating revenue through providing services to third parties.

The UNDP/PCU did establish a trustful partnership with NAPA, which benefitted the agency and its regional administrations, as well as the project implementation.

The Forestry management funds and roles were also decentralized on January 1st, 2016. Forestry is now under the jurisdiction of the new 61 municipalities. This provides an environment that enables co-management approaches for protected areas and habitat management at the local level.

Finally, a National Coastal Agency was established in January of 2014 with the mission to protect, preserve, and promote the coastlines in Albania. The agency’s projects include the sustainable development of Albania’s beaches, as well as increased infrastructure for the promotion of research on both Albania’s coasts and biggest island, Sazani. It is housed under the Ministry of Economy, Tourism, Trade, and Entrepreneurship of Albania. However, despite UNDP/PCU’s efforts, the National Coastal Agency has never actively contributed to the project.

#### Output 1.2 Building Karaburuni-Sazani MPA Administration capacities.

In 2010, the Albanian government established the marine area near Karaburuni peninsula and Sazani island as MPA. The Project’s Outputs were adapted accordingly to support the government in building the capacity of the MoE and of the local authorities responsible for MPA management, i.e. Regional Forestry Directorate in Vlora, the Municipality of Orkumi. Since its creation in 2015, the Project has invested in building the capacity of the new National Agency for PAs and specifically of its Regional Administration in Vlora.

The UNDP project provided technical support to the MoE in the definition of the new MPA management structure, roles and responsibilities of key personnel, and in the establishment and operationalization of the Administration unit for Karaburuni-Sazani MPA. A new “Law on Protected Areas” has been drafted, building on the lessons from the project and, specifically, on the experience in Karaburuni- Sazani MPA, and is in the process of being approved by the MoE. The new law addresses the following concerns:

- The use of terminology should be clear, easily understood by all stakeholders, and reflecting the objectives of MPAs
- The legal instrument should provide for the drafting of the management plan and the business plan of the MPA and for its inclusion in the national development strategy
- Public participation should have an important part in the legal instrument
- Compensation requirements and process should be estimated and provided before the adoption of the legal instrument, if the need for such compensation arises
- Clear competencies among the involved institutions should be provided
- Coordination issues should be clear and well defined
- Supremacy of different pieces of legislation should be provided in the legal instrument establishing the MPA
- International principles, commitments and obligations should be taken into consideration
- Penalties and enforcement provisions should have an important place in the legal instrument, and, in addition should be clear and effective
- Financial resources need to be clearly defined and included in the legal instrument before its adoption

Management Committees have been established by MoE for all PAs in Albania. The Management Committee of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA was integrated to the Project Board and gathered one or twice a year since its establishment.

Since the establishment of NAPA and the recruitment of the staff of the Regional Administration in Vlora, the project has provided ongoing technical and financial support to the management, administration and enforcement functions, as well as the basic equipment, including a vessel, 6 rangers and an Information Centre.

*Output 1.3 Buffer zones for the MPA is identified and demarcated and management actions integrated into MPA and local development plan.*

The project provided financial and technical support to the development of the Management Plan of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA. A fully participatory process was adopted and lessons learned, recommendations and best practices fed into relevant by-laws and regulations.

The project has also reviewed the buffer zones for all 9 MCPAs in Albania and produced guidelines for buffer zones management, integrating climate change direct and indirect impacts on PAs.

Capacity building activities, including ‘training of trainers’, were performed in support to the management planning process.

***Outcome 2: Improved management arrangements for MCPAs based on clear institutional responsibilities and development of capacities.***

*Output 2.1 Cross-Sectoral Forum on Protected Area management is created.*

A *Cross-sectoral Forum*, which was conceived as an advisory body bringing together key sectors and institutions (e.g., fisheries, agriculture, tourism, physical planning), protected area site managers, NGOs, and representatives of the main user groups, has not been established. It was proposed to avoid confusion and duplication of tasks and duties among administrations with authority on the coastal and marine areas, as well as to address and minimize current or future inter-sectoral conflicts. The project was supposed to support the Forum by focusing initially on the effective management of MCPAs and then gradually expand it to cover all Albanian PAs. The Forum was also meant to raise awareness on MCPAs in Albania.

Instead, the Project Board was integrated into the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA Management Committee, which was established by Ministerial order in 2015, and considered as a first step towards inter-sectoral coordination. The UNDP/PCU invited all relevant stakeholder groups, such as the Ministry of Agriculture and relevant Fisheries Directorates (Fisheries Policies Directorate + Control/Monitoring/Services Directorate), the National Federation of Fishermen, fisheries management organizations (FMO), the Ministry of Urban Development, the Agency for territorial planning, the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Economic Development, Tourism, amongst others, to be part of the Steering Committee. However, not all Ministries and agencies and sectors did attend it. The Committee did take over some of the functions planned for the Forum and did deliver in the Vlora district. However, as important decisions could be taken only at central level (Ministerial level), it proved less effective than the intended Forum in addressing conflicts and MCPA management issues.

NAPA is mandated to establish MPA Management Committee in each PA. These are currently only advisory bodies. The plan is to transform them into decision-making bodies. However, as these last years have seen too many

changes at political, governance and territorial level, this transition might not be pursued soon. In 2016, NAPA has also established a Coordination Forum involving all donors and projects on PAs in Albania.

Tough several of the functions of the Cross-sectorial Forum have been taken over by NAPA and the Steering Committee, the project missed the opportunity to ensure the inter-sectorial and inter-ministerial dialogue that is at the basis of effective management of MCPAs. To build on the success of the Steering Committee and move it to another stage, the organization and facilitation of its meetings need to be ensured after the project end.

*Output 2.2 System for joint surveillance and monitoring of the network of MCPAs to track biodiversity impacts and management effectiveness is piloted.*

The project aimed originally to assist Karaburuni-Sazani MPA implementing the MCPA monitoring system developed under *Output 1.1*. In its place, the METT, which was originally used to monitor project results and impacts, was adapted, systematized into an online platform (<http://www.mett-undp.al>) and adopted by the MoE to monitoring and evaluating PAs management effectiveness. Progresses in METT scores have been assessed annually starting from end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of the project onward.

During the PPG phase, the METT was only completed for the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA pilot site to determine baseline and target METT scores. METT score for Karaburuni-Sazani moved from 17% at project outset to 61% in 2016, showcasing the effectiveness of project activities at site level.

UNDP succeeded to have the MoE /NAPA applying METT as an operational tool for monitoring the national system of PAs and have it further improved with additional indicators. The platform is now used by other initiatives, such as the NATURA 200 project, and further enriched with information and reporting entries pertinent to visitor survey, illegal activities, nature and culture monument.

Key equipment (speed boat, buoys, ranger uniforms etc.) was purchased to boost patrolling and field observations in Karaburuni-Sazani MPA. This will strongly contribute to the successful establishment of the park administration and will enhance the monitoring activities in the area. Six rangers have been also secured by the project to patrol the MPA on a regular basis, report on illegal activities, contribute to awareness raising and the protection of forests in the coastal area. Joint patrolling missions are conducted periodically with the participation of Guard Coast Delta force (border policy) and other inspection bodies. However, no system of joint surveillance has been yet conceived.

*Output 2.3 Technical extension services for site managers on cost-effective management and conservation approaches.*

A set of training modules on management of MCPAs were developed by the project to build the capacities and skills of managers for effective MCPA management. Topics considered included:

- marine biodiversity conservation measures and monitoring of impacts on biodiversity
- PA management planning
- PA business planning (including issues such as building relations with donors and the private sector, understanding of intra-governmental roles and responsibilities, identification, marketing and implementation of new revenue generation opportunities, reducing costs of PA management),
- Ecotourism
- Ecological education for general public
- Setting and running participatory PA Management Boards,
- Use of the METT, and
- Approaches to conflict resolution.

The modules were conceived to address the main CB needs identified in the PPG phase and delivered through seminars and workshops. About 10 central level staff of the MoE (former MEFWA) and 15 site managers of all MCPAs and 20 representatives of the Regional Environmental Agencies were trained.

A Manual on Training on Integrated Management of MCPAs was published as a reference for MCPA managers and practitioners in Albania. A guide for the MPA rangers was also developed and published.

Since its establishment, NAPA has been centralising and coordinating the extension service program for all PAs in Albania. It has been collaborating with local authorities, namely municipalities, which have absorbed the former forestry services into their departments, to review the existing program and secure the necessary capacity and knowledge to site managers for effective PA management.

Output 2.4 Management and business planning demonstrated at the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA.

The Management Plan for Karaburun-Sazani MPA was developed through participatory process and approved by the MoE through the decree nr. 750, date 24.11.2015. The conceptual model of the management plan was widely and carefully discussed with a wide range of stakeholders and user groups to ensure ownership and buy-in.

A Financial Plan (FP) was also developed following the same approach, including an assessment of the market and non-market based mechanisms to meet the MPA funding needs.

An economic valuation of the critical marine ecosystem services delivered by Karaburuni-Sazani MPA was carried out as a baseline study to the definition of a long-term strategy to finance the Albanian MCPAs network. The results of the evaluation should contribute to the strengthening of local decision-makers and local stakeholders' buy-in to the MPA. It should also facilitate the implementation of specific management actions, the selection of the most relevant financial tools for the MPA and the enhancement of its management effectiveness.

Following the official approval of the Management Plan of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA, the project started the implementation of high priority and visible actions identified during the consultative process. Specifically, the following actions will be implemented before the end of the project in 2016:

- Information Centre of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA (construction and equipment)
- Design, production and setting-up of information boards and their maintenance
- Communication and information
- Preliminary assessment, design and deployment of underwater and terrestrial trails for diving sites and hiking itinerary
- Set up of buoys to delimit the MPA borders
- Repair and maintenance of existing docks.

A guidance document on how to elaborate a management and business plan for a MCPA was produced and lessons emerging from the development of the Management and Business Plan for Karaburuni-Sazani were integrated into the extension services program under Output 2.3.

In addition to those, the UNDP/PCU conceived and hired expertise on Ecosystem Services Valuation (ESV) for the MCPA. For that purpose, training on ESV and its application to MCPA were provided for local stakeholders

RAPA in Vlora is today responsible for the daily implementation of the Management and Financial Plans of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA, under the supervision and guidance of the MPA Management Committee.

Significant branding, communication and public awareness was achieved through the production and publication of the MPA Karaburun-Sazan photo album “The treasures of the two seas”. It was also accompanied with other efforts and achievements such as the enrichment and update of the project website <http://mcpa.iwlearn.org>, the production of communications tools and publications, celebrating the WWD and WED, delivering locally and nationally MCPA publicity and information materials. The project did also succeed to establish and made operational a very attractive CEPA with significantly improved branding, corporate identity tools (communication and public awareness, website, publication, eco-informative-touristic application iVlora and info kiosks erected both with local authority premises and with the Information Centre of the MCPA for the wider public and visitors).

The project did not achieve the following expected target values:

- The status of *Posidonia* beds and of medio and infralittoral communities (mainly focus on species richness and abundance of species of international concern) along Karaburuni-Sazani and the Ionian coast of Albania has not been monitored due to technical and resources limitations. Two new indicators were suggested by the project’s Mid-term Evaluation:
  - A baseline understanding of the fish resources of K-S MPA.
  - Awareness of inhabitants and stakeholders adjacent to the MPA (and countrywide) of marine biological diversity values

The rating of project’s achievements against the Objectively Verifiable Indicators of the Project Results Framework can be found in Annex 7.

### 3.3.2 RELEVANCE

#### *Relevance for the Government of Albania*

The project was originally developed by UNDP to respond to the needs and priorities of the MoE and key stakeholders (such as the former Municipality of Orikumi) directly involved in MCPAs designation and management in Albania. In 2009, MCPA development was one of the key priorities of the Government of Albania, which intended 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 were conceived to contribute to the shaping of policies and legal instruments aimed at the expansion and improvement of the national system of MCPAs and the strengthening of the MCPAs administrative capacity.

To fulfil Albanian Government’s commitment to the COP 10 decision<sup>12</sup> on Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its obligations under the SAA, the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP 2012 – 2020), which was first prepared in 1999, needed to be revised to fully incorporate the Aichi targets and EU policies with a special focus on increasing the marine PA coverage. To this end, a Strategic Plan for Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (SPMCPA) was developed by the Project, approved by the Council of Ministries in 2015 and fully integrated into the NBSAP. The NBSAP is the main strategic document guiding the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity requirements in Albania.

---

<sup>12</sup> Decision X/2 of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention of Biological Diversity (CBD), to which Albania is a party, adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the associated Aichi biodiversity targets. In the same decision, the COP urged Parties and other Governments to develop national and regional targets, using the Strategic Plan as a flexible framework, and to review, update and revise, as appropriate, their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAP) in line with the Strategic Plan and the guidance adopted in CBD Decision IX/9. The COP also urged Parties and other governments to support the updating of NBSAP as effective instruments to promote the implementation of the Strategic Plan and to use the revised and updated NBSAP as effective policy instruments for the integration of biodiversity targets into national development and poverty reduction policies and strategies, national accounting, economic sectors and spatial planning processes.

Negotiations with the European Union raised the issue of the capacity of the MoE to manage the protected area system and the future demands associated with the establishment and administration of a Natura 2000 network. Consequently, in 2015, the Government of Albania gazetted a ‘*Decision on establishing and organisation and functioning of the national agency for protected areas and regional administration for protected areas*’. The Decision (No. 102, dated 4/2/2015) envisaged the establishment of a *National Agency of Protected Areas (NAPA)* as a public state budgeted entity subordinate to the Ministry of Environment (MoE). MoE established as well the National Environment Agency and the National Environment Inspectorate and their regional branches. The project helped building the administrative capacity of NAPA and its Regional Administrations, as well as local institutions and administrations (particularly, within the Municipality of Vlora) with responsibility on the management of coastal and marine areas.

The project has also contributed to advance the legal and policy framework for the effective conservation of marine and coastal biodiversity in Albania. Major institutional changes, following the national election and the Administrative and Territorial reform in 2015, have further contributed to the removal of systemic and regulatory barriers. In 2014, the “Law on biodiversity” was revised establishing the legal framework for the establishment of a Natura 2000 network in Albania. Consecutively, the “Law on Protected Areas” (N. 8906 of 2002, as amended), which establishes the legal context for the declaration, conservation, administration, management and use of the protected areas, was also revised with the assistance of the Project to integrate the findings of an in-depth review of all legal acts pertinent to environment conservation and management, possible MCPA management and financing models and mechanisms. The new Law is still waiting final approval from the Ministry of Environment and the Council of Ministries.

Since the first Marine Protected Areas (Karaburun-Sazani) was declared, through a Decision of Council of Ministers no. 289 date 28 April 2010, the Project has contributed in shaping the legal instrument to be used as a model for future MPAs in Albania, building its management capacity and ensuring its operationalization.

In regards to the major threats identified in the beginning of the project, they remain much as they were at that time, with some pressures increasing particularly in the coastal zone. The project put little emphasis on directly addressing these threats, although the awareness of these threats in general does appear to have increased as a result of the project.

The most clearly defined barrier throughout this assessment continues to be the lack of inter and intra-institutional coordination and collaboration. Additionally, other institutional/operational issues such as the need for identifying sustainable financing mechanisms from within the government, remain unresolved. There is also a need to move from stakeholder-based advisory bodies to decision-making bodies for MPAs. And finally, a general need to improve the capacity of individuals and institutions.

Through strategic partnerships and active engagement of all stakeholder groups, UNDP has maximized complementary and synergistic relationships with other national, local and international projects and helped creating a positive momentum in support to MCPAs in Albania. Most of the project partners and stakeholders concurred that it is important to build off of the accomplishments to date by expanding efforts to create an ecologically representative network of MPAs; securing enough financial resources to the network of MCPAS; address uses and user conflicts across the entire coastal and marine environment in Vlora Bay; and addressing human uses and associated impacts occurring in upland areas of the watershed that are impacting the coastal and marine environment. These priority future actions have been taken into consideration by UNDP in the drafting of new project proposals.

*Relevance to GEF policy*

The project contributed significantly to meeting the targets of the GEF Focal Area Strategy’s Strategic Objective 1 (SO-1), Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at national levels/ Strategic Priority 2: Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems. GEF remains the main donor for marine conservation projects in Albania.

Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes and Indicators:

Increase in surface coverage of marine protected areas within the national protected area system that enhances marine ecosystem representation (Increase in coverage of MPAs by at least 12570.82 hectares)

Enhanced management effectiveness of the new MPA and existing 9 coastal PAs as measured by METT (Achievement of METT target scores for Karaburuni-Sazani MPA and for the existing 9 coastal PAs).

This TE considers this project as **RELEVANT**.

### 3.3.3 EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY

#### *Efficiency*

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) in January 2011. The project became operational in March 2011 with the anticipated completion date of April 2016.

The project had an inception phase of about six months involving large consultations with stakeholders that culminated in an Inception Workshop and the delivery of the Inception Report. 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 MoE and other key stakeholders.

At the project outset, EA (MoE) requested that UNDP (as the IA) undertake key administrative functions on its behalf (specifically: the PCU, recruitment and procurement).

The administrative functions, the process of initiating the project, and the yearly implementation of the project activities have been executed efficiently. The project was terminated with an 8-month delay, which is acceptable for a 5-year project.

Following two external audits, the general finding is that expenditures were adequate and the procurement procedures were followed properly. The project relied mostly on national and local experts and organizations. International experts were contracted only when local expertise was not available.

The TE rates the project efficiency as **HIGHLY SATISFACTORY**.

#### *Effectiveness*

The effectiveness of a project can be evaluated by considering how well the project has achieved its expected outcomes. The effectiveness of the project was praised by many of the stakeholders interviewed during the MTE and the TE.

As already analysed in section 3.3.1, the project has been implemented effectively to the satisfaction of the national and local stakeholders.

The TE rates the project effectiveness as **HIGHLY SATISFACTORY**.

### 3.3.4 COUNTRY OWNERSHIP

As stated in previous sections, the UNDP/PCU has adopted a highly participatory approach at all levels of project management: this greatly contributed to boosting stakeholders' ownership to the project. The relevance of the action to the Government of Albania (show-cased in the section above), coupled with the high level of participation to the project design and implementation of the MoE and key interested groups, further helped enhancing stakeholders' buy-in. Interviewed stakeholders felt as benefitting from the project, actively contributing to its achievements and that their views and concerns were duly taken into consideration, as a result of the openness and responsiveness of the UNDP/PCU.

### 3.3.5 MAINSTREAMING

#### Climate Change

Climate change was identified in the Project Document as a factor that impacts the health of Albania's coastal and marine biodiversity. However, the document also acknowledged that the impacts from climate change were not easy to measure in Albania, mainly due to the lack of historical data and inappropriate evidence for enabling accurate statistic elaborations. During the Inception Phase, a new risk assumption was integrated to the project associated to climate change impacts to the marine and coastal ecosystems and a mitigation strategy developed accordingly (pls. also refer to comments on climate change risk as explained at risks table at page 20).

#### Gender Issues

The project worked (as expected in the Project Document) to consider gender issues in general terms (for example on the Project Steering Committee), but did not specifically target gender concerns within project activities. However, each project activity did involve women, as a very important target groups (e.g. any public awareness campaign was organised with the active involvement of young girls, teachers, etc.)

#### Stakeholder Engagement

The project did duly and successfully address the principles of inclusiveness of all stakeholders.

### 3.3.6 SUSTAINABILITY

As set out by the Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects, *"sustainability is generally considered to be the likelihood of continued benefits after the project ends"*.

As with most GEF actions, the ability of countries to support the activities, post-project, is undermined by a wide range of institutional, political, financial and environmental risks.

#### Institutional Sustainability

The project came on the heels of the POWPA project, which made important strides in terms of building foundational capacities for ecological gap assessment for the PA system, building a knowledge base on MCPAs, and starting a policy dialogue on the enabling environment for MCPAs. Thus, some awareness among key institutions and other stakeholders was already there. However, required competencies (experience levels, skills and knowledge base) have never been identified at the various levels of government to designate and effectively manage MCPAs. And, as mentioned above in the barriers, institutional stability is still under construction at different levels of government.

At the NAPA and RAPA level, new staff dedicated to MCPAs has been hired, often coming from the project itself, and a strong commitment has been made to developing their capacity, through the MCPA project and other donor actions. To date, NAPA is still missing a comprehensive capacity building program (CB) for its staff built on an analysis of existing capacity and CB needs. Most of the staff of NAPA and RAPA is not civil servant.

At site level, the local institutions, Municipalities, Environmental Directorate, etc., have insufficient resources (financial, equipment and trained personnel) to support the expectations of a MPA administration as presently configured. The project provided significant training in the form of workshops for technical and managerial issues, and supported delegates on study tours to Croatia and France. The project provided capacity development and awareness raising support for the local and communities and representatives of the private sector (tourism, fisheries, etc.). They offer the potential, through small-scale support, to assist with the maintenance of the MPA awareness and information activities.

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 supported obligations / expectations to both these processes, particularly through the updating, and approval by the MoE, of the National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan, which was delivered to the CBD Secretariat in 2016. Moreover, the actual EU approximation process in Albania represents a strategic opportunity to consolidate a sustainable partnership between national and local authorities in resource and ecosystem management.

Financial Sustainability

Whether funds are appropriated through the MoE and/ or there is the use of a trust fund mechanism, financial sustainability continues to be a challenge for MCPAs in Albania. It is not apparent from the information collected from project partners that there is any secured plan in place for committed funding and/ or developing an income generation scheme for the MCPA system. The UNDP/GEF “Enhancing financial sustainability of the protected area system in Albania” project was conceived to address the financial sustainability of system of PAs in Albania and includes pilot actions targeting the PA complex of Llogara-Karaburuni-Sazani. However, as mentioned above in regards to Institutional Sustainability, at the MoE level, the “Law on PAs” has not declared a commitment to appropriate funding for MPAs (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) more work is needed by all to identify sustainable funding arrangements for the MPA (administration and maintenance).

Environmental Sustainability

Environmental sustainability is built into the same concept of an MCPA: by removing anthropogenic pressures (unsustainable fishing infrastructure development), well-designed and managed MCPA should increase the productivity and resilience of the protected marine and coastal ecosystems, with positive spill overs to neighbouring areas. The Karaburuni-Sazani MPA is in a too early stage of development for it to deliver on this objective and the other identified priority areas have not being gazetted yet. Moreover, the project did not directly address the main drivers to changes in coastal and marine ecosystems (namely, unregulated tourism and urban development and unsustainable harvest of natural resources): they are still relevant today and new ones (e.g. cruise, on-shore O&G drilling, recreational fishing) are emerging at an alarming pace, further reducing the resilience of these areas to climate change. However, the basis for the environmental sustainability have been laid out by taking important steps forward in ensuring a more effective management of priority coastal and marine areas.

Sustainability	rating
Political Sustainability:	LIKELY
Financial Sustainability:	MODERATELY LIKELY
Institutional Sustainability:	LIKELY
Environmental Sustainability:	LIKELY

### 3.3.7 IMPACT

The impact of environmental projects is difficult to discern since impact is a fundamental and durable change in the condition of people and their environment brought about by the project and environmental impact almost never can be verified earlier than 4 years after the completion of a project. This holds particularly true for the UNDP/GEF MCPA project as no baseline data exist to effectively monitor and evaluate the impacts of the changes in the governance and management of MCPAs brought about by the project. The TE can exclusively consider whether the project has managed to remove the barriers targeted by the project. In this sense, there is evidence that the impact should lead to reduced environmental stress and improved ecological status in the future.

As stated in the previous sections, the project proved instrumental in assisting the Government of Albania, the MoE and all relevant partners, creating the enabling environment for MCPAs to be more effectively designated and managed.

The interest, ownership and knowledge of the stakeholders within the sector and at the project site were also raised to continue implementation from where the project ends. There seems to be also no question that all the partners who provided input feel that the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA is an exemplary and replicable model. However, except for the project reports, there seems to be no documentation on lessons learned or best management practices (BMPs). There is also some question on whether the project partners actually have the capacity to apply the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA to other sites.

Interviewed stakeholders have also reported anecdotal examples of project impacts, such as:

- ✓ The establishment of the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA, and particularly the development of its management plan through participatory process, prevent the establishment of new aquaculture infrastructures in the Vlorë bay
- ✓ The clear demarcation of the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA (on land and at sea), the presence of the rangers with uniforms and the Information Centre help the area become a reality for local community and tourists and act as a deterrent to illegal activities
- ✓ Increase in fish resources
- ✓ Decrease in illegal fishing, especially using explosives
- ✓ Improved awareness of ecosystem concerns, fish resources, MPAs within communities
- ✓ All local stakeholders interviewed agreed on that the trainings received and the planning process they contributed to were a benefit to the ‘general management’ of the local environment.

The TE considers the overall project impact as being **SIGNIFICANT**.

## 4 CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS

### 4.1 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

The project was well designed and considered the priorities expressed by the Ministry of Environment and local stakeholders. It contributed to Albania’s obligations under the CBD and assisted with the EU accession process on PAs and marine conservation. The relevance of this project to Albania has been consequentially high and the execution professionally undertaken. All the stakeholders referred to the interactive and responsive nature of the UNDP/PCU. Their willingness to engage all interested parties, seek synergies with parallel actions and 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 adhered to the M&E plan presented in the Project Document and utilised the Project Results Framework, and particularly the indicators/targets, daily to manage the project execution. In 2015, the Project Steering Committee (Project Board) merged with the Management Committee overseeing the first Albanian Karaburuni-Sazani MPA and this was considered by all as beneficial and leading to improved efficiency in project implementation and the management of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA.

One of the major contributions of UNDP/GEF MCPA project has been to advance the legal and policy framework for the effective conservation of marine and coastal biodiversity in Albania. Major institutional changes, following the national election and the Administrative and Territorial reform in 2015, have further contributed to the removal of systemic and regulatory barriers.

The commitment of the Government of Albania to improve the national system of PAs was renewed in 2015 with the establishment of a *National Agency of Protected Areas (NAPA)*, as a public entity subordinate to the MoE. Since then, NAPA and its Regional Protected Area Administrations (RAPA) have become the main project partner and have secured the administrative capacity to the first Albanian MPA of Karaburuni-Sazani. Moreover, the following strategic documents developed through the project were duly considered by the MoE:

- i) the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP 2012 – 2020) was revised to fully incorporate the Aichi targets and EU policies with a special focus on increasing the marine PA coverage. To this end, a Strategic Plan for Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (SPMCPA) was developed, approved by the Council of Ministries in 2015 and fully integrated into the NBSAP;
- ii) the “Law on Protected Areas” (N. 8906 of 2002, as amended), which establishes the legal context for the declaration, conservation, administration, management and use of the protected areas, was revised to integrate the findings of an in-depth review of all legal acts pertinent to environment conservation and management, possible MCPA management and financing models and mechanisms. The new Law is still waiting final approval from the MoE and the Council of Ministries;
- iii) the management plan of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA was approved in 2016.

Interviewed stakeholders (including the MoE) had positive statements about the project (and the need for this intervention), the method of execution (highly participatory and adaptive) and the project staff (both the PCU based in Tirana and the local project office). They particularly praised the project contribution to:

- ✓ creating the enabling environment to MCPA designation and management;
- ✓ establishing the first MPA in Albania and make it operational;
- ✓ enhancing PA management and monitoring;
- ✓ improving the understanding and enhancing the awareness on the role and values of MCPA among local

- communities, tourists and the public in the Vlora region;
- ✓ starting a platform for inter-sectoral dialogue on coastal and marine areas management;
- ✓ ensuring coordination and cooperation among organizations, projects and administrations dealing with coastal and marine management;
- ✓ changing the image of Vlora bay, which is today perceived as a natural hotspot in Albania.

Sustainability at all levels will continue to be a challenge, as with most GEF projects. The Project recognised this from the beginning and devoted significant resources to capacity development to ensure adequacy of skilled staff and by investigating financial and institutional mechanisms to sustain the MPA administration.

Finally, the main drivers that are causing changes in coastal and marine ecosystems described in the UNDP/GEF MCPA project, that is unregulated tourism and urban development, unsustainable harvest of natural resources and climate change, are still relevant and new ones (e.g., cruise, on-shore O&G drilling, recreational fishing) are emerging at an alarming pace. To best address these mounting sources of pressures, it is important to build off of all accomplishments to date by expanding efforts to create a truly ecologically representative network of MPAs; to address uses and user conflicts across the entire coastal and marine environment, starting from the Vlora Bay; and to address human uses and associated impacts occurring in upland areas of the watersheds that are impacting the coastal and marine environment.

#### 4.1.1 TE RATINGS

The ToR for this assignment 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	HS
Overall quality of M&E	HS
Relevance	RELEVANT
Effectiveness	HS
Efficiency	HS
Overall Project Outcome	HS
Quality of UNDP Implementation	HS
Quality of Execution – EA	HS
Overall quality of implementation / execution	HS
Financial Sustainability	ML
Socio-political Sustainability	L
Institutional Sustainability	L
Environmental Sustainability	L
Overall likelihood of sustainability	L
Overall Rating	HS

## 4.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

### 4.2.1 CORRECTIVE ACTIONS FOR THE DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION AND M&E OF THE PROJECT

As the project is officially terminated, no corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project can be further suggested. However, the evaluator would like to recall the effective response of the UNDP/PCU to the few corrective actions that were requested during the MTE in 2014:

- two indicators/targets (the status of seagrass *Posidonia oceanica* and the medio and infralittoral communities) were changed. Since the MTE, the baseline understanding of the fish resources of the MPA and the level of awareness on environment issues within the population adjacent to the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA have been measured and monitored instead, providing useful baseline data to monitor the conservation impacts of the project;
- the project spend to-date or the budget for each year was regularly presented to the Project Board /Steering Committee meetings, and a record was attached to the minutes of the meetings, allowing for effective monitoring of project implementation.

Moreover, to ensure a quick operationalization of the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA to the benefit of local communities and the environment, the project provided to Regional Administration (RAPA) in Vlora: i) a surveillance vessel to patrol the area, together with the basic equipment for the MPA rangers and staff for both data collection and illegal activities detection, ii) ad hoc training to MPA rangers and staff, iii) a system of buoys to demarcate the MPA boundaries, iv) information panels installed in Vlora, Orikumi and along the coast adjacent to the MPA and other communications material on the MPA, v) terrestrial trails traced on Karaburuni peninsula, and an underwater trail within the MPA waters. More recently, the UNDP/PCU allocated the remaining funds to contribute to the construction and equipment of the first Information Centre of the MPA. A call for interest has been also launched for local NGOs to manage the Information Centre during a 4-months period, and quickly build a professional image of the Centre. RAPA will ensure the institutional functioning of the entire office, while being trained on the concept and management of an Information Centre. It is important that NAPA and RAPA quickly take the lead in the management of the Information Centre to ensure that they are recognized as the main institution responsible for MPCA management. To this end, it is strongly recommended that RAPA's office in Vlora is transferred into the Information Centre to further the link between the MPA and its administrative body and enhance RAPA's visibility.

#### 4.2.2 ACTIONS TO FOLLOW-UP OR REINFORCE INITIAL BENEFITS FROM THE PROJECT

The UNDP/PCU proved particularly effective in addressing in a timely manner the following issues that were recognized during the MTE as priority actions that could reinforce the initial benefits from the project:

- The capacity of the project to attract 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). Since the MTE, information on these additional contributions have been duly recorded. This helped to substantiate the interest in the project and its capacity to federate and maximize synergies similar actions;
- The potential risks from unregulated developments in the coastal zone, particularly for tourism development, have been addressed by a project run by WWF-INCA. The UNDP/PCU was successful in fostering the collaboration with this parallel action and securing the engagement of the tourism sector in the MPCA project activities;
- The UNDP/PCU has been successful in starting the replication work to identify and initiate other MPAs: in Porto Palermo, UNDP sought collaboration with UNEP/MAP RAC/SPA on the development of the management and financial plan for the new MPA and the project field team has supported the preliminary consultation process (hearings) in the area; in Cape of Rodoni, preliminary hearings and studies were also conducted with the assistance of UNDP project team;
- Due to the importance of the operationalization of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA for the success of the project as well as for the future of MCPAs in Albania, UNDP allocated additional funding to equip and train the MPA staff, demarcate and install information panels throughout the area, create terrestrial and underwater trails, and build and set operative the first Information Centre;

The project's and MoE's goals for MCPAs would have also benefited from the formation of the Cross-Sectoral Forum. Such a Forum (inter-ministerial and inter-sectoral) would have enabled the many competing ambitions for MPCA

areas to be openly discussed and any potential pressures to be identified and mitigated. The Project Board/Steering Committee of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA did act at local level as an inter-sectoral platform and was praised by all interviewed stakeholders as one of the project’s successes. All stakeholders interviewed praised the pivotal contribution of the Steering Committee to the governance and management of the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA. NAPA and RAPA, with the support of UNDP, should ensure that the Steering Committee remains operational after project ends, its composition is scaled up to include national instances and it develops into a truly intra- and inter-sectoral governance body for multi-jurisdictional coordination and decision-making at both the national and regional scale.

#### 4.2.3 PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE DIRECTIONS UNDERLINING MAIN OBJECTIVES

There is general agreement among interviewed stakeholders (including the MoE) on the need of securing a proper follow up to the UNDP MCPA project. UNDP has been effective in already raising funds for two top priority actions identified during project implementation. That is:

- The financial sustainability of the Albanian PA system, which will be addressed by the UNDP/GEF “*Enhancing financial sustainability of the protected area system in Albania*” (2016-20). The project seeks to assist the Albanian Government reducing existing funding gaps for the system of PAs, improving the management of individual protected areas, improving cost-efficiencies in individual protected areas and building the financial management capacities of protected area staff in the NAPA. The project will focus on: (i) building the financial management capacities of NAPA; and (ii) demonstrating the efficacy of different financing strategies in a sub-set of individual protected areas (including Karaburuni-Sazani MPA).
- A national environmental monitoring and evaluation system, which will be developed by UNDP/GEF project “*Establishing Albania’s Environmental Information Management and Monitoring System Aligned with the Global Reporting*” (2015-19). The project aims to strengthen capacity for environmental monitoring and information management in Albania by establishing an operational environmental information management and monitoring system (EIMMS). The project will address the need for an environmental monitoring system that is integrated throughout relevant government institutions and that uses international monitoring standards for indicator development, data collection, analysis, and policy-making. It will also build on existing technical and institutional capacity in Albania to align its management and monitoring efforts with global monitoring and reporting priorities. Increased capacity in this area will improve reporting to the Rio Conventions and lay the groundwork for sustainable development through better-informed environmental policy.

Moreover, most of the project partners and stakeholders concurred that it is important to build off of all accomplishments to date by expanding efforts to create an ecologically representative network of MPAs; address uses and user conflicts across the entire coastal and marine environment in Vlora Bay; and to address human uses and associated impacts occurring in upland areas of the watershed that are impacting the coastal and marine environment. The emphasis for the post project phase should be directed towards:

- the implementation of the management plan of the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA, demonstrating practically and sustainably its operationalization. Not only this will validate the methodology, but it will assist with replication and meeting CBD and EU accession obligations. The practical demonstration could also gather significant data on the marine resources in the MPA and understand the logistics required for managing an MPA,
- the replication / up-scaling of the approaches developed and agreed in Karaburuni-Sazani to other priority areas (e.g. Porto Palermo, Cape of Rodoni),
- the design of a scientifically-based MCPA network whose outcomes are focused more on the ecosystem scale and the corresponding multiple benefits that can be obtained when taking a systems approach – from conservation to livelihoods to climate resilience,
- the continuous investment into building the capacity of both individuals and institutions to manage MCPAs,
- the continuous engagement of all economic sectors and Ministries with authority on the coastal and marine

- areas,
- the development of a pro-active (versus reactive) management approach whereby the types and locations of human uses in the coastal and marine environment are in concert with one another and contribute to meeting multiple management objectives including marine biodiversity protection, socioeconomic sustainability for coastal communities, and a coordinated and collaborative multijurisdictional management approach through marine spatial planning, starting from the Vlora bay.

To this end, the following four recommendations have been already developed into project proposals by UNDP in 2016:

- 1) Develop the capacity, institutional support and management effectiveness (including measurable results) of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA to build a Model of Practice (standard) for future MPA development in Albania.
- 2) Focus on design and development of a comprehensive MPA network that protects habitats hosting critically endangered, threatened and near-threatened species.
- 3) Create the institutional and policy framework and pilot project for integrated management between watersheds, coastal zones and MCPAs.
- 4) Develop a comprehensive and inclusive marine spatial planning process with the MPA network as the centerpiece.

#### 4.3 BEST AND WORST PRACTICES IN ADDRESSING ISSUES RELATING TO RELEVANCE, PERFORMANCE AND SUCCESS

Based on the review of documents, interviews, and analysis of the information collected, the following best practices have been identified:

- The **GEF Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT)** has been adopted by the Project to monitor progress on **increasing the management effectiveness of MCPAs**. During project development, the METT has been completed for Karaburuni-Sazani MPA. During project implementation, the use of the METT was further developed into an online software and institutionalized as a system-level tool for measuring and monitoring PAs management effectiveness, and it was applied to all PAs in Albania (to access the system: <http://www.mett-undp.al/>). The online METT centralizes monitoring inputs from the Albanian PAs system and is managed by NAPA. It collects also data clustered in the following categories: i) tourism, ii) natural monument, iii) damages. The coming EU-funded "Strengthening capacity in National Nature Protection - preparation for Natura 2000 network " NaturAL Project might create a new layer for N2000 sites/indicators;
- A **Training Manual** with the curricula developed within the project was made available to be applied by the relevant institutions for PAs (NAPA and RAPA) and other NGOs or associations in Albania. They are available in Albanian but so far not endorsed and used by NAPA/MoE;
- The MCPA project developed the first **MPA management planning guidelines**, based on IUCN guidelines and applying a fully participatory process. The guidelines have been officially adopted by MoE;
- **MPA financial planning guidelines** will be also developed by UNDP within a regional project managed by Montenegro, by building on the lessons learned from the financial planning process in Karaburuni-Sazani MPA;
- The UNDP/PCU has been particularly successful in **federating around the project any other initiatives** concerning MCPAs in Albania. Examples include the partnerships established with Conservatoire du Littoral on the development of the management plan of Sazani island, the joint patrolling missions conducted periodically with the participation of the Guard Coast Delta force (border policy) and other inspection bodies in Vlora. Collaborations and cross-fertilizations between parallel projects proved particularly effective in advancing and scaling up the project results;
- The **engagement of local experts and resource users** (e.g., divers, fishermen), who have an incredible wealth of knowledge regarding their local environment, together with international experts allowed to complement scientific studies with local knowledge, improve the understanding the complexity of the project site and provide an effective expertise-sharing opportunity.

The Project has also generated important experiences and lessons learned that should be considered in the development of future actions. These include:

- The **Inception Phase** was highly beneficial to refine the project strategy, to ensure full alignment with the Government’s priorities, to strengthen the linkages/involvement with both national and local institutions and NGOs and to start an open and transparent communication with all interested groups;
- A **participatory approach** was adopted at all stages of project implementation to engage stakeholders and project partners. This allowed for strong ownership and buy-in in the project activities, while strengthening the sustainability of the efforts beyond the project. Interviewed representatives of the Municipality and the Prefecture in Vlora, as well as local fishermen, small entrepreneurs and environmental associations, praised the opportunity provided by the project to contribute to the creation of the first MPA in Albania;
- **Continuous communication** on project objectives and strategies has also been carefully carried out to ensure transparency and maintain stakeholders’ commitment to the project. Despite these efforts, however, key stakeholder groups have only marginally participated to the project activities and key institutions and economic sectors are still far from actively contributing to the management of the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA;
- The use of **formal ‘memorandum of understanding’ (MoUs)** furthered the sense of ownership and involvement of project partners in the project’s activities and goals;
- The UNDP/PCU proved capable to adopt an **adaptive management** approach to project execution by addressing evolving needs and expectations. Examples include the ability to quickly adapt to the new institutional setting following the official establishment of NAPA and its Regional Administrations, as well as the new administrative arrangements in the Vlora bay as a result of the Administrative and Territorial reform in 2015;
- 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;
- The **early and active engagement of local institutions**, namely the former mayor of Orikumi and of its administration, in the project and the establishment of a field project team have proved instrumental to the project’s success at site level;
- The **communications tools** (e.g. brochures, a video documentary, a photo-album, an eco-guide, an information tool iVlora, etc.) developed by the project have proved effective not only in raising the awareness of local communities and tourists on MCPA’s values and role: they helped redefining the profile of the Vlora bay, making it a biodiversity hotspot and a nature-based tourism destination in Albania, and are still used today by local authorities to promote the area.

Finally, Albania is a country where designating and effectively managing MCPAs are still fairly new concepts. The MCPA project has generated a vast amount of lessons learned, experiences and guidelines that the Government of Albania can rely on to advance more rapidly towards meeting its obligations under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the EU accession process. The project has achieved great momentum for MCPA in the country. Stakeholders at all levels are engaged, aware and feel ownership for the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA, as the first MPA in Albania. Expectations are high and everyone is ready to move onto the next phase. It is critical at this stage to capitalize on this momentum and keep sustaining NAPA, RAPA, and all relevant authorities and stakeholder groups, for MCPAs start achieving their conservation objectives and delivering the expected socio-economic benefits in Albania.

## 5 ANNEXES

### ANNEX 1: TOR OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION

#### Terms of References

Post Title: International Final Evaluation Consultant  
 Project Title: Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas  
 Duty station: Home based with 1 mission in Albania (6 days)  
 Work Experience: At least 10 years of professional experience in the areas addressed by the project and proven track record of policy advice and/or project development/implementation in integrated ecosystem management, international waters, biodiversity conservation

#### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of the Marine and Coastal Protected Areas Project, PIMS 4255

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

#### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:		Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas		
GEF Project ID:	3997		at endorsement (thousand US\$)	at completion (thousand US\$)
UNDP Project ID:	PIMS 4255 Atlas 00060315 00075893	GEF financing:	950	860
Country:	ALB	IA/EA own:	100	100
Region:	ECIS	Government:	1,577.5 in kind 300 in cash	1,618.6 in kind 276 in cash
Focal Area:	Biodiversity	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:	1,977.5	1,894.6
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment	Total Project Cost:	2,927.5	2,854.6
Other Partners involved:	n/a	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		21/11/2011
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: April 31, 2016	Actual: December 31, 2016

## OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

---

The project was designed to secure the long-term 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 will remove systemic, regulatory and knowledge barriers to realizing this objective.

The objective will be achieved through two outcomes:

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

The Albanian government has initiated several steps to conserve and sustainably manage its biodiversity. It has developed a Coastal Zone Management Plan (prepared in 1996 and approved in 2002), a Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan (prepared in 1999 and approved in 2002), and a National Environmental Action Plan (updated in 2002). It has in place several laws that support the conservation of coastal and marine biodiversity. Responsibilities for implementing these laws have been allocated to various institutions. It has also established a number of protected areas.

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:

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

The project is executed by the Ministry of Environment (MoE), which is the main institution responsible for the protection of environmental values in Albania. There are relatively high research capacities within a number of research institutions and universities on issues of ecology and protected areas. An important recent step has been the creation of the so-called management boards at PAs, which are participatory structures that engage local communities and entrepreneurs in site planning and management. This has been introduced in law, but its practical application remains extremely limited.

Implementation of marine/coastal programs, projects and plans occurs at two main governance levels, namely: central administration and local. Each authority in these levels has different mandate/roles with respect to the implementation of marine/coastal programs and related activities in the country.

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

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

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

---

An overall approach and method<sup>13</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects have developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of

---

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

relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (fill in [Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Albania, including the following project sites ([Tirana, Vlora](#)).

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](#).

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

#### PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

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

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (thousand US\$)	Government (thousand US\$)	Partner Agency (thousand US\$)	Total (thousand US\$)

	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants	100	100	300	27614				
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support			1,577	1,618				
• Other								
Totals	100	100	1,977	1,894				

#### MAINSTREAMING

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

#### IMPACT

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

#### CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

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

#### IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

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

#### EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 12 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing	Completion Date
Preparation	2 days	December 09, 2016
Evaluation Mission	4 days	December 23, 2016
Draft Evaluation Report	5 days	January 10, 2017
Final Report	1 days	January 31, 2017

---

14 Discrepancy due to the exchange rate

EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

---

The evaluation team 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.

EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

---

**Evaluators:**

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

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>15</sup>**

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

**Name of Consultant:** Alessandra Pomé

**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 *Paris* on *09.12.2016*

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

---

<sup>15</sup> [www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## EVALUATION CRITERIA, QUESTION MATRIX AND RATINGS

---

The evaluation of project performance was carried out based against expectations set out in the Project Results Framework which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification.

The evaluator used the evaluation matrix below in accordance with the "*UNDP-GEF Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported GEF-financed projects*" with the questions used during the Mid-term evaluation (April 2015) as a basis for extracting information from documents reviewed and for conducting interviews.

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

Evaluation Criteria	Question	Indicator	Source	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of national/regional/international authorities and the GEF Focal Area for Biodiversity?				
Is the project relevant to the GEF BD Focal Area and UNCBD?	How does the project support the GEF BD Focal Area?	Existence of clear relationship between the project objective and GEF BD Focal Area	<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?	How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of Albania? Is the project 'country driven'? What is the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation?	Degree to which project supports national environmental objectives Degree of coherence between project and national priorities etc. Appreciation from national stakeholders to project design and implementation Level of government involvement in the design of project	<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?	How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders? Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders? Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?	Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Project partners and stakeholders</li> <li>- ProDoc</li> <li>- Needs assessment studies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document analyses</li> <li>- Authorities and Interested Stakeholders Assessment Survey</li> </ul>
Is the project internally coherent in design?	Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (PRF) and the project design? Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?	Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach	<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>- Authorities and Interested Stakeholders Assessment Survey</li> </ul>
How is the project relevant to other donor-supported activity?	Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors? How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors? Is there coordination and complementarity between donors?	Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Donor representatives and documents</li> <li>- ProDoc</li> <li>- MTE report</li> <li>- Strategic Concept</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document analyses</li> <li>- Authorities and Interested Stakeholders Assessment Survey</li> </ul>
What lessons and experiences can be	Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MTE report</li> <li>- Information from PCU UNDP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data analyses</li> </ul>

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

Evaluation Criteria	Question	Indicator	Source	Methodology
drawn regarding relevance for other BD projects?			and Stakeholders/ Partners	
Effectiveness: To what extent have/will the expected outcomes and objectives been achieved?				
Has the project been effective in moving towards achieving the expected outcomes and objectives?	Has the project been effective in achieving outcomes?	(indicators from PRF)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ProDoc</li> <li>- PCU UNDP</li> <li>- Stakeholders</li> <li>- PIR/APRs</li> <li>- Tracking Tool</li> <li>- MTE report</li> <li>- Strategic Concept</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document analyses</li> <li>- Interviews with project EA and IA staff</li> <li>- Interviews with partners &amp; stakeholders</li> <li>- Authorities and Interested Stakeholders Assessment Survey</li> </ul>
How is risk and risk mitigation managed?	How well are risks assumptions and impact drivers being managed? What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient? Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?	Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ProDoc</li> <li>- PCU UNDP</li> <li>- Stakeholders</li> <li>- PIR/APR</li> <li>- MTE report</li> <li>- Strategic Concept Note</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> <li>- Authorities and Interested Stakeholders Assessment Survey</li> </ul>
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other BD projects?	What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes? What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project to improve the achievement of the project’s expected results?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data collected</li> <li>- MTE report</li> <li>- Strategic Concept Note</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data analysis</li> </ul>
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently in-line with international standards?				
Was project support provided in an efficient way?	Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use? Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation? Were the accounting and financial systems	Availability and quality of financial and progress reports Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ProDoc</li> <li>- UNDP</li> <li>- PCU</li> <li>- Strategic Concept Note</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document analyses</li> <li>- Interviews with partners</li> <li>- Authorities and Interested Stakeholders Assessment Survey</li> </ul>

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

Evaluation Criteria	Question	Indicator	Source	Methodology
	in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information? Were progress reports produced accurately timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes? Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)? Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned? Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently? Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources? How was results-based management used during project implementation?	Planned vs. actual funds leveraged Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting monitoring and evaluation) Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives		
How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	To what extent partnerships/ linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported? Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable? What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements? Which methods were successful or not and why?	Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners Examples of supported partnerships Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ProDoc</li> <li>- Project partners and stakeholders</li> <li>- Strategic Concept</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document analysis</li> <li>- Interviews</li> </ul>
Did the project efficiently utilise local capacity in implementation?	Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity? Did the project take into account local	Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts Number/quality of analyses done to assess	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ProDoc</li> <li>- UNDP</li> <li>- Beneficiaries</li> <li>- MTE report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Document analysis</li> <li>- Interviews</li> </ul>

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

Evaluation Criteria	Question	Indicator	Source	Methodology
	capacity in design and implementation of the project? Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?	local capacity potential and absorptive capacity		
What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other BD projects?	What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency? How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures partnerships arrangements etc...)? What changes could have been made (if any) to the project in order to improve its efficiency?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data collected</li> <li>- MTE report</li> <li>- Strategic Concept</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data analysis</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial institutional social-economic and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>				
To what extent are/will financial institutional socio-economic and/or environmental risks to the long-term sustainability of the project being addressed?	How well are the outcomes achieved through this project secured for the long term?		Data collected Strategic Concept	Data analysis Authorities and Interested Stakeholders Assessment Survey
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>				
Are there indications that the project has contributed to or enabled progress toward reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?	Are there main principles for the management of a MPA in Albania established? How has the MCPA protected areas changed with the project start? Are there MCPA management implementing arrangements in place? Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in Project design? Is there evidence that Project partners will continue their activities beyond Project		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data collected</li> <li>- MTE report</li> <li>- New proposals</li> <li>- Strategic Concept</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data analysis</li> <li>- Authorities and Interested Stakeholders Assessment Survey</li> </ul>

UNDP/GEF project  
 "Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas"

Evaluation Criteria	Question	Indicator	Source	Methodology
	support? Are laws policies and frameworks being addressed through the Project to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms? Is the capacity in place at the national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date? Are Project activities and results being replicated elsewhere and/or scaled up?			

### Explanation of ratings

Ratings for M&E, IA&EA Execution, Objectives and Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency	Sustainability ratings:	Impact Ratings:	Relevance ratings:	Additional ratings where relevant:
Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings.				
Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings.				
Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate.	Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability			
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings.	Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks	Significant (S)		
Unsatisfactory (U): The project had major shortcomings.	Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks	Minimal (M)	Relevant (R)	Not applicable (N/A)
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings.	Unlikely (U): severe risks	Negligible (N)	Not relevant (NR)	Unable to Assess (U/A)

#### Notes:

1. Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and outcomes may not be higher than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. To have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.
2. All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings.

As per the ToR the following evaluation ratings grid was applied:

Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of IA Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of EA Execution	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Political Sustainability:	
Effectiveness		Financial Sustainability:	
Efficiency		Institutional Sustainability:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental Sustainability:	

ANNEX 2: FIELD MISSION AGENDA

Date	Activities
Monday, 9 <sup>th</sup> January	Meeting with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Project staff. Document review</li> <li>○ UNDP Country Director and environment program analyst</li> <li>○ Project Director, Ministry of Environment</li> <li>○ Biodiversity directory staff, Ministry of Environment</li> <li>○ General Director, NAPA</li> </ul>
Tuesday, 10 <sup>th</sup> January	<u>SITE VISIT</u> Meeting with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In Vlora:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Department of Environment, Prefecture of Vlora;</li> <li>○ Vlora Chamber of Commerce and Industry</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. In Orikum: (at Administrative Unite of Orikum meeting venue)                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Project local staff</li> <li>● Local stakeholders/ beneficiaries (PA staff, Orikum Administrative Unit, NGOs, Fishery Associations, touristic operators etc.)</li> </ul> </li> </ol>
Wednesday, 11 <sup>th</sup> January	Debriefing and wrap up

PERSONS TO MEET/ INTERVIEW

UNDP / GEF

Limya Eltayeb	Country Director
Elvita Kabashi	Program Analyst
Project Staff	
Violeta Zuna	MCPA Project Manager
Eno Dodbiba	Project Expert
Ema Moci	Admin. / Finance Assistance
Ministry of Environment	
Pellumb Abeshi	MoE, General Director, Project Director
Klodjana Marika	MoE, Director of Biodiversity and PAs
Elvana Ramaj	MoE, Biodiversity senior experts
Zamir Dedej	Director of National Agency of Protected Areas
Local staff	
Petrit Dervishi	Local project moderator
Doreid Petoshati	Local stakeholder support and communication specialist
Local stakeholders / beneficiaries	
Melaize Selamaj	Administrator of Administrative Unite of Orikum
Lorela Lazaj	Director of Regional Administration of Protected Areas
Nexhip Hyslakoj	Regional Administration of Protected Areas of Vlora / Former Vice Mayor of Orikumi Municipality
Vladimir Haxhi	Department of Environment, Prefecture of Vlora
Arben Breshani	Chairman of Vlora Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Rangers (4)	Artan Jazoj / Jani Kushta / Xhelo Lazemetaj
Gezim Capoj	Former Mayor of Orikumi Municipality
Fisherman association	Sherif Durmishi – Chairman
Simo Ribaj,	Chairman of SEEP, NGO
Muharrem Jazoj	Albadriatica aquaculture

QUESTIONS

Question
Respondent's name, organisation and contact details
Role in the project (& which activities involved with)
General impression on how the project was being implemented by UNDP and the MoE
Key impacts of the project
Are there any project activities that should have been 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 Albania with meeting its obligations to the CBD and EU/ and 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 / results from the project?
What is your estimate of the success of the project (highly satisfactory – satisfactory – not so satisfactory)
Please give some examples of the important achievements and benefits of the project from your perspective

### ANNEX 3: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

All project reports and relevant documents which have been saved in the dedicated IW:LEARN webpages (<http://mcpa.iwlearn.org/docs>) and/or shared by the UNDP/PCU. Specifically:

- UNDP Project Document (2009)
- Inception report (2011)
- Capacity Development Score Card (July 2014)
- Mid-Term Evaluation (2014)
- Annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) 2015
- Project Board and Management Committee Meeting Minutes (2016)
- Strategic Plan on Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (SPMPAs) and short- medium action plan 2015-20
- Socio-economic assessment of Sazan - Karaburuni marine and coastal protected area
- draft report for potential MPA under assessment namely Porto – Palermo and Rodoni Cape.
- Training Needs Assessment and guidelines
- The METT system (<http://www.mett-undp.al/> )
- Mid-term GEF Tracking Tool
- Delegation of Authority
- UNDP Project Document
- Inception Report
- Annual Plan 2015
- Capacity Development Score Card (July 2014)
- GEF management tracking tools 2014, 2015
- PIR 2015, 2016
- Management Committee Minutes December 2012 + 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016
- Risk table 2015
- PSC (Project Board) Meeting Minutes March 2014
- PSC (Project Board) Meeting Minutes June 2015
- PSC (Project Board) Meeting Minutes June 2016
- Workplan 2015
- Workplan 2016
- ATLAS Overall budget
- UNDP Combined Delivery Report 2014/2015
- Indicator progress – 2015
- Management Plan for K-S MPA
- The treasures of the two seas – photo album
- Financial business plan for K-S MPA
- Ecosystem service valuation report
- Different awareness and training reports/ tools <http://mett-undp.al/> ; <http://www.bashkiavlore.info/MainPages/Other/index.aspx>
- Habitat assessment update and relevant mapping for the MCPAs
- Designed assessments studies for priority action (as per Management Plan)
- Strategic Concept Note

Other relevant documents, websites and reports reviewed:

- UNDP/GEF Establishing Albania’s Environmental Information Management and Monitoring System Aligned with the Global Reporting (Inception Report) (2016)
- UNDP/GEF Enhancing financial sustainability of the protected area system in Albania (Project document) (2015)
- UNDP project on floods and CC:

[http://www.al.undp.org/content/albania/en/home/library/democratic\\_governance/project-document-and-agreement--eu-flood-protection-infrastructu](http://www.al.undp.org/content/albania/en/home/library/democratic_governance/project-document-and-agreement--eu-flood-protection-infrastructu)

- UNDP Transboundary Drin Project:  
<http://drincorda.org/gef-supported-drin-project/project-components>
- “The Integrated Cross Sectorial Plan for Coast” (still draft)
- The National Agency for Territorial Planning site: <http://www.planifikimi.gov.al/?q=sq>
- Economic valuation of the Karaburun-Sazani MPA – First draft - May 2016 – Vertigo Lab
- The report on fishing activities in MCPA Sazan-Karaburuni , developed from the Royal Albanian Foundation namely prof. Rigers Bakiu
- Adriatic IPA cross border cooperation 2007-2013:  
<http://www.shape-ipaproject.eu/> the WP4 report:  
<http://www.shape-ipaproject.eu/Download.asp?p=documents-download&id=wp4-action-4-1>
- UNDP Prespa Park project report
- INCA/WWF SEA-Med project documents
- WWF Netherland under Project Number 200/2015/NL201070. “Sustainable Financing of Albanian MPAs” and the SEA-Med Project (“Sustainable Economic Activities in Mediterranean Marine Protected Areas”), led by WWF Mediterranean.
- WWF Switzerland IMPACT Venture “Investing in marine recreational tourist opportunities to support a newborn MPA in Albania”
- Binet, T., Diazabakana, A., Hernandez, S. 2015. Sustainable financing of Marine Protected Areas in the Mediterranean: a financial analysis. Vertigo Lab, MedPAN, RAC/SPA, WWF Mediterranean. 114 pp.
- RAC/SPA – UNEP-MAP, 2015 Financial planning for the Porto Palermo Marine Protected Area in Albania by Thomas BINET and Ambre DIAZABAKANA, Vertigo Lab, Ed. RAC/SAP – MedMPAnet Project, Tunis:37 p. + annexes.
- RAC/SPA - UNEP-MAP, 2015. Management Plan of “Porto-Palermo-Llamani Bay” Protected Area in Albania. By Zamir DEDEJ, Genti KROMIDHA and Nihat DRAGOTI. Ed. RAC/SPA - MedMPAnet Project, Tunis: 84 p + annexes.
- Conservatoire du Littoral – Synthesis of Sazani Island Management plan (2015)
- Territorial and administrative reform, a strategic priority of the Albanian Government. The Albanian Parliament approved on July, 31, 2014 Law 115/2014 “On the Administrative and Territorial Division” of local government units in the Republic of Albania” and with the new map of 61 Municipalities, certified also in December 2014 by the Constitutional Court
- INCA 2013 “Strategic Plan for Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (SPMCPAs)” developed with the support of UNDP in the frame of the Project “Improving Coverage and Management Effectiveness of Marine and Coastal Protected Areas”
- UNDP-Albania strategic plan (draft)

ANNEX 4: PROJECT STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders	Mandate
<b>GOVERNMENT</b>	
Council of Ministers	The Council approves all enabling legislative and regulatory frameworks for the functioning of the protected area system; including NAPA.
Ministry of Environment	The Ministry is the focal point institution for the implementation of the CBD and the implementing partner for this project. It is responsible for preparing the enabling legislative and regulatory framework for project activities and ensuring that they are presented to the Council of Ministers for approval. The Ministry is responsible for creating the enabling conditions for implementation of all project activities and it will facilitate the establishment staffing and resourcing of the NAPA. The Ministry will develop and present a motivation for an increase in funding from the state budget for the protected area system.
National Agency of Protected Areas (NAPA)	The NAPA is the key institution to benefit from the project and will be responsible for the sustainability of all project activities.
National Environmental Agency/ Regional Environmental Agencies	The NEA issues any required environmental permits in protected areas during the project and will enforce provisions of environmental legislation relating to EIAs environmental permitting and coordination of monitoring activities in protected areas
State Inspectorate of Environment Forests and Water	The SEIFW supports the enforcement of legislation on environmental protection forest water and fisheries activities in protected areas.
Inter-institutional Operational Maritime Centre (IOMC)	With the new amendment made to the law the Coastal Guard functions through the Inter-institutional Operational Maritime Center (IOMC). This center is composed of all the institutions as provided in the article 32 of the SEA Code (mainly line ministries). The center is a much specialized institution and can manage the entire situation with the power to control all the activities in the marine environment through a very specific newly established system.
Service Department of Fisheries and Aquaculture	It is responsible for all services related to infrastructure management and data collecting of fishing and aquaculture activities and ensuring compliance with legal requirements on the protection of fisheries and aquaculture in Albania. It includes the Aquaculture Sector the Finance Sector Services Sector the Ports Management and Monitoring and Control Division.
Ministry of Defence	It controls the military bases located at Karaburuni peninsula and Sazani island.
National Coastal Agency	It is responsible for coastal protection promotion and monitoring of projects for the development of the coastal zone. Cooperation on new MPAs.
<b>STATE ORGANIZATIONS</b>	
Regional Agency for Protected Area (RAPA)	Responsible for the management of PAs.
Regional Environment Inspectorate	Law enforcement controlling illegal activities; fire protection.
Regional Environment Agency	Present in each Prefecture; implementing procedures related to environmental licenses; collecting environmental data.
Fisheries Inspectorate Vlorë	It has responsibility for surveillance of fisheries activities including the MPA.
Border Police and Immigration	It has responsibility in MPA as well (controlling access to the area).
<b>RESEARCH INSTITUTIONS</b>	
University of Tirana/ The museum of natural sciences	This is the highest scientific body that performs research and education on marine ecosystems marine habitats and species. The museum of natural sciences is under this university and provides several practical training and know how on this regards
University of Vlorë Shkodra and Durrës	These are regional universities that provide curricula on tourism navigation and also on marine biology. Yet the vocation/curricula level is much modest than that of university of Tirana. Little coordination so far with RAPA.
University “Ismail Qemali”	Natural science and Tourism Departments
Academy of Sciences	Provides scientific justification for accepted decisions in all areas including the sustainable use of nature resources and biodiversity conservation

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

Stakeholders	Mandate
<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENTS</b>	
The local authorities and administrative bodies	Local government authorities municipalities and communes represent an administrative and territorial unit covering the urban and rural areas respectively. The local government structures are required to fulfil joint obligations with regard to the protection of the environment and implementation of environmental law. These authorities are empowered with the designing of environmental action plans in accordance with national environmental strategies and the technical assistance provided by the Ministries.
Vlora Prefecture	It supervises legal framework implementation and controls local government authorities.
Vlora County Council	It develops and implements regional policies and coordinates with central and local government authorities
Vlora Municipality	It is responsible for local governance management and administration of resources (including nature resources) in the areas of Vlora bay. Also it is the main structure from the institutional point of view with a significant role in administration of the sea and coastal matters. Decides over local development (businesses).
Orikumi Administrative Unit	This used to be the main local governance body whose territory is part of the watershed of Vlora bay. Following the Administrative and Territorial Reform it is now a unit within the Vlora Municipality.
Saranda municipality and Ksamil municipality	These are the southern most local authorities of Albania closely coordinating and assisting the Butrinti national park on management and administration of the Butrinti ecosystem and cultural /historical resources. They are crucial actors in forthcoming planning and development towards new MPAs (Porto Palermo) and their institutional setup.
Qender Administrative Unit	Responsible for Sazani island but the Ministry of Defence is still the main authority on the island.
<b>PUBLIC ENTITIES</b>	
Harbour Master Vlora	Once the entrance into the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA is regulates it could become more important.
Harbour District Vlora	Port authority in Vlora at the moment does not provide moorings for nautical tourists.
<b>LOCAL AND NATIONAL NGOS /FORUMS</b>	
Divers association “Ekspedita blu’	Local association based in Vlora that gathers the professional and amateurs divers as well as promotes and develops diving education and practice in coastal area of Albania (mainly the southern part)
Association for Protection of Aquatic Wildlife of Albania (APAWA)	A non-profit organization based in Tirana which develops and implements projects and activities with focus on aquatic life and conservation wildlife and biota in water ecosystems.
“Adriatic” association	A local association based in Vlora district involved with urban environment nature conservation and community development in Vlora area.
Organisation for Environmental Education – SEEP	Association focused mainly on public information and education.
Association for Vlora Bay Protection	
Centre for Research Cooperation and Development - CRCD	Association dedicated to public awareness and education research and capacity building on issues related to sustainable development and nature conservation.
INCA	A non-profit organization dealing with several biodiversity conservation programs nature protection and also coastal zone management activities. It is the main NGO to work on marine issues in Albania.
ECAT Tirana	A non-profit organization engaged in environment management programs. Among others it has also implemented projects on coastal zone management and planning (PLANCOAST) as well as actually undertaking an IPA joint application with other Mediterranean countries on coastal zone management
Albanian Network for Study of Marine and Lagoon Ecosystems (MarLagunAlb)	A recently established forum of professionals whose main area of activities is research and monitoring of aquatic life and ecosystems

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

Stakeholders	Mandate
<b>LOCAL COMMUNITY</b>	
Local communities	Local communities live coastal areas in vicinity of MPA and their livelihoods are interwoven with use of natural resources in limited use of MPA and its potential buffer zone. In terms of subsistence fishing there are 500 small scale vessels and nearly 1000 persons involved in this activity. Other important activities taking place in the coastal zone include farming and livestock (mainly sheep) rearing in coastal areas and its mountainous zone.
<b>BUSINESS SECTOR</b>	
Tour and Hotel Operators	Although recently opened to the international market the traditional “sun and sand” tourism is the main tourism product offered by the hotel and tour operator in Vlorë region. Nature areas (in particular protected areas) are one of the three “jewels in the crown” of Albanian tourism. The country cannot be successful in the long term without significant investment in upgrading and continued maintenance of the core natural assets that form the underlying basis for the tourism sector.
Organisation of Touristic Operators	Tourism agencies
Marina of Orikum	Private marina cca 600 berths fully equipped organises regattas
OaziBlu	Diving CSO
<b>USER ASSOCIATIONS</b>	
Chamber of Commerce and Industry Vlorë	Association of private businesses in Vlorë potential for promotion
Fisheries Management Organisation – OMP	UNDP has signed an agreement with OMP to provide for 3 rangers fuel and logistics who in turn write weekly reports; for the time being due to technical and financial constraints rangers can only record illegal activities from land.
Organization of fishery management of Vlorë (OFM)	This is an economic operator licensed by the MoE for the management of the fishery resources of Vlorë region in compliance with the fishery law and other economic /fiscal regulatory provisions in Albania. Recently re-established following 2 years of inaction.
<b>INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS</b>	
European Union	It supports biodiversity conservation in the country. Main organizer of the Albanian Environmental Film Festival.
Italian Cooperation	Potential donor. Supporting a new Natura200 project in Albania.
World Bank	It has supported several projects aimed at delivering an immediate alleviation of poverty and at providing sustainable tools and long-lasting development to foster further growth. It has promoted integrated coastal zones management and sustainable economic development.
WWF	International NGO mainly supporting capacity building for protected areas K-S MPA management planning process (within the framework of UNDP-WWF MoU) sustainable financing of MCPAs.
MedPAN	Supporting MPA regionally. Small grant programme. Mediterranean Trust Fund
CEPF	Donor supporting INCA’s project on sustainable tourism management in Vlorë area.
Waitt Foundation	Donor supporting baseline marine and coastal features assessments/surveys to advancing the creation of MPA in Albania.
Conservatoire du Littoral	It supports the MoE in the designation of small islands a PAs and promoting their sustainable management and development

ANNEX 5: CO-FINANCING, AT JANUARY 2017

Description	Source	Amount USD	Cash or In-kind	Notes
Office space	Orikumi Municipality	7200	In-kind	36 months @ 200 \$ /month
Community consultation and management actions meetings	Orikumi Municipality	3000	In-kind	30 months @ 100 \$ / month (local support specialists from the municipality)
Water and energy		3600	In-kind	36 months @ 100 \$ /month
Management Committee meetings		1000	In-kind	not pertinent
Inspectorate support	Regional Env Inspectorate	1750	Cash	25 months @ 70\$ / month (local logistic support enabled for project purposes)
Capacity building	Forestry Service	2100	Cash	30 months @ 70 \$ /month (Training of rangers / commitment of NAPA resources)
Meetings and support of the Army	Ministry of Defense	5000	Cash	10 trips @ 500 \$ /trip
Survey of the MPA with Orikumi Municipality	Orikumi Municipality	17100	Cash	3 MoUs so far
Survey of the MPA with Forestry Service of Vlora	Forestry Service	11400	Cash	2 MoU so far
Survey of the MPA with Fisherman Association	Fisherman Association	10000	Cash	1 MoU so far
Stakeholder engagement	Different meetings	10000	In-kind	Local NGOs local authorities CBOs
Support to monitoring	CEMSA	1000	In-kind	2 monitoring missions with 3 experts providing data and info
Management Plan and Tourism Management	WWF	150000	In-kind	Env Expertise with developing of management draft and respective priorities
Office equipment	Orikumi Municipality	3500	In-kind	Furniture and commodities
Transport equipment (boat/motorcross)	Orikumi Municipality & Forestry Service	5000	In-kind	Ranger`s transportation used for patrolling/monitoring
Mobile phone costs	Orikumi Municipality & Forestry Service	2500	Cash	
Training PAs administrator on METT June 2015	Natura 2000 Project	10000	In-kind	Staff of MCPAs was trained on METT completion
Stakeholder engagement on Porto Palermo area	INCA	3200		
Promotion of Porto Palermo- Gjiri Llamanit area	INCA	4000		
Socio-economic assesment on Porto Palermo area	INCA	1700		
Ecologic assesment on Porto Palermo area	INCA	2600		
Survey on touristic activities in Karaburun Sazan MPA	INCA	1800		
Survey on terrestrial trails on Karaburun peninsula area	INCA	1400		
Survey on underwater trails on Karaburun Sazan area	INCA	2000		
Study on mooring boys system/docks arrangement/zoning)	INCA	1350		
Drafting Business plan activities	INCA	3500		
Developing sustainable tourism plan activities	INCA	8500		
Survey with Ministry of Defense	Ministry of Defense	2000	in-kind	2 trips July 2015 May 2016
Fish stock analyses	Royal Foundation Alb	30000		
Promotion of fish reproduction in Karaburun Sazani	Waitt Foundation			2015 - 2016
Management Plan and Studies for Sazani Island	Conservatoire du Littoral			2015-2016
Regional Administration of protected areas Vlore		387562		2015 - 2016
Administration of PAs Shkoder				2015 - 2016

UNDP/GEF project  
"Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas"

Description	Source	Amount USD	Cash or	Notes
Lezhe Fier		924882		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1 618 644</b>		

ANNEX 6: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

List of stakeholders reached by the *Authority and interested stakeholder assessment survey* (2016), survey respondents and/or interviewed by the evaluator:

Institution	Name	Position	Project Board – Karaburuni-Sazani MPA Management Committee	Survey filled in (July 2016)	Interviewed
UNDP	Limya Eltayeb	Country Director			
UNDP	Elvita Kabashi	Head of Environment, Program Analyst			X
UNDP	Mirela Kamberi	Climate Change project			
UNDP	Odeta Cato	Environmental monitoring and information			X
UNDP	Violeta Zuna	MCPA Project Manager			X
UNDP	Eno Dodbiba	Project Expert			X
UNDP	Ema Moci	Admin. / Finance Assistance			X
UNDP	Petrit Dervishi	Local project moderator			X
UNDP	Doreid Petoshati	Local stakeholder support and communication specialist			X
Ministry of Environment	Klodiana Marika	Director Biodiversity	X		X
Ministry of Environment	Elvana Ramaj	Head of Biodiversity			X
Ministry of Environment	Pellumb Abeshi	GEF FP, National Director			X
Ministry of Environment	Silvamina Alshabani	Head of the PA section			
National Agency for Protected Areas (NAPA)	Zamir Dedej	Director	X	YES	X
Regional Administration for Protected Areas (RAPA) Vlorë	Lorela Lazaj	Director		YES	X
Regional Administration for Protected Areas (RAPA) Vlorë	Nexhip Hysolakoj	Former Vide-Mayor Orikumi Municipality			X
Regional Administration for Protected Areas (RAPA) Vlorë	Tatiana Mehillaj				X
Inter-institutional Operational Maritime Centre (IOMC)	Gen. Maksim Malaj	Director			
National Coastal Agency	Auron Tare	Director			
State Inspectorate of Environment, Forests and	Gjergji kokuri	Director			

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

Institution	Name	Position	Project Board – Karaburuni-Sazani MPA Management Committee	Survey filled in (July 2016)	Interviewed
Water – Vlorë region					
INCA - NGO	Marinela Mitro	INCA PAs Project coordinator		YES	
APAWA association (Association for Protection of Aquatic Wildlife of Albania)	Sajmir Beqiraj	Chairman			X
European Union Information Centre Vlorë – EUIC					
Divers association ‘Ekspedita blu’	Pajtim shpata				
REC-Albania	Mihallaq Qirjo				
Organisation for Environmental Education – SEEP	Simo Ribaj	Director		YES	x
Centre for Research, Cooperation and Development - CRCD	Alba Naci	Project officer		YES	X
PineFlag NGO				YES	X
PPNEA Vlorë	Niko Numani	Representative	X	YES	X
Municipality of Vlorë	Dritan Leli	Mayor	X		
	Abdulla Shimi	Forest Inspector		YES	
	Llazar Gjoncaj	Head of Forestry Service Department			
	Kreshnik Lilaj	Head of Regional Environmental Directory			x
Vlorë Prefecture	Vladimir Haxhi	Specialist of Environment Department		YES	X
Vlorë County Council	Mandi Karrocieri	Specialist in planning and development			
Orikum Administrative unit	Melazime Selamaj	Orikum Administrator	X		X
Fisheries Inspectorate Vlorë	Reshat Xhelili	Chef Inspector			
Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Vlorë	Merita	Specialist		YES	
Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Vlorë	Arben Breshani	Chairman of Vlorë			X
	Andrian Vaso	Marine biodiversity expert			
	Saimir Beqiraj	Marine biodiversity expert, University of Tirana			
	Sulejman Sulçe	Professor, Research Centre for Rural Development /Consultant			

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

Institution	Name	Position	Project Board – Karaburuni-Sazani MPA Management Committee	Survey filled in (July 2016)	Interviewed
Regional Environment Directorate, Vlora	Kreshnik Lilaj	RDIRECTOR			
Former Municipality of Orikumi	Gezim Capoj	Mayor			X
Administrative Unit of Orikumi	Melajze Selamaj	Head of Administrative Unit of Orikumi			
Administrative Unit of Orikumi	Nertila Perrallaj	Head of Tourism			
SEEP (NGO), Vlora	Simo Ribaj				
Environmental Protection and Conservation of Nature (NGO) Vlora	Dumani				
Agriculture Protection (NGO), Vlora	Mendim Baci				
Tour operator	Jasim Habibaj	St.Vasil –Boat ‘Teuta’			
	Rangers (4)	Artan Jazoj / Jani Kushta / Xhelo Lazemetaj			X
Fisherman association	Sherif Durmishi	Chairman			
SEEP, NGO	Simo Ribaj,	Chairman			
Albadriatica aquaculture	Muharrem Jazoj	Albadriatica aquaculture			X
Fisheries Management Organisation – OMP					
University of Tirana	Spiro Drushku	Dean	x		
University of Vlora, Biology Department	Mariel Halili	Specialist Department			X
	Denada Kasemi	Chairman Biology Department			
WWF Mediterranean Programme	Zeljka Rajkovic			YES	X
Conservatoire du Littoral	Céline Damery	Europe & International project officer		YES	X
MedPAN	Marie Romani	Director			
UNEP-MAP RAC/SPA	Souha El Asmi	Programme officer SPAs		YES	X

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

ANNEX 7: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Sources of verification	Target level at end of project	Rating
<b>Overall objective: To improve coverage and management effectiveness of Albania’s marine and coastal protected areas.</b>							
	Develop SPMCPA 10-years plan to expand the MPA network including specific action plan for each new area	Area (in ha) under protection as Coastal and Marine PA	100236 ha (existing coastal protected areas - mainly coastal wetlands)	An additional 12570.82 ha declared as Albania’s first MPA (Karaburun – Sazani)  Justification and technical documentation for an additional 3500 ha (Rodoni Cape-Lalzi Bay and <b>Pagane-Kepi i Stillos</b> ) are prepared and submitted for decision makers by the 4 <sup>th</sup> year of the project.	Maps technical reports and studies official gazette	The first MPA (Karaburun-Sazani) declared by a Decision of Council of Ministers no. 289 date 28 April 2010. The surface of MPA is 12570.82 ha.  Two other MPAs Porto Palermo (approx. 6100 ha) and Cape of Rodoni (approx. 27700 ha) are in the process to be proclaimed. Assessment and public hearing are conducted in the two areas. For Porto Palermo is foreseen the status of Natural Park and the documents for proclamation of the Park (with a surface of 2067.75 ha) have been shared with relevant ministries.	
	Legislative/Regulatory framework: - amendments PA law to remove legal barriers to effective MPA management - stipulations on funding sources: i) budget allocations ii) revenue raised by PAs iii) donor funding - promotion and communications on new legal framework - review of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)	Enabling environment for MCPAs	Current Albania's National biodiversity strategy and action plan was approved by Council of Ministers in 2000	Marine and coastal protected area targets are fully incorporated into Albania's National biodiversity strategy and action plan for 2020 by the 4 <sup>th</sup> year of project	Council of Ministers’ decision on approval of the revised NBSAP revised NBSAP	The SPMCPA is part of the NBSAP approved by the Government of Albania with the DCM No 31 date 20.01.2016. The document was delivered to the Convention of Biodiversity.  After extensive analysis of the institutional legal and financial aspects related to MCPA management and considering the EU approximation process the “Law on biodiversity” Nr. 9587 date 20.7.2006 was amended and gazetted Nr. 68/2014 establishing the legal frame for the EU Natura 2000 network and a new “Law on PAs” was elaborated to better address the MCPAs  A National Agency for Protected Areas (NAPA) was established.  Awareness campaign on the values and needs of CMPA. International Environmental Days celebrated and	

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Sources of verification	Target level at end of project	Rating
						covered through the media. Photo exhibition from Coastal and Marine PAs.	
	Legal instruments for new MPAs gazetting/official declaration	Management effectiveness of Karaburuni - Sazani MPA	Baseline METT Score as percent of Total Possible Score is 17%	Karaburuni-Sazani MPA management effectiveness assessed by METT score at least doubled compared to baseline by the end of 5 <sup>th</sup> year of project	METT score sheets for Karaburuni-Sazani MPA	No change for MPA Karaburun Sazani for 2012. METT score for Karaburun-Sazani is 47%.  The assistance to the National Agency of Protected Areas (NAPA) and the Ministry of Environment is ongoing in frame of management effectiveness of PAs. The METT tool is applied and assessment of management effectiveness of PAs (including Karaburuni-Sazani MPA) was performed in 2015. The methodology and assessment forms were adopted and incorporated in an online platform <a href="http://www.mett-undp.al">http://www.mett-undp.al</a> The website was further enriched with info and reporting entries from the NAPA relevant to visitors survey illegal activities nature and culture monument etc. Finally the web based METT tool is established and functional allowing links with project website and other relevant sites contributing to make this assessment tool more user friendly (website pattern navigation structure etc.). The main development which attest for the change (increase) of the METT are institutional progress (establishment of NAPA) and regulatory /management arrangements (functioning of NAPA). In addition the project has assisted the Marine Park administration on capacity building and with logistic to improve its daily work.	
	Increased systemic institutional and individual capacity for establishing and managing and MCPA	Increased Systemic Institutional and Individual capacities for establishing and managing an MCPA system (measured by the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard in Annex 5)	See UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard in Annex 5 for baseline  Systemic - 37% Institutional - 29% Individual - 38%	See UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard in Annex 5 for target  Systemic - 90% Institutional - 87% Individual - 95%	Updates to CD Scorecard by project team; findings of external evaluations	Systematic 67% Institutional 67% Individual 67% Compared to the baseline there is an increase of about 50%. Compared to the reported scores in 2015 UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard for MCPAs shows an increase for systematic institutional and individual levels. The legislation is under development and biodiversity strategy and action plan is approved.	

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Sources of verification	Target level at end of project	Rating
						A new institution is established National Agency for Protected Areas shows the political will towards Protected Areas and will help on building consensus among all institutions and stakeholders capacity to mobilize information and knowledge and capacity to monitor evaluate report and learn.	
<b>Outcome 1: Improved bio-geographical representation of marine and coastal protected areas (MCPA)</b>							
1.1	Strategic Plan for Albania's MCPAs is incorporated in the revised National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) for 2020	Strategic Plan for Albania's MCPAs	No Strategic Plan has been developed for this sub-system of the national PA system  Former Albania's NBSAP was approved by Council of Ministers in 2000	SPMCPA is developed and approved by the Council of Ministers and fully incorporated into revised Albania's NBSAP for 2020 by the end of 4 <sup>th</sup> year of project	Council of Ministers' decision on approval of the revised NBSAP	The SPMPCA is part of the NBSAP approved by the Government of Albania with the DCM No 31 date 20.01.2016. The document was delivered to the Convention of Biodiversity.  Awareness campaign on the values and needs of CMPA International Environmental Days celebrated and covered through the media Photo exhibition from Coastal and Marine PAs	
1.2	Building Karaburuni-Sazani MPA administration capacity based on legal instruments on establishing MPAs	# of proposals for new MPAs establishment	Current NBSAP and national MPA gap identified 8 potential MPAs	Technical and scientific work for realizing designation of at least 2 new MPAs (Rodoni Cape-Lalzi Bay and <b>Pagane-Kepi I Stillos</b> ) are complete and political consultation process has been initiated by the end of the project.	Minutes of meetings of public hearings	The designation process for two new MPAs (Porto Palermo instead of <b>Pagane-Kepi I Stillos</b> and the Rodoni Cape-Lalzi Bay (approx. 27700 ha) advanced.  For Porto Palermo is foreseen the status Natural Park (covering an area of 2067.75 ha) and the set of the regulatory documents (including the Management and Financial Plans) have been finalized within the MedMPAnet project of UNEP/MAP RAC/SPA. Valuation of ecosystem services (ES) was also completed as an assessment tool. Several public hearings organized.  In Rodoni Cape-Lalzi Bay: - preliminary assessment were carried out - several public hearings organized  A study with focus on rapid economic valuation of ES beneficiary identification and financing	

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Sources of verification	Target level at end of project	Rating
						instruments for MPAs was also completed. This enabled the assessment of the economic valuation of critical marine ecosystems and determination of the potential for long-term financing of the Albania MCPAs system. The same methodologies and approaches were also applied to assess the range of ecological goods and services within the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA. In addition, options are explored for multi-criteria valuation of ecosystem services provided by the marine areas assessing the equity and efficiency of the payments as well as compensation schemes.	
		Legal instrument establishing MPA at Karaburuni-Sazani	No legal instrument	The legal Instrument for effective management and enforcement of MCPAs mandates and roles and responsibilities of MCPA administration personnel developed for Karaburuni-Sazani MPA as a model for future MPAs and approved by Council of Ministers	Official Gazette	The first MPA (Karaburuni-Sazani) declared by a Decision of Council of Ministers no. 289 date 28 April 2010. The surface of MPA is 12570.82 ha.  The governance and management body of the new MPA is established and operative since 2015.	
		Legal environment for MCPA management	There are no legal instruments for effective management and enforcement of MPA	Legal Instrument for effective management and enforcement of MCPAs mandates and roles and responsibilities of MCPA Administration personnel developed for Karaburuni-Sazani MPA as a model for future MPAs by the end of 2nd year of project.	Minister’s decree on enacting by laws and relevant regulations	The law on biodiversity Nr. 9587 dd 20.7.2006 has been amended and gazetted (Nr. 68/2014). With the establishment of the National Agency of Protected Areas the work on review and analyses of the Albanian legal framework related to PAs is ongoing. A new law on Protected Areas is under preparation and is going to be approved during 2016	
1.3	Buffer zones for the MPA is identified and demarcated and management actions integrated into MPA and local development plans	Adequate management of buffer zones for MCPA	No buffer zones defined and no management plans in place.	Clearly demarcated buffer zones in Karaburuni-Sazani MPA with management actions integrated into MPA and local development plan.	Approved management plan for Karaburuni-Sazani MPA.	The management plan of K-S MPA developed through participatory process and approved with MoE decree Nr. 750 date 21.11.2015. The Management plan includes a section on the buffer zone and permissible activities resulting from the preparatory analyses and qualitative survey.  The financial plan was also developed and shared	

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Sources of verification	Target level at end of project	Rating
						<p>with all stakeholders.</p> <p>The findings and recommendations have been considered by the National Agency of Protected Areas and are being implemented jointly with UNDP.</p> <p>Two other MPAs Porto Palermo and Cape of Rodoni are in the process of being proclaimed. Assessment and public hearing conducted. The Porto Palermo area of 2067.75 ha is planned to be proclaimed as a Natural Park and the set of the regulatory documents (including the Management Plan) have been circulated among line ministries. Valuation of ecosystem services (ES) is undertaken as an assessment tool. In this framework it was developed a study with focus on rapid economic valuation of ES beneficiary identification and financing instruments for the Marine Protected Areas. This enabled assessment of the current economic valuation of critical marine ecosystems and determination of the potential for long-term financing of the Albania MCPAs system. Also the methodologies and approaches for such assessment were provided including examination of the range of goods and services within the Karaburun-Sazani MPA conducting an Ecosystem Value Transfer to identify the value of the ecosystem services. In addition options are explored for multi-criteria valuation of ecosystem services provided by the marine areas assessing the equity and efficiency of the payments as well as compensation schemes.</p>	
		Guidelines for adequate management of buffer zones in MCPA	No buffer zones defined and no management plans in place.	Guidelines/recommendations on setting up buffer zones for MCPAs and integrating buffer zone and PA management plans	Technical reports and guidelines available to MoE (former MEFWA)	The assessment report on the establishment of Buffer Zones in 9 marine and coastal PAs completed including guidelines/ recommendations on setting up buffer zones for	

UNDP/GEF project  
 "Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas"

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Sources of verification	Target level at end of project	Rating
						<p>MPAs. This contributed to NAPA's effort in verifying and redefining the borders of the Albanian terrestrial and coastal PAs including zoning updating.</p> <p>In-depth assessment for main sensitive marine and coastal areas including ecological quantification of MPAs ecosystems and GISbased maps produced for all coastal areas. This work was done in support of NAPA. As newly established National Agency NAPA invested considerable efforts in verifying and defining borders of all PAs (terrestrial and coastal) considering also the need for zoning updates. This exercise was particularly useful for the accurate accounting and transfer of forests grazing and other ecosystem habitats formerly under the General Directorate of Forests to the newly established NAPA. The main achievement of this work captured completion of the qualitative survey of these sites administering of all possible information regarding zoning (and habitat when available) with the proper demarcation and buffer zones description of biodiversity values and environmental state in target areas distribution ecological and environmental state of the most important and sensitive species biocenosis in the targeted area zoning (and habitat when available) mapping (maps and cartography) of the targeted area through the GIS expertise.</p>	
Outcome 2: Improved management arrangements for MCPAs based on clear institutional responsibilities and development of capacities							
2.1	Cross-sectoral Forum on PA management is created	Management boards at MCPAs	0	At least 2 MCPAs have Management Boards	Official decision for the establishment and structure of the Management Boards	Management Committees (MCs) established for all Coastal PAs and meetings organized annually. The MC of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA is a cross-sectorial body which hosts representatives of the main central and local relevant authorities NGOs user groups and other stakeholders. It has	

UNDP/GEF project  
 "Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas"

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Sources of verification	Target level at end of project	Rating
						functioned also as project board convened each semester discussing the management plan project progress main problems as well as financial issues.	
		# of agreements or MoUs on MPA/PA issued	0	<p>Cross sectoral forum which will bring together key sectors and institutions PA site managers NGOs and representatives of the main user groups established by the end of Year 3 of the project.</p> <p>At least 2 official agreements or memorandum of cooperation/ understanding between relevant ministries/institutions</p>	Minutes and records of the meetings of Cross-sectoral Forum meetings Official agreements (MoU/Cooperation)	<p>The MoUs between UNDP and Orikumi Municipality and then with RAPA in Vloera allowed for effective gathering of data on illegal activities (monthly reports delivered to MoE) improving law enforcement through better patrolling of K-S MPA.</p> <p>The MoU between UNDP and INCA contributed to the implementation of priority actions of the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA management plan.</p> <p>Cooperation with Vloera Prefecture Regional Directorate of Environment Vloera National Coastal Agency is ongoing.</p> <p>The MoU between UNDP and NAPA secured efficient control and management in the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA.</p> <p>The MoU between UNDP and WWF secured the development of K-S MPA management plan.</p> <p>efficient in securing synergies among the international and local expertise including a multilateral well known organization but also with prominent Albanian expertise such as WWF Conservatoire du Littoral INCA and local institutions. A successful instrument applied for the enforcement purpose resulted in the MoUs between: 1) UNDP and Orikumi municipality on control and supervision of the illegal activities in and around MPA 2) UNDP and National Agency of Protected Areas which has secured efficient control and management in the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA. 3) UNDP and INCA/WWF on</p>	

UNDP/GEF project  
 "Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas"

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Sources of verification	Target level at end of project	Rating
						implementation of priority management actions Very successful patrolling of the area is accomplished by 6 rangers who report periodically and assist with information and raising awareness for the MPA Karaburun-Sazani.	
2.2	System for joint surveillance and monitoring of the networks of MCPAs to track biodiversity impacts and management effectiveness is piloted	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 from end of 2 <sup>nd</sup> year of project thereafter	METT score sheets for 9 CPAs	<p>2 training sessions were conducted in Vlora and Lezha with PAs administrators on METT preparation.</p> <p>METT as a management effectiveness assessment tool continued to be applied at national scale with involvement of all PAs personnel including Karaburun-Sazani MPA throughout project implementation.</p> <p>The METT methodology and assessment forms were adopted and incorporated in an online platform (<a href="http://www.mett-undp.al">http://www.mett-undp.al</a>). The website was further enriched with info and reporting entries from the PAs related to visitors' survey illegal activities nature and culture monuments. The web based METT tool is now established and operational allowing links with project website and other relevant sites contributing to make this assessment tool more user friendly (website pattern navigation structure etc.</p> <p>METT as an assessment of management effectiveness tool continued to apply at national scale with involvement of all PAs personnel including Karaburun-Sazani MPA making clear comparative analyses with the earlier results. METT score for Karaburun-Sazani is 47% in 2015. The methodology and assessment forms were adopted and incorporated in an online platform <a href="http://www.mett-undp.al">http://www.mett-undp.al</a> The website was</p>	

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Sources of verification	Target level at end of project	Rating
						further enriched with info and reporting entries from the PAs pertinent to visitors survey illegal activities nature and culture monument etc. Finally the web based METT tool is established and functional allowing links with project website and other relevant sites contributing to make this assessment tool more user friendly (website pattern navigation structure etc).	
2.3	Technical extension services for site managers on cost-effective management and conservation approaches	Number of manuals/guidelines prepared as a resource for imparting further training	Very limited	6 training modules are tested and taught by Year 3 of project.	Publication record of the manuals Project Annual Reports	<p>Training needs assessment and development training modules for MCPA personnel has been completed and the final workshop was conducted on August 2014. 32 questionnaires completed by participant and assessed.</p> <p>Curricula and 8 training modules on marine biodiversity conservation and management were produced and training sessions conducted. The 'Manual on Training on Integrated Management of MCPAs' is published and used by NAPA NGOs and others organizations. It is also considered a valuable source for the extension services in both terrestrial and coastal PAs. In addition two other publications on touristic guide and rangers information support are produced to facilitate the daily work of the rangers and tourists/ operators access. (Ref. 'Orik guide' and 'In Blue').</p> <p>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</p>	
2.4	Management and business planning demonstrated in the Karaburuni - Sazani MPA.	Funding of Karaburni – Sazani MPA	Gap to be assessed by end of 1 <sup>st</sup> year	At least 50% of funding needs are being met by end of 5 <sup>th</sup> year of project	Annual financial records of the MPA	<p>Financial resources for the administration of Karaburun – Sazani have been identified in its business plan.</p> <p>Uniforms with logo and equipment provided to</p>	

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Sources of verification	Target level at end of project	Rating
						<p>the MPA staff and rangers.</p> <p>he Management plan (including the financial plan) for the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA has been approved and is being implemented. Enforcement mechanisms for the supervision of the MPA are strengthened through different agreements allowing for more efficient control and supervision of the illegal activities in the project site Karaburuni-Sazani MPA. 6 rangers are in place and patrolling the area reporting periodically and assisting the simple monitoring and raising the awareness for the MPA Karaburun-Sazani protection of forests in the coastal area. Joint patrolling missions are conducted periodically with participation of Guard Coast Delta force (border policy) and other inspection bodies. The main local partners of the project in site are the Vlora Regional Agency of Protected Areas (local branch of the NAPA) and the Municipality of Vlora (under the actual territorial reform); therefore the MoUs were accordingly revised and addressing additional MPA management activities such as: (1) establishing the information center in the site as one of the most significant activities that strengthen capacities for marine ecosystem information and awareness raising; and (2) extended patrolling (yearlong) with respective rangers patrolling and reporting Logistic equipment and support is provided for the MPA administration to enable better control and access in the area particularly provision for the first time with a navigation speed boat including training and certification of two skippers. Another agreement is under implementation with INCA (national experienced NGO) to accomplish some priority actions as per the Management Plan like:</p>	

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Sources of verification	Target level at end of project	Rating
						(1) preparation of three preliminary assessment studies for terrestrial trails on buffer zone diving sites and mooring buoys; (2) works for establishing the mooring buoys and to repair of the existing docks; (3) underwater and terrestrial trails. In addition the Ecosystem Value Transfer conducted identified the value of the ecosystem services exploring options for multi-criteria valuation of ecosystem services provided by the marine areas and assess the equity and efficiency of the payments and compensation schemes. According to the National Agency of Protected Areas financial data approx. 150000 USD are dedicated to the Marine Park Karaburun-Sazani. This amount represents almost 70% of the estimated annual running cost of the MPA administration based on Management Plan document which after analysing the management scenarios against the main conservation and management priorities estimates the relevant budget. The project with its fund has helped to reach the management objectives of the year	
		Increased understanding of the fish resources of the MPA	Very limited studies on fish resources for the targeted area (s)	At least 3 site diagnoses missions and reports for K-S MCPA deep insights fishery cross-sectorial studies scoping the management and conservation of this sector	Increased understanding of the fish resources of the MPA	The socio-economic study on MPA area has included an assessment on fishery resources and fish stock. A recent study coordinated and supported by the project focused on fish stock population in the Vlorë bay including the Karaburun-Sazani MPA. It focused on improving artisanal management fishing in MPA based both on outputs from the present study and experience gained from long term fishery scientific programs in the area. The study was conducted by The Royal Albanian Foundation and the University of Tirana Aquaculture Department. The Waitt Foundation supported marine assessment along the Albanian coasts. The final report reveals information and analyses from all	

UNDP/GEF project  
 “Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas”

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Sources of verification	Target level at end of project	Rating
						Albanian marine area with comparative analyses of main marine habitats; the results on <i>Posidonia</i> coralliganeous and water quality in the Karaburuni-Sazani MPA indicate a very good status.	
		Aware inhabitants and stakeholders adjacent to the MPA (and countrywide) of MBD values	No means and tools available at local level to deliver information to stakeholders. No media coverage and no website for the targeted site. Local media (radio and TV) has never run programme on MCPA and /or MBD values).	At least 3 dedicated programmes on MCPA and MBD conservation are mediated per year by the end of 5 <sup>th</sup> year of project. All school children in Orikumi and Vlora are fully aware of globally important biodiversity in the K-S MCPA by the end of 5 <sup>th</sup> year of project.	Records from the local media report from the information events visitors log book. Random survey among school children and teachers;	The analyses for amendment of this indicator considered the progress and NGO knowledge/ information status of the information (communication tools websites or advocacy and education work plan available or local media approached to this issue)- there seem one or two local media that cover all Vlora region in addition to national media. None of the local media has run programme on issues linked with MBD and /or MCPA and find to be rather blind on environmental issues. In this respect the project believed that involving local media will have wider awareness impact and close collaboration and changing the local media attitude toward proactive MBD conservation including Karaburun-Sazani ecosystem. Articles published in 2 national newspapers ('Telegraf' and 'Dita'). A video documentary produced on project achievements and MCPA values and role. Awareness campaign leaflets eco-guide and branding materials targeting stakeholder as well as the wider public were organized throughout project implementation. Several awareness campaign public hearing thematic classes and site visits were conducted in close cooperation with the regional education public institutions Vlora University and local NGOs. Other productions are: - a photo-album of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA - a guide for the MCPAs titled In Blue eco-guide - information tables branding materials were	

UNDP/GEF project  
 "Improving coverage and management effectiveness of marine and coastal protected areas"

#	Outputs	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Sources of verification	Target level at end of project	Rating
						prepared and distributed - the International Biodiversity Day and World Environmental Day were celebrated - an information tool iVlora was developed and published through website and apps providing an information platform for communities and visitors on environmental issues sustainable tourism PAs of the Vlorë region particularly of Karaburuni-Sazani MPA. - the project the website is <a href="http://mcpa.iwlearn.org">http://mcpa.iwlearn.org</a>	

Colour coding

Green: Indicator shows successful achievement
Yellow: Indicator shows expected completion by the end of the project
Red: Indicator shows poor achievement unlikely to be accomplished by project closure

