

# **United Nation Development Programme**

## **Mid-Term Review**

### **Adaption Fund Project:**

**“Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources in Honduras: Increased Systemic Resilience and Reduced Vulnerability of the Urban Poor”**

**UNDP Project No. 00077360**

**Dean Pallen**

**Final Report**

**April 15 2014**

---

## Acronyms

AF: Adaptation Fund  
AMDC: Central District Municipal Government (Spanish Acronym)  
BHN: National Hydrological Balance (Spanish Acronym)  
CABEI Central American Bank for Economic Integration  
CCAD: Central American Commission for Environment and Development (Spanish Acronym)  
CATIE: Centro de Investigaciones Agrícolas y Educación Superior  
CCIC: Climate Change Inter-institutional Committee  
CCITC: Climate Change Inter-institutional Technical Committee  
DNCC: Climate Change National Office (Spanish Acronym)  
DRR: Disaster Risk Reduction  
GOH: Government of Honduras  
ICF: Forestry Conservation Institution (Spanish Acronym)  
JICA: Japanese International Cooperation Agency  
MTR Mid-Term Review  
NGO: Non Governmental Organizations  
NDE: National Designated Entity  
PANLCD National Plan to Combat Desertification and Drought (Spanish Acronym)  
PFA: Adaptation Fund Project (Project's Spanish Acronym)  
Pro Doc: Project Document  
PPR: Project Performance Reports  
RMN: National Meteorological Network (Spanish Acronym)  
RSC LAC: United Nations Development Programme Regional Service Centre for Latin America and the Caribbean  
SANAA: Autonomous National Service of Aqueducts and Sewers (Spanish Acronym)  
SEFIN: Secretary of Finance (Spanish Acronym)  
SEPLAN: Technical Secretariat of Planning and Cooperation (Spanish Acronym)  
SERNA: Secretary of Natural Resources and Environment (Spanish Acronym)  
SICA: Central American Integration System (Spanish Acronym)  
SMN: National Meteorology System (Spanish Acronym)  
SWAT: Soil & Water Assessment Tool  
UNAH: Autonomous University of Honduras (Spanish Acronym)  
UNDP: United Nations Development Programme  
UNDP CO: United Nations Development Programme Country Office  
UNFCCC: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

### Opening Page

Project Title:	Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources in Honduras: Increased Systemic Resilience and Reduced Vulnerability of the Urban Poor			
UNDP Project ID:	No. 00077360	<b>Project financing</b>	<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at MTR (Million US\$)</i>
ATLAS Project ID:	AF PIMS 4399	GEF financing:	\$5,620,300	2,775,395.00
Country:	Honduras	IA/EA own:		
Region:	Central América	Government:		
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:		
		Total co-financing:		
Executing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost in cash:		
Other Partners involved:	Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y Ambiente (SERNA)	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		June 2011
			Planned closing date: April 2016	Revised closing date:

**Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report:** The evaluation commenced February 17<sup>th</sup> 2014 and was by and large concluded by April 30<sup>th</sup> 2014. The field work for the evaluation was completed Feb 24<sup>th</sup> to March 4<sup>th</sup>.

**Implementing and Project Partners:** The Implementing partner is the Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y Ambiente (SERNA) in partnership with the Secretaria Técnica de Planificación y Cooperación Externa (SEPLAN), el Instituto Nacional de Conservación y Desarrollo Forestal, Áreas Protegidas y Vida Silvestre (ICF), el Servicio Autónomo Nacional de Acueductos y Alcantarillados (SANAA), el Servicio Meteorológico Nacional (SMN), la Comisión Permanente de Contingencias (COPECO), la Secretaria de Finanzas (SEFIN), la Oficina del Despacho de la Presidencia, Relaciones Exteriores, Alcaldía Municipal del Distrito Central (AMDC), the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras (UNAH) and the Fundación Hondureña de Ambiente y Desarrollo (Fundación VIDA).

**Evaluation team:** Dean Pallen Evaluation and Climate Change Adaptation specialist

**Acknowledgements:** The evaluation team would like to begin by acknowledging the contribution of the Evaluation Unit of UNDP Panama that oversaw the evaluation with direct support from Leonardo Moreira. Deep gratitude is expressed to the staff of the UNDP Country office in Honduras and most specifically Climate Change Specialist and Project Officer Noelia Jover and Juan Fernando Coordinator of the Environmental and Risk Management Unit for their technical guidance and ongoing support throughout the evaluation process and especially during the field mission. A very special expression of gratitude is due to the PFA project team including Christian Rossi, Milton Domínguez, Lizeth Gómez and newly appointed project coordinator Sonia Suazo who collectively shared responsibility in ensuring that the evaluation received the support and guidance it required. Special thanks are due to Ana Cáceres who demonstrated expediency and resourcefulness in addressing administrative matters related to the evaluation.

**Table of Contents**

Acronyms.....	1
Overview Page and Acknowledgements.....	2
1.0 Executive Summary.....	4
2.0 Introduction.....	10
2.1 Purpose of the evaluation.....	10
2.2 Scope & Methodology .....	10
2.3 Factors Constraining the Evaluation Process and Mitigating Measures .....	11
2.4 Evaluation Time Period.....	11
2.5 Structure of the evaluation report.....	11
3.0 Context and Background of the Mid-Term Evaluation.....	11
3.1 Water Shortages in Honduras: The Case of the Nation’s Capital Tegucigalpa.....	12
3.2 Climate Change in a Context of Growing Water Scarcity.....	12
3.3 Current Political and Governance Context.....	13
4.0 Project Actors, Objectives and Project Components.....	14
5.0 Evaluation Findings.....	16
5.1.1 Progress Towards Results.....	16
5.1.2 Project Design.....	20
5.1.3 Adaptive Management.....	20
5.1.4 Work Planning.....	20
5.1.5 Project Finance and Co-Financing.....	20
5.1.6 Monitoring Systems and Risk Management.....	21
5.1.7 Reporting.....	22
5.2 Management Arrangements.....	22
5.2.1 Overall Project Management.....	22
5.2.2 Quality of Implementing Partners.....	22
5.2.3 Quality of Support provided by UNDP.....	22
5.3 Gender.....	23
6.0 Conclusions.....	23
7.0 Recommendations.....	26
8.0 Lessons learned.....	27

**Annexes**

**Annex 1: Environmental Matrix**

**Annex 2: List of Individuals Interviewed**

**Annex 3 Publications Consulted**

**Annex 4: Project Publications and Communications Materials**

**Annex 5: Assessing the contribution of project’s products to Outcome 5 and Outcome 3 Honduras Country Programme 2012-2016**

**Annex 6: Adaptation Fund Mid-term Evaluation Rating Scale**

### 1.0 Executive Summary

**“Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources in Honduras: Increased Systemic Resilience and Reduced Vulnerability of the Urban Poor”** or as it is known by its Spanish acronym, (PFA) is one of the first projects funded through the Adaptation Fund (AF) a funding source under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to support adaptation projects and programmes in developing countries which are parties to the Kyoto Protocol. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is the implementing entity and the Honduras Secretary of Natural Resources and Environment (SERNA) is the executing entity. The project was approved during the 11th meeting of the Board of the AF held in Bonn in September 2010 through an agreement signed by the Honduras UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) and the Government of Honduras (GOH). The five-year project commenced in June of 2011 and is expected to be completed in April 2016. The operating budget for the project is \$.5, 180,000.00.

Throughout Honduras, access to water is emerging as an important challenge made more complicated by uncontrolled deforestation, inappropriate agricultural practices and pollution from multiple sources and other factors negatively impacting ground water and aquifers. At the same time Honduras has been and remains one of the poorest countries in Central America making it difficult for it to properly manage its natural resources. Of special concern are the watersheds that support the large urban centres of the country (Tegucigalpa and San Pedro Sula) where the demand for water is on a constant increase while its availability progressively decreases. At the time of the project’s inception modelling scenarios indicated that climate change would increasingly exacerbate the problem. In response the PFA would seek to increase resilience to climate change and water-related risks in highly vulnerable communities through pilot activities. At the same systematic activities designed to mainstream climate change within the water sector were to be undertaken as well as targeted training and outreach activity. Specific activities of the project were to be; integrating climate change risks and opportunities into the country’s new water law and the new National Plan Law, strengthening the national meteorological network; improving information on the scientific, technical, and socioeconomic aspects on the impacts of climate change, vulnerability and adaptation; and increasing the availability of climate risk assessment tools and information to relevant institutions. The pilot activity was to be implemented throughout the sprawling Tegucigalpa City area to improve land use practices and institute financial mechanisms to assist in managing water supply and demand. Institutional capacity building and the training of decision makers and resource users to better understand the projected impacts of climate change and providing them with the knowledge to identify effective options for reducing climatic risks and vulnerability was also identified as priority activities for the project.

SERNA was designated for ensuring that the objectives and components of the project would be delivered and project resources allocated and disbursed in an appropriate manner. SERNA was also deemed responsible for establishing agreements with Honduran partner institutions in support of the implementation of the different project components. The national partner institutions are the Technical Secretariat of Planning and Cooperation (SEPLAN), Forestry Conservation Institution (ICF), the Autonomous National Service of Aqueducts and Sewers (SANAA), the National Meteorology System (SMN), Permanent Contingency Commission of Honduras (COPECO), the Secretary of Finance (SEFIN), la Oficina del Despacho de la Presidencia, Relaciones Exteriores, as well the Central District Municipal Government (AMDC), the Autonomous University of Honduras (UNAH) and the Fundación Hondureña de Ambiente y Desarrollo (Fundación VIDA) that is a part of the NGO Network that monitors the progress of AF project activity. As per the Project Document (Pro Doc) these institutions were expected to manage the financial resources necessary to carry out their respective project activity with SERNA assuming overall administrative and financial management of the project in accordance with its objectives. UNDP was designated to provide support to SERNA and more directly to the project

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

---

team. UNDP was tasked with the responsibility of administering resources in accordance with specific objectives as defined in the Pro Doc. In addition, the Pro Doc designated UNDP to provide key general management and specialized technical support services through UNDP's Global Network of regional and headquarters offices and technical units and where possible, enhance the reach of the project.

There are a number of key contextual issues related to the project's implementation. In Honduras, interagency cooperation is not typically practiced or encouraged. The project sought to promote a very ambitious agenda of interagency collaboration while at the same time increasing the number of institutional actors engaged in climate change and water resources issues. Honduras's climate change capacity lags behind neighbouring countries such as Nicaragua. Yet El Salvador, as much as any Central American country, is impacted by climate change. In fact in the 1993 to 2013 time period, Honduras is considered the third most adversely impacted country in the world.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, Honduras is rife with violence and crime and these unfortunate circumstances are especially a concern in larger urban centres such as Tegucigalpa. Crime and violence are considered to be on the rise in and currently Honduras has the highest homicide rate in the world.<sup>2</sup>

A new government recently came to power that has committed itself to reducing crime and violence. This same government has also acknowledged that it will be taking the issue of climate change seriously. The previous Government was also recognized as being concerned with climate change and supportive of the project.

This Mid Term Review (MTR) analyzes the project's success in achieving its states objectives. Beyond this the MTR is meant to assist in mapping out a course of action for the remaining two years of the project and determining how to make best of the project's resources given ongoing contextual matters.

### Summary of Key Findings

The MTR revealed a project making important progress at its midpoint in achieving results in relation to its three components; improving institutional capacities and tools for mainstreaming adaptation to climate change with a focus on water, pilot project activity in the Tegucigalpa area to anticipate and manage climate change impacts and training and outreach to assist in responding to climate change over the long-term. The project is having a positive development effect through its support of Honduran institutions, government bodies at different levels, and local communities. The project is contributing to establishing a foundation that can guide Honduras into the future in addressing climate change and the water scarcity challenge.

*According to the AF's criteria of project success towards achieving results, the project is currently at a "Satisfactory Level".* This means most major objectives of the project are being met but with some shortcomings. Much of what is being promoted by the project is new territory for Honduras thus it should be anticipated that difficulties have and will continue to be encountered. *At the same time following the AF criteria aspects of the project such as the in-depth climate change courses and institutional changes that have been achieved would rate as being "Highly Satisfactory".* Given the strength of the project's management and the receptiveness of stakeholders, there is no reason to believe that the project will not continue to meet with success and that overtime aspects of the project could be deemed to be considered "Good Practice" as defined by the AF.<sup>3</sup> In terms of the AF criteria on Adaptive management and Management Arrangements the project also rates as being Satisfactory but again with

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://germanwatch.org/en/7673>

<sup>2</sup> <http://uk.reuters.com/article/2014/04/10/uk-latam-crime-idUKBREA390IK20140410>

<sup>3</sup> See annex 6 for a description of the Adaptation Fund Rating Scale

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

---

some reservation. The findings of the MTR are consistent with the analysis conducted by the Fundación VIDA that through their monitoring activity have found that the project stakeholders are very satisfied with the progress the project has made.

As a result of the project there is a new level of engagement and coordination between national institutions, governments at all levels and community stakeholders. The project has been able to train over 600 people representing a strong cross section of stakeholders from community level participants to technical specialists and decision makers within important line ministries. As well, the Fundación VIDA estimates the project has sensitized close to 700 stakeholders. According to stakeholders the project's effort to train has resulted in establishing higher professional standards in matters such as technical report writing, and enhancing the overall knowledge base and technical capability of government employees. The in-depth courses on climate change and climate change and water proved to be highly beneficial in terms of enriching individual capabilities, establishing professional bonds and energizing a relatively youthful cohort.

The project was cited for having a number of unanticipated positive impacts such as contributing to improving the collective conversation in Honduras surrounding climate change that has become more open, inclusive, and better informed. As important, the project is credited with contributing to a broadening range of individuals participating in an increasingly national debate on climate change.

Other concrete gains include facilitating the installation and management of a network of 46 new automated weather stations throughout the country capable of generating important weather related data. Water supply services in Tegucigalpa are now benefiting from better protection through the updating of management plans for 35,380 hectares of protected area to incorporate climate vulnerability analyses and adaptation measures. The project has supported the preparation of numerous technical studies and plans. This includes five Regional Development Plans; three of four protected area plans and one of three anticipated watershed management plans have been completed. These planning tools have integrated climate change considerations into their respective processes. The project has also contributed to the creation of the National Climate Water Balance (BHN) that is a study of surface water, and inventory of ground water sources in Honduras.

To date, the building of interagency relations has been the project's major achievement. The project has established a technical platform, although not formal, for inter-agency coordination and cooperation that has allowed technical staff from different institutions to develop a shared comprehension of how to address climate change and in particular, adaptation and mitigation measures to protect the country's scarce water resources. This has created the basis for a more consistent and informed collective approach in addressing climate change. Furthermore, the Working Paper WP 4H (Guide to mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management into development planning), which is the methodological guide for integrating climate change adaptation into development and territorial planning was institutionalized within SERNA and SEPLAN. The Working Paper has introduced a more structured and comprehensive approach to addressing climate change.

There have also been some clear problems with the project. Although there have been major gains in cultivating improved relations and dialogue between stakeholders, there remain specific circumstances where communication and inter-relations remain problematic. This can be observed within the National Meteorological Network (RMN) where there have been displays of disharmony between the four partners. The project has been facilitating collaboration between the project's national level partners such as the University with stakeholders at the municipal and community level. On this front there has been success but challenges as well. While over the long-term the University is seen as being as important as any institution in addressing climate change in Honduras, the project has yet been able to

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

---

determine how to make best use of the University. While the partners overseeing the 46 meteorological stations struggle with some technical glitches, good information is being produced that many stakeholders would like to see shared more effectively. The project has not been able to make progress on the matter of incorporating climate change considerations into water pricing in the Tegucigalpa area. It might be that this complicated endeavour would be better suited to another implementation platform that the project cannot provide.

Progress has been made with Pilot activity and this was observable through the limited field visits that were possible during the MTR. This includes the introduction of water conservation practices (drip irrigation) in agricultural systems and the construction of street level flood control systems appearing to be effective and appreciated by project beneficiaries. At the same time though project stakeholders suggest that not all is positive with the project pilot activity citing the complexity of the activities and the difficult implementing environment as challenges. The need for concrete examples of incorporating climate uncertainties into proactive approaches to planning is undeniable and the AF's insistence on pilot activity being a part of the project was well founded. The project should remain engaged in pilot activity however some thought should go into how to approach in the remaining years. The project's limited success with pilot project activity stands in contrast to the accomplishments in developing plans, building institutional capacity and interagency relations, and training, and engaging stakeholders. Gains in these areas will have substantive implications for Honduras over the long-term.

An idea that could help to guide subsequent activity is to consider how the project can contribute to preparing Honduras to become a more pro-active participant in regional and global dialogues on climate change. It may not have been the intent but the project is already doing just that. The question is whether the project is able to continue to work towards its objectives while helping Honduras prepare to collaborate more pro-actively with other Central American countries on a more equal basis. Are there parallels that can be drawn with other circumstances in Central America that could inspire and guide the project? For example is there a university in Central America that could serve as a role model for the UNAH on climate change?

The project team within SERNA is handling a highly complicated portfolio of activities from both a technical and procedural standpoint. It is important therefore legitimate to reflect on the composition and capabilities of the project team and how it could be reinforced. The relation between the project and the Climate Change National Office (DNCC) that is within SERNA and is responsible for the delivery of national action on adaptation to climate change should also be re-evaluated. From the standpoints of mainstreaming climate change and institutional capacity building the PAF project overlaps with the mandate of the DNCC. The relationship between the two entities could be better fleshed out and might entail the DNCC being considered a stronger focus of the project. The DNCC in conjunction with the project could also be called upon for example, to facilitate the formalizing of the currently non-formal technical platform between ministries that the project created.

The project is having some impacts that were not necessarily anticipated. For example, development agencies not connected to the project have been seeking to see their own activities connect or benefit from the plans, structures and studies produced by the project. Examples of this include the National Hydrological Balance (BHN) that has seen its information feeding into roughly ten other processes or projects such as the National Plan to Combat Desertification and Drought. In terms of the regional plans USAID's ProParque project is one of many international initiatives that are taking advantage of the regional plans in their own planning activities. The project has situated itself to have a wider influence and possibly benefit from opportunities to incorporate support and other initiatives into aspects of its own programming. In a context where most donors and international NGO programmes are active in the climate change and water management fields, it is easy to imagine a scenario where partnerships and

alternative sources of funding could support activities that further the overall mandate of the project. Where this might be special interest would be pilot activity which would free up the project's core resources for further training and institutional building.

### Recommendations

- 1) To undertake a process to contemplate what should be the priorities of the project for the remaining two years and whether this could mean a reorientation of project activity. This should include an open discussion regarding the possibility of reallocating the project's budgetary resources. The objective would be to create enough latitude for the project team in consultation with UNDP to favour programming in areas where there are greater opportunities for success in terms of advancing the climate change and water conservation agendas in Honduras. Existing commitments should be respected but there should be openness to reallocating resources between the three major project components.
- 2) While working towards achieving its objectives identify how the project can continue to develop capacity at the institutional and the individual professional level to bring Honduras closer to the standards of other countries in Central America in terms of the ability to address climate change and in particular in relation to managing water resources. The focus should be on replicating the best practices found in countries such as Nicaragua, Guatemala and El Salvador and if possible, Costa Rica. On this matter the Honduras UNDP CO in consultation with the UNDP's Panama Regional Service Centre Office should play a role on providing technical support and facilitating contacts in Central America.
- 3) To continue to develop and improve upon the tools (training and otherwise) that the project has been developing such as the Water Balance.
- 4) As it has some responsibility for nurturing and guiding the work of its partners the project team's own knowledge and technical capabilities should be reinforced. This will enable the team to maintain a strong confident footing when assisting the project's implementing partners on challenging technical matters.
- 5) To determine how stronger synergy and mutual support can be established between the project and the DNCC. Some areas to explore would include improving the dissemination of key publications, reinforcing the capabilities of the DNCC and through the DNCC formalize the inter-agency coordination and cooperation that the project has been nurturing.
- 6) The collection and availability of project information has to be improved. It is critical that professional technical people, institutions, governments at all levels and community groups develop the capacity to interpret and put to use climate related information. This cannot happen if the information is not made available. This is equally true for the focussed technical studies that the project has and will continue to support. There should be a common and easily accessible Internet platform for accessing all the information and resources that the project has contributed to developing.
- 7) Time and resources should be allocated to proactively attracting secondary funding that could for example, support and enable pilot activity and address other needs. This should result in developing new forms of partnerships and extend the outreach of the project. Establishing partnerships to contribute to a more comprehensive approach to protecting the watersheds of Tegucigalpa would be an admirable and worthy endeavour. Possible sources of additional project funding could include the Central American Bank for Economic Integration (CABEI).

8) To undertake a process to revise the projects indicators to reflect the success the project has had and to incorporate the project's orientation for the remaining years.

### Lesson Learned

- Although a clear interest and commitment in mainstreaming climate change adaptation practices is emerging, the reality is that there is still a great deal that must be done. In this context, a premium has to be placed on stimulating dialogue, the development of knowledge and establishing a shared approach to problem solving by capitalizing on the growing consensus on the need to ensure effective climate change mainstreaming.
- Strong national lead agencies capable of coordinating and providing leadership on climate change mainstreaming are essential. At the same time, the UNDP CO and SERNA must have access to the relevant expertise to guide and nurture national partners on a broad range of water and climate related issues.
- Ensuring national engagement in the climate change mainstreaming agenda is challenging but it is achievable provided stakeholders are encouraged to participate in a constructive manner and have the knowledge to do so. This is why the in-depth climate change courses have been so important. This type of capacity building results in positive outcomes that are not always easy to capture as sometimes it may be informal or not quantifiable as for example, the professional relationships that develop between individuals who take courses together.
- With an endless array of development priorities the case for mainstreaming climate change adaptation has to be made convincingly and strategically. The experience of the project demonstrates that this can be accomplished but it is more effective when it is tied to other development priorities like water management or regional development planning.
- The modification and/or development of policies and plans to promoting climate are valid learning vehicles. Interested individuals and organizations seek practical opportunities for applying the mainstreaming of climate change concept. Overall, the importance of practical experiences in understanding how to mainstream climate change adaptation should never be underestimated.
- The need for pilot activity that demonstrates how climate uncertainty can be addressed constructively is paramount. However, in challenging circumstances such as found in the greater Tegucigalpa area, one has to choose each intervention wisely.

### **2.0 Introduction**

#### **2.1 Purpose of the Evaluation**

While conducting this evaluation it was understood that it requires an independent and impartial process that appreciates and documents results (both positive and negative). The MTR follows the standards and procedures established by the UNDP and the AF. The objectives of the MTR are to analyse the achievements of results and identify opportunities to improve the project over the next two years before its completion. The MTR is meant to keep the project on track towards achieving its expected results and make recommendations to facilitate modifications in direction with the intent of achieving the best possible results.

The project has attempted to achieve results at very different levels of intervention from the upper structures of government to poor urban communities. The evaluation had to understand the effectiveness and efficiency of the project in operating in these diverse implementing contexts. Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), crisis prevention and climate change adaptation are important programming themes for the UNDP in Honduras. These are also strong priorities for the GOH. The evaluation should contribute to a broader dialogue regarding UNDP's and the GOH's efforts in these areas.

#### **2.2 Scope & Methodology**

At the time of the project's inception baselines were documented corresponding to the project's objectives and describing the state of affairs in Honduras regarding institutional capacity, level of knowledge and capacity of technical specialists and the degree to which climate change considerations had been integrated into national and regional policies and plans. The MTR was able to use these baselines to better comprehend what the project has been accomplishing. In addition, two Project Performance Reports (PPR) provided a good indication of what the project had achieved in its first two years of operation. This base of information also created the possibility of more direct and subtle questioning on issues such as project effectiveness, efficiency, and adaptive management. AF's guidelines for preparing a MTR were employed to establish the structure for this report.

All evaluations must strive to be as participatory as possible involving as many different actors as possible. Given the diversity of stakeholders involved in this project, there was a need for a flexible approach that allowed for differentiated interview techniques and questions. The methodology of the evaluation allowed for the triangulation of information to ensure that findings and opinions were confirmed by multiple sources. In relation to the pilot project activity complete verification of results was not possible through triangulation as access to individuals and project sites was limited due to security reasons. Where this occurred it is duly noted in the report. An evaluation question matrix was developed (see annex 1). The evaluation matrix provided criteria, groups the specific questions and identifies secondary questions, and identifies information data sources and methods and tools for data collection. The matrix was used to collect and systematize information including the limited number of field visits. A complete list of the stakeholders who were interviewed can be found in Annex 2. Annex 3 provides a list of the documents that were consulted. The following tools were employed to gather information:

- Document analysis (project reports, research publications, media, etc.)
- Key Informant Interviews

- Focus Groups
- Field Visits

### **2.3 Factors Constraining the Evaluation Process and Mitigating Measures**

The evaluation encountered limitations that are common with this type of evaluative such as a restricted amount of time to undertake the evaluation. These types of obstacles were overcome through practical means such as following up with people afterward the field work period to clarify matters. There was one critical constraint that was created by security concerns and the threat of violence. This made it impossible to visit certain project areas in and around Tegucigalpa. Just prior to the field work the United Nations security team in Honduras made a recommendation not to enter into certain areas of Tegucigalpa where the project is implementing project activity. Although a recommendation and not a ban the advice of the security team was respected. To the best degree possible information was gathered from alternative sources of information regarding the functioning of the pilot activity in the Tegucigalpa area that was not visited.

### **2.4 Evaluation Time Period**

The evaluation process began the week of February 11 2014. The fieldwork for this MTR was carried out from Feb 24 to March 5 2014. The report was finalized in April 2014.

### **2.5 Structure of the Evaluation Report**

The main part of the Evaluation Report presents a synthesis of information gathered on the project. It explores key issues concerning the project and its implementation. It is structured to present the Evaluation Findings and the corresponding Conclusion, Lessons Learned, and Recommendations in response to evaluation questions and the information sought by the AF regarding such matters as Adaptive Management. A list of documents utilised in the context of the evaluation is provided in Annex 3. A full list of interviewees is provided in Annex 2. The Evaluation Question Matrix is provided in Annex 1. Annex 5 provides an assessment of the project's contribution to Outcome 5 and Outcome 3 of the Country Programme 2012-2016. The evaluation assessed the contribution of UNDP to changes in behaviours, practices and / or institutional performance of actors related to these Outcomes. Annex 6 presents the AF's MTRs Rating Scale.

### **3.0 Context and Background of the Mid-Term Evaluation**

The project was approved during the 11th meeting of the Board of the AF held in Bonn in September 2010 with an agreement signed by the UNDP CO and the GOH. It was conceptualized in a context where Honduras had initiated a process to develop a framework for national land use planning and water management to growing water scarcity in the country. Throughout Honduras, access to water is emerging as an important challenge made more complicated by uncontrolled deforestation, inappropriate agricultural practices and pollution from multiple sources and other factors negatively impacting ground water and aquifers. At the same time Honduras has been and remains one of the poorest countries in Central America making it difficult for it to properly manage its natural resources. As of May 2013, the Honduran National Institute of Statistics considered 64.5% of Honduran households as living in poverty.

Although poverty is more severe in rural areas, more than half of the homes in urban areas are considered to be living in poverty.<sup>4</sup>

Another area that has posed a challenge for Honduras is managing natural disasters. In 1998, Honduras was devastated by Hurricane Mitch. In the aftermath of Mitch there were three days of rain that caused landslides and floods, burying towns and killing thousands of people. Many rural communities were devastated but larger population centres were also severely impacted. The hurricane caused \$58 million in damages and left 75% of the country without safe drinking water.<sup>5</sup> In response to Mitch the GOH with the support of the UNDP and the World Bank established the National Disaster Management Programme. In reality Honduras has never fully really recovered from Mitch. It has never established appropriate DRR capacity. Nor has a significant part of the transportation infrastructure of the country been restored after Mitch.

### 3.1 Water Shortages in Honduras: The Case of the Nation's Capital Tegucigalpa

Drought-like conditions are on the increase across the country. According to the National Plan to Combat Desertification and Drought (PANLCD), as of 2005, close to half of the municipalities of Honduras were already considered vulnerable to drought conditions.<sup>6</sup> Honduras has 19 watersheds and a number of key watersheds are found in heavily populated areas like Tegucigalpa. Such watersheds are under enormous pressure in terms of a high volume of demand and being in vulnerable state. In terms of Tegucigalpa, there are two reservoirs and surface water sources supplying the national capital area with water. SANAA recently announced that the water produced by these sources is dropping each year and that SANAA is not able to provide water to everyone with only 60 % of the 896 neighbourhoods and districts in the Tegucigalpa area being served. According to SANAA this means 400 thousand people do not have direct access to water from their homes. The demand for water is increasing by 2% yearly due in large part to migration to Tegucigalpa. This means that more people are at risks when incidents such as heavy flooding occur as they often do. The colonies of Tegucigalpa are poorly equipped to deal with such emergencies.

### 3.2 Climate Change in a Context of Growing Water Scarcity

Honduras is commonly recognized as one of the most vulnerable countries to climatic change. From the standpoint of financial damage and loss of life, during the 1990 to 2009 period Honduras ranked third in terms of the negative impacts of extreme weather events (IISD 2013). It has been estimated that there were 53 extreme weather events during this time period (IISD 2013). Honduras is contenting with rising temperatures and increasing variability in rainfall. In recent times there have been prolonged and more intense droughts in the southern and eastern regions and intense rainfall events in northern areas. Cyclonic activity over the Atlantic has increased and sea levels are rising. Most of these climatic tendencies and others are expected to worsen with time.<sup>7</sup> A national study on future climate change scenarios determined that a 5% decrease in annual rainfall by 2020 was probable in Honduran departments located along the northwest - south east corridor (Argeñal 2010). This same study anticipates that between 0.5 and 0.75 degrees Celsius increase in mean annual temperature will occur and will be most pronounced in the western and southern regions. By 2050, a 20-25% decrease in precipitation is projected for most parts of the country between the months of June through August, with a 30% reduction in most parts during the months of July and August (Argeñal 2010). Longer-term

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://ine.gob.hn/index.php/censos-y-encuestas/encuestas-todos-las-encuestas-de-honduras/encuesta-permanente-de-hogares>

<sup>5</sup> <http://water.org/country/honduras/>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.fao.org/forestry/13214-0b54512539222481ea40707bff0ce5485.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/honnc2.pdf>

forecasts are more pessimistic in terms of anticipating further decreases in precipitation with increased temperature.

### 3.3 Current Political and Governance Context

Generally speaking the political context in Honduras for moving the climate change agenda forward has been and should remain favourable. The project rightly determined that the political risk posed to the project have been and will remain low for the foreseeable future. The previous government was by and large supportive of the project. A new government was recently elected that to date, has given every indications that it might be even more supportive than the previous government. This speaks to the growing consensus in Honduras that climate change is a national priority.<sup>8</sup>

Compared to other countries in Central America, Honduras is lagging behind in terms of climate change related technical and institutional capacity. While countries such as Nicaragua may still have considerable work to do establish the necessary elements to address climate change systematically, Honduras is considered to be further behind. There are similar challenges within the water sector where effective water management practices and capabilities are lacking in agriculture, industry and public water systems. Formulating and implementing effective climate policies and action is posing a critical challenge for Honduran governments at all levels. They need to be empowered to successfully confront the challenges of climate change.

There has been progress from a governance standpoint. In the 2010, the Honduran National Climate Change Strategy (NCCS) was created with the goal of reducing the country's vulnerability to climate change (including social and economic aspects) and to strengthen the framework of policies, strategies and measures for adaptation and mitigation, particularly in the most climate change prone regions. The NCCS identifies a broad range of possible interventions including to protect freshwater, to reduce drought impacts, assist farmers adapt to climate change, preserve the function, structure and composition of ecosystems, conserve marine and coastal systems, and promote improved DRR practices.

Honduras' development plan and vision for 2010 to 2038 identifies climate change adaptation and mitigation as one of 11 strategic themes (Honduras 2010). On adaptation, the strategy mentions the development of monitoring and measurement systems, early warning systems, new forms of soil use and agricultural production, construction codes, local risk management, preventative land-use planning, water storage and watershed conservation as key measures. In the long run, the Development Plan recognizes that climate change should be mainstreamed into sector level planning and all public and private investment decisions.

The national authority on climate change issues is SERNA. It is responsible for the implementation of international treaties (such as the UNFCCC and its Kyoto Protocol). As such, SERNA leads the elaboration of National Communications and the NCCS. The UNDP provided crucial support to SERNA in the elaboration of these documents. DNCC was created in 2010 and is part of SERNA. It acts as the National designated entity (NDE) for UNFCCC's Climate Technology Centre and Network (CTCN). DNCC is responsible for the delivery of national level action on adaptation to climate change. As a relatively new body, the DNCC is working to establish itself.

---

<sup>8</sup> During the field mission of the MTR there was considerable media coverage surrounding climate change that was not unrelated to the project

The Institutional Technical Committee on Climate Change (CTICC) is a sub-committee of the Institutional Committee on Climate Change CICC is a permanent organ of consultation and support anchored in the DNCC, representing national and sub-national government institutions (including the Association of Municipalities of Honduras), civil society, private sector, professional associations, academia and cooperants representing international development agencies.

Honduras is a member of Central American Integration System (SICA), the institutional framework for the integration of Central American states, and of the Central American Commission for Environment and Development (CCAD), a committee which brings together environmental ministries of SICA member states. Under the auspices of the SICA and CCAD, a regional climate change strategy has recently been developed (CCAD and SICA, 2010).

In Honduras, donor activity in both the climate change and water resource management sectors is very pronounced. This is also true for the international and national NGO sector. UNDP is considered a leading if not the lead international agency on climate change. This is not based so much on the financial resources that UNDP provides as much as the strategic nature of its interventions and demonstrating leadership. There are questions as to how well donors coordinate their activities. There appears to be a considerable amount of donor overlap in activities including within specific regions of the country. However, there was not enough time to fully comprehend the situation.

#### 4.0 Project Actors, Objectives and Project Components

UNDP is the implementing entity and SERNA is the executing entity. The Board of Directors of the PFA is comprised of representatives of civil society, the private sector, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and government institutions. SERNA was designated as the institution responsible for ensuring that the objectives and components of the project are delivered and resources allocated and disbursed in an appropriate manner. SERNA was also deemed responsible for establishing agreements with Honduran partner institutions in support of the implementation of the different project components. The national partner institutions are SEPLAN, ICF, SANAA, SMN, COPECO, SEFIN, la Oficina del Despacho de la Presidencia, Relaciones Exteriores, as well the AMDC, the UNAH and Fundación VIDA that is a part of the international NGO Network that monitors the progress of AF project activity. As per the Project Document (Pro Doc) these institutions were expected to manage the financial resources necessary to carry out their respective project activity with SERNA assuming overall administrative and financial management of the project in accordance with its objectives. UNDP was designated to provide support to SERNA and more directly to the project team. UNDP was tasked with the responsibility of administering resources in accordance with specific objectives as defined in the Pro Doc. In addition, the Pro Doc designated UNDP to provide key general management and specialized technical support services through UNDP's Global Network of regional and headquarters offices and technical units and where possible, enhance the reach of the project.

The objective of the UNDP/AF project “*Addressing Climate Change Risks on Water Resources in Honduras: Increased Systemic Resilience and Reduced Vulnerability of the Urban Poor*” is to increase the capacity of the most vulnerable population in relation to the risks created by climate change and most specifically the impact on water resources through pilot activities and more systematic activities designed to mainstream climate change within the water sector and targeted training and outreach activity. The project would seek to contribute to incorporate climate change criteria into the planning processes and investment decisions of key ministries. Targeted work in Tegucigalpa and the watersheds that provision the capital city was expected to validate concrete response measures – ranging from economic incentives to low-cost technology investments to assist in orienting work at the policy levels.

---

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

---

The project intends to work towards implementing the following three project components and their corresponding outputs and budget allocation as per the original project design:

1. Improved institutional capacities and tools for mainstreaming adaptation to climate change through the regulation and application of the new Water law and the National Plan law, which calls for inter-sectoral and landscape approaches that internalize climate change concerns.

1.1 Integration of climate change risks and opportunities into the new Water Law and the new National Plan Law effectively mainstreams these into water resource policies, watershed management plans, and investment planning policies for sectors with high water demand. **(\$152,900)**

1.2 Capacities at the new Water Authority and SEPLAN for integrating climate risks into planning and programming processes strengthened (e.g. investments, allocation of land and water use rights, and urban development) **(\$892,600)**

1.3. National meteorological network strengthened, and quality and quantity of information on the scientific, technical and socioeconomic aspects on impacts of climate change, vulnerability and adaptation improved. **(\$892,600)**

1.4 Climate risk assessment tools and information available (e.g. updated National Hydrological Balance, vulnerability assessment of groundwater resources, update of CC risk socioeconomic indicators, review of climate related risk maps) to relevant institutions and embedded in planning processes for climate proofing watershed management approaches, agricultural practices, flood and landslide control measures, and infrastructure development **(\$130,000)**

2. Existing water stress and projected increased water scarcity in Tegucigalpa and environs, as well as flash floods due to extreme events, addressed through a range of complementary measures that will serve to pilot responses to climate change impacts in both watershed and urban settings.

2.1. Water provisioning services maintained despite long-term climate trends through sustainable land use practices piloted in the highland watersheds and green belt around Tegucigalpa **(\$155,000)**

2.2 Financial mechanisms (e.g. water pricing, risk transfer/insurance) assist in managing water supply and demand to address current and projected water scarcity in the capital city and surrounding landscape **(\$50,000)**

2.3 Activities for adaptation to climate change impacts, ranging from water scarcity to flooding piloted in the 14 most vulnerable areas of Tegucigalpa (e.g. low cost water storage facilities, stabilized landslides areas, more efficient water use and rainfall management schemes, early warning systems) **(\$2,712,600)**

2.4 Targeted thematic strategic plans (e.g. adaptation strategy for upper Choluteca basin, rainfall management plan, groundwater diagnostic analysis) enable municipal authorities of the upper Choluteca River to overcome short-term reactive responses to climatic risks and impacts **(\$32,400)**

3. Targeted capacity building and tools enable stakeholders at all levels to effectively respond to long-term climate change impacts

3.1. Targeted training provided to policy-makers and key stakeholder at national and municipal levels on the incorporation of CCA information in decision-making processes **(\$121,000)**

3.2. “Policy dialogue platforms” enable key Ministries and stakeholder groups to define and prioritize adaptation options, negotiate trade-offs and resolve conflicts **(\$65,000)**

3.3 Communications and outreach strategy uptakes lessons and practices developed through the project for replication (\$124,000)

### 5.0 Evaluation Findings

#### 5.1.1 Progress towards Results

The MTR revealed a project making important progress in achieving its stated objectives in relation to the three project components. It can be said that the project's is having a positive development effect through its support of Honduran institutions, Government and local communities. The project is contributing to establishing a foundation that can guide Honduras into the future in addressing climate change and the water scarcity challenge. There are objectives that will not be achieved but overall, the project is moving in a good direction.

*According to the AF's criteria of project success towards achieving results, the project is currently at a "Satisfactory Level".* This means most major objectives are being met but with some shortcomings. Much of the activity promoted by the project is new territory for Honduras and for this reason the project will probably continue to encounter difficulties. *At the same time aspects of the project such as the in-depth climate change courses provided by the project and institutional changes the project has achieved would rate as being "Highly Satisfactory" following the AF criteria.* Given the strength of the current project management team backstopped by the UNDP CO, and the receptiveness of Honduran stakeholders, there is no reason to believe that the project will not continue to meet with success and aspects of the project could one day be considered as "Good Practice" as defined by the AF (see Annex 6 for AF Mid-term Rating Scale). The findings of the MTR are consistent with the analysis conducted by the Fundación VIDA that has found in its monitoring activity that the project stakeholders are very satisfied with the progress the project has made. The MTR also found a project that is having a number of beneficial impacts that are not properly accounted for in the project's outputs and project indicators.

Below are considered to be the key project achievements to date. They are presented providing a sense of how they are impacting on the three project components and as noted early some achievements lay outside of the stated project objectives:

- The project has been able to establish a technical platform, although not formal, for inter-agency coordination and cooperation that has allowed technical staff of institutions to develop a shared comprehension of how to address climate change and in particular, adaptation and mitigation measures to protect the country's scarce water resources. This creates the basis for a more consistent and informed collective approach amongst partner institutions (SANAA, ICF, AMDC, UNAH, the engineering faculty of IHCIT, the National Meteorological Network (RMN) & SEPLAN) to address climate change. The Working Paper WP 4H (Guide to mainstream Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management into development planning), which is the methodological guide for institutions to integrate climate change adaptation into development planning has been institutionalized by SERNA and SEPLAN. This exemplifies how the project has been able to penetrate into ministries and mainstream climate change in ways that were previously not possible while developing a management and planning tool that has long-term implications. **Addresses Primarily Component 1 and Component 3 through awareness raising**

---

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

---

- Five Regional Plans have been developed that incorporate adaptation planning into their design through the application of mainstreaming guide. The plans create a platform for action on climate change and simultaneously addressing other development objectives. Non-project related development initiatives are benefiting from the plans including USAID's ProParque project that is taking into consideration the Regional Plans into its own project design. **Addresses Components 1, 2 and 3**
- Three of four protected Area Plans and one of three Watershed Management Plans that were targeted in the Pro Doc have been completed. **Addresses Components 1, 2 (plans in Tegucigalpa area), and 3**
- Updating the National Hydrological Balance (BHN), a study of surface and ground water sources in Honduras. In addition to providing a national situational analysis, valuable information has been generated by the BHN that is already being used to inform roughly ten other initiatives and dialogue such as the National Plan to Combat Desertification and Drought. **Addresses Components 1 and indirectly 3**
- The project is credited with helping to better understand the extent of the impact of climate change on Honduras. There is a perception but admittedly not based on clear research findings that the project's efforts to educate and sensitize have went beyond the project's anticipated reach. On a completely unexpected matter, the project is also recognized for helping to improve the perception of stakeholders of the DNCC, the national climate change body. This was not a project objective but raises the question on how the project should or should not be connected to the DNCC moving forward. **Addresses Component 3**
- The project's efforts to train technical specialists have resulted in establishing higher professional standards and more capable individuals. The project for example, is cited for enabling Government technical specialists to improve their report writing skills and more importantly their overall knowledge and technical capability. Overall, the project has provided training in climate change subject matter to over 600 technical people. The in-depth courses in climate change and climate change and water have proven to be highly beneficial in terms of creating a cadre of highly capable and younger individuals with diverse backgrounds that are motivated to make a difference. Twenty six technicians have taken the Climate Change Continuing Education course accredited by UNAH and 30 have completed the Climate Change and Water Resource Continuing Education course. Sixty technicians have been trained for example as climate change adaptation trainers, who are certified by SERNA's DNCC. A total of 336 technicians from key institutions, municipalities and interest groups have been trained. Six technicians were trained in ecosystems-based adaptation and two in Soil & Water Assessment Tool (SWAT) from the Watershed Management at CATIE, in Costa Rica. Feedback and knowledge learned from CATIE courses assisted in developing a methodology to mainstream CC adaptation into watershed management plans and protected areas management plans. The training on SWAT was replicated for 20 technicians of the Interagency Spatial Data Committee (CIDES). **Addresses Components 1, 2 (plans in Tegucigalpa area), and 3**
- The in-depth six month courses that were offered enabled individuals to not only better understand concepts and technical matters in a more comprehensive manner but other skills have

been nurtured as well. One engineer trained by the project explained how he now works with a dedication to the importance of broader consultation and more detailed information gathering relying on non-technical sources of information to inform his approach to engineering. A forester who participated in the in-depth training explained how she is now able to work more constructively with community members. The training introduced a more structured approach to engaging communities on climate change and related matters. **Addresses Component 3 and to some extent Component 1**

- The project through its outreach activity has established a platform for information in the knowledge management realm. This includes a number of high quality communication documents that have been produced for diverse audiences, to disseminate information on climate adaptation and best practices synthesized through the project. Fundación VIDA estimates that through its communication tools such as its newsletters, information on the project and important issues reaches some 700 members of different institutions. Annex 4 provides a partial list of the communication materials produced by the project. **Addresses Component 3 and facilitates Component 1**
- The project has made incredible headways in encouraging different types of participation and partnerships in support of addressing climate change. Community members and municipal officials for example, have appreciated working with institutions such as the university. These sorts of circumstances were seldom seen before in Honduras. There is also a more open dialogue regarding climate change with a diverse range of individuals in the professional realm participating. **Addresses Component 3**
- The national meteorological network had been enhanced through the purchase and calibration of 46 new national meteorological network stations and the installation and development of a new climate-information network. There remain a number of bugs with the stations with some functioning better than others. There are also ongoing issues with the Italian company that is the provider of the equipment. The 46 stations nonetheless represent an important gain for Honduras. A wide range of stakeholders from municipal governments to national institutions can make direct use of better information. However, this activity requires greater attention to ensure its full potential is realised. **Addresses Component 1**
- Ecosystem water supply services in the high basins that serve the Tegucigalpa urban area have been protected through updating management plans for 35,380 hectares of protected area to incorporate climate vulnerability analyses and adaptation measures. This experience points towards the potential of the project playing a substantive role in establishing a forest or biological corridor in the Tegucigalpa area. **Addresses Component 2**
- The detailed design of concrete adaptation measures in the form of water harvesting systems for vulnerable urban areas in Tegucigalpa had been undertaken. It involved strong participation of community members and academia in the decision-making processes. The designs seek to increase the adaptive capacity of at least 3,500 households with respect to improving water scarcity risk and at least 1,000 households with respect to reducing flooding and landslide risk. The works in two principal communities were out to tender at the time of the mission. One of the benefits of the project has been to bring together stakeholders to look at how more collective

efforts are possible. **Addresses directly Component 2 and to some degree Component 1 and 3**

When one considers the baseline point of reference for many of the project activities, a number of the gains that have been made are important. There were only fourteen hydro-meteorological stations and none were in good condition. Now there are 46 although admittedly with challenges. Previously there was no mechanism to coordinate the mainstreaming of climate change considerations. The project has created one. Before government staff at the national and sub-national levels did not have a good understanding of climate change issues nor the tools to effectively incorporate considerations for climate change into planning and programming processes. Now with the Guide to mainstream Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management into development planning, government reports are now regularly integrating climate change analysis. There is also debate taking place that is probably too broad for the project to fully track.

There are still problem areas. At the start of the project information on weather and climate variability information was difficult to access. The project was supposed to address this yet concerns remain as to whether or not a fully accessible information system will be established as hoped. The incorporation of the projected climate change impacts into the price of water in Tegucigalpa was a project objective and thus far it continues to elude the project. This is a very complicated proposition for which other donor initiatives in the field have struggled.

Project activities developed directly relating to water are done so within the framework of the General Water Law through agreements signed with the ICF and SANAA. Although one of the obstacles encountered by the project to influence in a more decisive way on the issue of water policy as described in the Pro Doc, is that although the General Water Law of the constitution mentions a National Water Authority, the Authority has never been formerly established. This has been an impediment to the project but has not halted it from making progress. Despite this obstacle, the project has guided the establishment of the "Council of the Sub Watershed of the Guacerique River Basin" and the "Council of the Sub watershed of the Hombre River ". This was done through the support of SANAA and ICF that promoted the thematic adaptation to climate change in local governments. Hence, while the project has not achieved all its objectives in this area, it is fair to say this has not always been the fault of the project.

While the building of interagency relations has been the project's major achievement, communication and relations between some partners is still a concern. This is observed with the RMN, where the functionality of the Meteorological partnership can be questioned. Once again though, the problem seem to originate from somewhere beyond the scope of the project. Some of the pilot project activity has not developed as hoped. Due to security reasons it was not possible to visit enough of the pilot project activity to make an accurate determination of what is taking place with all pilot project activity. The impression provided by individuals close to the project is that there are issues due to the complexity of the activities, the difficult implementation environment and the fact that in most situations there is a great deal of learning on the job taking place.

The project has been facilitating a process whereby national level partners such as the University collaborate with stakeholders at a municipal and community level in developing pilot project activity and undertaking studies. The University had no previous experience in community level work. It has been sending young people into communities that are unfamiliar with the structures and practices that drive community work. It is a different and much more imperfect world from academia. All stakeholders agree that moving forward the University is as important as any partner in ensuring that Honduras is able to effectively address climate change over the long-term. But there is also agreement that the

participation of the university in the project has to be better thought out and hopefully the learning that has already taken place will contribute to this.

### **5.1.2 Project Design**

From a structural standpoint the design of the project was and remains well suited to the needs and possibilities of the implementing context. The project has retained the interest of a very diverse group of stakeholders. The combination of encouraging dialogue, developing capacity at both the institutional and within professional circles along with creating more certainty through the establishment of policies and plans and protecting watersheds and forest areas has been effective. The project design guided the nurturing of a wide range of partners both national and local towards being able to play more confident roles in the climate change field.

The project design was suitable for the first years of the project but based on feedback provided by stakeholders during the MTR some modifications are sought in terms of orientation and budgetary allotment. Most of the discussion surrounding modifying the project design involves pilot project activity. The AF is correct in insisting that pilot activity be included in projects to demonstrate and solidify adaptation approaches. However in Honduras, more recognition should have been paid to the complicated implementation environment. The violence in the Tegucigalpa area appears to be increasing although the new government has promised to crack down. There is also the fact that some of the measures such as water conservation efforts are being promoted in a context where as helpful as they might be, there are larger threats to Tegucigalpa’s water sources from other wasteful practices and industrial pollution that the project cannot control and that negate any gains in water conservation that the project may make.

### **5.1.3 Adaptive Management**

Overall statement of Adaptive Management: *In terms of the AF criteria on Adaptive management and Management Arrangements the project rates as being Satisfactory meaning that by and large the management has been effective but with some difficulties.*

### **5.1.4 Work Planning**

The evaluation can identify no major concerns regarding work planning with nothing that stands out as being problematic. Most of the problems of the project can be attributed to other issues such as inadequacies of the project design or the inexperience of project partners.

### **5.1.5 Project Finance and Co-Financing**

Table 1

<b>Project financing</b>	<u><i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i></u>	<u><i>at MTR (Million US\$)</i></u>
<b>AF financing:</b>	<b>5,180,000.00</b>	<b>2,775,395.00</b>
<b>IA/EA own:</b>		
<b>Government:</b>		

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

<b>Other:</b>		
<b>Total co-financing:</b>		
<b>Total Project Cost in cash:</b>	<b>5,180,000.00</b>	<b>2,775,395.00</b>
<b>ProDoc Signature (date project began):</b>	<b>March-2011</b>	

As noted above the AF is the only source of direct funding for the project. However, the various institutions involved in the project have been dedicating government technical staff to working directly on project activity. This is an incredible boost to the project's resources. Although during the MTR it was not possible to conduct a detailed audit of the financial activities of the project, inquiries and information gathering to identify any possible issues did not reveal any major concerns. The project model of delegating responsibility for project activity which is accompanied by a corresponding allocation of financial resources, structures how the project's money is spent. This structure along with the fact that the project supports a high volume of activities means that the project's finances are disbursed in smaller amounts reducing risks. The success to date of most of project's activities would indicate that the project's financial resources are having their desired impact.

Financial risk reduction measures were employed to guarantee that all procurement processes were carried out according to UNDP policies and regulations. For example, a Procurement and Hiring Committee was formed by UNDP, the Project team, SERNA Administrative Management and Procurement.

### 5.1.6 Monitoring Systems and Risk Management

Fundación VIDA is part of the AF NGO network that monitors AF project activity. Fundación VIDA has developed a clear and observant perspective of the project through its monitoring of the perceptions of project stakeholders. It is an innovative barometer for reading a project's progress. In 2013, an AF portfolio monitoring mission was conducted of Honduras and Nicaragua with a report submitted to the AF's Ethics and Finance Committee Fourteenth meeting Bonn, Germany, 18-19 March 2014. There have been two PPRs for each of the respective years of the project. In addition the UNDP CO works closely with the project team to stay on top of issues of concern while the project team is in constant contact with the other project partners regarding the day to day activities of the project. Collectively these monitoring efforts along with this MTR, represents a very comprehensive approach to tracking and accounting for what is taking place with the project. This monitoring structure and the design of the project that has compartmentalized project activity into manageable sized activities implemented by the six project partners with the direct support of one of the specialists from the project team establishes a very good basis for managing risks. The project in its analysis of potential risks has demonstrated a good understanding of where the project may encounter difficulties. A good example of this would be the international procurement for the 46 meteorological stations that was viewed as being highly risky. It involved a complex international procurement processes in addition to allocating a larger amount of financial resources, something the project by and large has avoided. The bidding process lasted over a year due to the complexity of the equipment's technical requirements. In the end, the procurement has been somewhat problematic even though the project hired an international procurement specialist to minimize potential risks. The supplier has shown a reluctance to fully respond to the concerns of the RMN. There is no local representative of the Italian company. This has been a learning experience that could have been much worst and the project has successfully avoided similar situations.

### **5.1.7 Reporting**

There are no concerns regarding project reporting practices. Both the UNDP and the project team are able to respect reporting requirements. The University on the other hand found the amount and type of reporting required to be excessive and wanted to have this addressed for the remaining years of the project. It is felt that the University, or at least the particular departments involved in the project, may not be accustomed to the reporting requirements typically associated with international development funding.

## **5.2 Management Arrangements**

### **5.2.1 Overall Project Management**

The combined project management team of SERNA, the direct project team, and the UNDP CO is viewed as being effective. There is a clear commitment by all these partners to see the project succeed. There is a lot of growing and learning taking place amongst the project partners and along with this, mistakes are being made. Under these circumstances predictable and thoughtful project management has been essential and according to all sources, this is what has been maintained. There are no glaring issues to report other than that have already been noted such as some of the problems between members of the RNM that runs deeper than the project itself.

### **5.2.2 Quality of Implementing Partners**

The team handling of the day to day implementation of the project comes across as being effective. Project partners speak highly of their work. Although the project team is a part of SERNA the manner in which the project team operates shares many of the positive traits one normally associates with a successful NGO project team. This means there is a degree of responsiveness to the concerns of stakeholders, good interpersonal relations and a strong collective vision espoused by the project team. The project partners whether it be municipal governments or national institutions are growing confident in their abilities and this bodes well both for the project and the climate change agenda in Honduras. The project partners are very grateful for the experience of having participated in the project and this is expressed in the attitude of most people involved in the project.

One concern that was pointed out by a number of stakeholders was the need for the project team and SERNA in general to have more capabilities to oversee/manage climate related subject matter. This relates mostly to matters of a technical nature.

It should be stated that in the short window of time of the MTR it was not possible to develop a detailed opinion on the six implementing partner institutions. The quality of the project partners appears to vary and there are a few that require more ongoing maintenance than others. UNDP CO and the SERNA project team understand the strengths and weaknesses of the implementing partners and none create the feeling they are unsuited to manage their respective project activity.

### **5.2.3 Quality of Support provided by UNDP**

The UNDP was cited for its strong support of the project. The direct project team in particular is grateful for the guidance provided by UNDP. There is a constructive ongoing dialogue between the project team and UNDP. UNDP has demonstrated an openness to make adjustments as the project has evolved.

There are no outstanding administrative issues or serious differences in opinions that have marked the project. Both UNDP and the project team are in agreement that collectively the project's implementing partners should be open to modifying the direction of the project for its remaining years.

One point that did come up in discussions was that UNDP could be providing more substantive technical support on matters related to climate change perhaps in the form of specialised training. The UNDP CO feels that one possible avenue for this to happen would be for UNDP's Regional Service Centre for Latin America and the Caribbean (RSC LAC) in Panama to be more engaged in the project by providing specialized technical support. The evaluation process concluded that the UNDP CO along with the RSC LAC could also facilitate more connections between the project and its partner and organizations in Central America where learning focussed partnerships could be nurtured.

### 5.3 Gender

The presence of women in all aspects of the project appears to be very strong. From the composition of the project team, including the recently appointed female project coordinator, to project trainees and the high volume of female project beneficiaries and women representing partner institutions, female participation in the project seems to be very strong. As noted in both PPRs workshops held with such groups as water boards, basin councils, consultative forest councils and community groups showed there was strong female participation in determining courses of action in different localities. In the Climate Change Continuing Education Course with UNAH, there have been an equal number of spaces for men and women and female participation in research activity is encouraged. The inclusion of women from neighbourhoods/colonials to provide input to determine the type of rainwater harvesting arrangements and in defining their designs with the UNAH Faculty of Engineering was noted in earlier project monitoring efforts.

### 6.0 Conclusions

The project is a great source of pride for both its guiding forces and beneficiaries. There is a feeling of being involved in something special, a one of kind project for Honduras. The project is helping to define key elements of Honduras's approach to climate change while endowing the country with badly needed practical experience, expertise and confidence. It is developing Honduras's capacity to address climate change issues on a national level and raises questions about project's role preparing Honduras to play a role beyond its borders. The territorial space inhabited by Honduras and surrounding countries is not massive and Central American countries share in the undesirable distinction of being among the countries most impacted by climate change. In the remaining years of the project it might be worth contemplating how the project can contribute to making Honduras a more capable regional partner on climate related matters. If this can be done without compromising the project's core objectives it should be considered.

In Honduras, SERNA is the motor for all matters related to climate change. From the National Communications on Climate Change to policy development, SERNA plays a guiding role. At the same time, the direct project team is handling a highly complex portfolio of activities. It is important that the project team and where appropriate, SERNA have the necessary technical capabilities to manage project activity. Over the long-term it makes little sense that SERNA would be assisting the various institutional partners to grow their climate change capacity while the project team and by extension SERNA remained somewhat stagnant in terms of its own capacities. On a few occasions during the evaluation it was mentioned that some of the problems encountered with the RMN could have been diffused if the project team could have intervened with more technical authority. Providing the project team with

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

---

access to some very specific technical capacity while ensuring the team has more overall capabilities would seem to be a reasonable and pragmatic step.

The project's connection to the DNCC could also be reconsidered to see how the DNCC could be reinforced in such a way to enhance both the project and the DNCC. As the national body accountable for climate change, DNCC's mandate intertwines with the project's mandate but not in the sense of there being repetition but there could be greater coordination. For example, the DNCC could facilitate the formalizing of the currently non-formal technical platform between ministries that the project has started. Other matters that were brought to the attention of the evaluator where collaboration could happen include the promotion of the project's publications and communication materials.

The project has been introducing a lot of different ideas and information on climate change into Honduras. Great inroads have been made in training and sensitizing decision makers and technical experts and establishing benchmarks in terms of policies and planning. This has been highly beneficial. However, project stakeholders also point out that the infusion of new knowledge and perspective paradoxically has made it clear how much more analysis and research and capacity building is required before Honduras will be able to address climate change effectively. Thinking about problems and solutions has become more refined. A good example of this is the notion of creating a forest or biological corridor to assist in protecting the watersheds of Tegucigalpa. At the time of the project's design this was not considered. Now based on the project's experience it is seen as a more viable solution to protecting Tegucigalpa's watersheds than the current pilot projects can achieve.

The concept of employing pilot project activity to test innovative practices should never be abandoned. Honduras needs practical demonstrations on how to address the unpredictability and excesses of climate change. But at the same time there should be some reflection about what is the best way to use the project's resources. To date, the pilot project activity is generating mixed results. During the evaluation a visit was made to a water conservation pilot project activity in the upper basin of Tegucigalpa. The project sought to demonstrate to farmers the benefits of conserving water through drip irrigation. On its own the activity was successful. However, in the surrounding project area most farmers carried on with more water intensive methods. On the return trip back down to the Capital from the Upper Basin other incidences of inefficiencies or inappropriate uses of precious water resources were observable including untreated industrial pollution. To protect the watersheds of Tegucigalpa comprehensive approaches are required and the project is not capable of this. The question is, are these the types of results the project should be seeking when it is clear other areas of endeavour might result in more sustainable and strategic outcomes?

A critique of the project team and this would include the UNDP CO is that perhaps there has not been enough thinking about how the project can build synergy with other development initiatives. As climate change and water management are key donor priorities, the institutional capacity the project has been building may be of appeal to development agencies in terms of providing structure to their own development activities. The Regional Plans and four Protected Area Plans and the Watershed Management Plans could be better utilized to stimulate synergy. This might also lead to other types of pilot activity that would then free up the resources of the project to make further strides in sensitization, training and building capacity. There may be potential partners that are better suited to guiding pilot activity that can benefit from the improving institutional structures that the project is helping to create. Integrating other partners into the project might be a first step towards developing a more comprehensive approach to protecting the watersheds of Tegucigalpa.

In the last few years of the project the UNDP is seen as playing an important role from reaching out to potential partner donors and organizations, identifying and securing secondary sources of funding like

through the CABI and working with UNDP's RSC LAC in Panama to provide technical support to the project. UNDP is also seen as being able to play a role in building bridges with other countries in Central America that may have useful experience and expertise to share with stakeholders involved in the project in Honduras.

### 7.0 Recommendations

- 1) To undertake a process to contemplate what should be the priorities of the project for the remaining two years and whether this could mean a reorientation of project activity. This should include an open discussion regarding the possibility of reallocating the project's budgetary resources. The objective would be to create enough latitude for the project team in consultation with UNDP to favour programming in areas where there are greater opportunities for success in terms of advancing the climate change and water conservation agendas in Honduras. Existing commitments should be respected but there should be openness to reallocating resources between the three major project components.
- 2) While working towards achieving its objectives identify how the project can continue to develop capacity at the institutional and the individual professional level to bring Honduras closer to the standards of other countries in Central America in terms of the ability to address climate change and in particular in relation to managing water resources. The focus should be on replicating the best practices found in countries such as Nicaragua, Guatemala and El Salvador and if possible, Costa Rica. On this matter the Honduras UNDP CO in consultation with the UNDP's Panama Regional Service Centre Office should play a role on providing technical support and facilitating contacts in Central America.
- 3) To continue to develop and improve upon the tools (training and otherwise) that the project has been developing such as the Water Balance.
- 4) As it has some responsibility for nurturing and guiding the work of its partners the project team's own knowledge and technical capabilities should be reinforced. This will enable the team to maintain a strong confident footing when assisting the project's implementing partners on challenging technical matters.
- 5) To determine how stronger synergy and mutual support can be established between the project and the DNCC. Some areas to explore would include improving the dissemination of key publications, reinforcing the capabilities of the DNCC and through the DNCC formalize the inter-agency coordination and cooperation that the project has been nurturing.
- 6) The collection and availability of project information has to be improved. It is critical that professional technical people, institutions, governments at all levels and community groups develop the capacity to interpret and put to use climate related information. This cannot happen if the information is not made available. This is equally true for the focussed technical studies that the project has and will continue to support. There should be a common and easily accessible Internet platform for accessing all the information and resources that the project has contributed to developing.
- 7) Time and resources should be allocated to proactively attracting secondary funding that could for example, support and enable pilot activity and address other needs. This should result in developing new forms of partnerships and extend the outreach of the project. Establishing partnerships to contribute to a more comprehensive approach to protecting the watersheds of Tegucigalpa would be an admirable and worthy endeavour. Possible sources of additional project funding could include the Central American Bank for Economic Integration (CABI).

8) To undertake a process to revise the projects indicators to reflect the success the project has had and to incorporate the project's orientation for the remaining years.

## **8.0 Lesson Learned**

- Although a clear interest and commitment in mainstreaming climate change adaptation practices is emerging, the reality is that there is still a great deal that must be done. In this context, a premium has to be place on stimulating dialogue, the development of knowledge and establishing a shared approach to problem solving by capitalizing on the growing consensus on the need to ensure effective climate change mainstreaming.
- Strong national lead agencies capable of coordinating and providing leadership on climate change mainstreaming are essential. At the same time, the UNDP CO and SERNA must have access to the relevant expertise to guide and nurture national partners on a broad range of water and climate related issues.
- Ensuring national engagement in the climate change mainstreaming agenda is challenging but it is achievable provided stakeholders are encouraged to participate in a constructive manner and have the knowledge to do so. This is why the in-depth climate change courses have been so important. This type of capacity building results in positive outcomes that are not always easy to capture as sometimes it may be informal or not quantifiable as for example, the professional relationships that develop between individuals who take courses together.
- With an endless array of development priorities the case for mainstreaming climate change adaptation has to be made convincingly and strategically. The experience of the project demonstrates that this can be accomplished but it is more effective when it is tied to other development priorities like water management or regional development planning.
- The modification and/or development of policies and plans to promoting climate are valid learning vehicles. Interested individuals and organizations seek practical opportunities for applying the mainstreaming of climate change concept. Overall, the importance of practical experiences in understanding how to mainstream climate change adaptation should never be underestimated.
- The need for pilot activity that demonstrates how climate uncertainty can be addressed constructively is paramount. However, in challenging circumstances such as found in the greater Tegucigalpa area, one has to choose each intervention wisely.

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

### Annex 1: Evaluation Matrix

Criterios de evaluación Preguntas	Indicadores	Fuentes	Metodología
<b>Relevancia:</b> ¿Cómo se relaciona el proyecto con los objetivos principales del área de interés del FMAM y con las prioridades ambientales y de desarrollo a nivel local, regional y nacional?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ¿En qué medida los objetivos de intervención del proyecto son coherentes con los requisitos de los beneficiarios, las necesidades del país?</li> <li>• ¿Cómo apoya el proyecto el área focal de cambio climático y las prioridades estratégicas del Fondo de Adaptación?</li> <li>• ¿Cuál ha sido el nivel de participación de los interesados en el diseño del proyecto?</li> <li>• ¿El proyecto toma en consideración las realidades nacionales (marco de políticas e institucional) tanto en su diseño como en su implementación?</li> <li>• ¿Cuál ha sido el nivel de apropiación de los interesados en la implementación del proyecto?</li> <li>• ¿Existen vínculos lógicos entre resultados esperados del proyecto y el diseño del proyecto (en términos componentes del proyecto, elección de socios, estructura, mecanismos de implementación, alcance, presupuesto, uso de recursos, etc.)?</li> <li>• ¿Es la duración del proyecto suficiente para alcanzar los resultados propuestos?</li> <li>• ¿Nivel de coherencia entre los resultados esperados</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>la importancia puesta en el proyecto por sus asociados y beneficiarios</li> <li>• Existencia de una clara relación entre los objetivos del proyecto y el área focal de cambio climático del Fondo de Adaptación</li> <li>• Grado en el que el proyecto apoya el objetivo de manejo sostenible del medio ambiente de la END.</li> <li>• Apreciación de interesados clave con respecto al nivel de adecuación del diseño e implementación del proyecto a las realidades nacionales y capacidades existentes.</li> <li>• Coherencia entre las necesidades expresadas por los interesados nacionales y el criterio PNUD y el Fondo de Adaptación.</li> <li>• Nivel de involucramiento de funcionarios gubernamentales y otros socios en el proceso</li> <li>• Nivel de coherencia entre los resultados esperados y el diseño de la lógica interna del proyecto.</li> <li>• Nivel de coherencia entre el diseño del proyecto y</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentos de Proyecto</li> <li>• Estrategias y documentos del área focal cambio climático del Fondo de Adaptación.</li> <li>• Entrevistas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Análisis Documental</li> <li>• Cuestionarios</li> <li>• Grupo focales</li> </ul>

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

<p>y el diseño de la lógica interna del proyecto. ¿Nivel de coherencia entre el diseño del proyecto y su enfoque de implementación?</p>	<p>su enfoque de implementación?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>de diseño del proyecto.</li> </ul>		
<b>Criterios de evaluación Preguntas</b>	<b>Indicadores</b>	<b>Fuentes</b>	<b>Metodología</b>
<b>Efectividad:</b> ¿En qué medida se han logrado los resultados y objetivos previstos del proyecto?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>¿Ha sido el proyecto efectivo en alcanzar los resultados esperados?</li> <li>¿Cómo se manejaron los riesgos y supuestos del proyecto?</li> <li>¿Cuál ha sido la calidad de las estrategias de mitigación desarrolladas?</li> <li>¿Qué cambios pudieron haberse hecho (de haberlos) al diseño del proyecto para mejorar el logro de los resultados esperados?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ver indicadores en el marco de resultados estratégicos/marco lógico del proyecto.</li> <li>Integridad de la identificación de riesgos y supuestos durante la planeación y el diseño del proyecto.</li> <li>Calidad de los sistemas de información establecidos para identificar riesgos emergentes y otras preocupaciones.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentos de Proyecto</li> <li>Entrevistas</li> <li>Grupos focales</li> <li>Visita a campo</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Análisis Documental</li> <li>Cuestionarios</li> <li>Observación directa</li> </ul>
<b>Criterios de evaluación Preguntas</b>	<b>Indicadores</b>	<b>Fuentes</b>	<b>Metodología</b>
<b>Eficiencia:</b> ¿El proyecto se implementó de manera eficiente en conformidad con las normas y los estándares internacionales y nacionales?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>¿Se utilizó o necesitó el manejo adaptativo para asegurar un uso eficiente de los recursos?</li> <li>¿Han sido utilizados como herramientas de gestión durante la implementación del proyecto el marco lógico, los planes de trabajo o cualquier cambio realizado a estos?</li> <li>¿Han sido los sistemas financieros y contables adecuados para la gestión del proyecto y para producir información financiera precisa y a tiempo?</li> <li>¿Han sido los reportes de progreso precisos y puntuales? Responden a los requerimientos de reporte? Incluyen los cambios por manejo</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disponibilidad y calidad de los reportes financieros y de progreso.</li> <li>Puntualidad y adecuación de los reportes entregados.</li> <li>Nivel de discrepancia entre el gasto planeado y el ejecutado.</li> <li>Cofinanciamiento planeado vs. actual.</li> <li>Costo en función de los resultados alcanzados en comparación con los costos de proyectos similares de otras organizaciones.</li> <li>Cuán adecuadas han sido las opciones seleccionadas por el proyecto en función del contexto, la infraestructura y el costo.</li> <li>Calidad del reporte de</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentos de Proyecto</li> <li>Reportes de avance trimestral y anual</li> <li>Entrevistas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Análisis Documental</li> <li>Cuestionarios</li> </ul>

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

<p>adaptativo?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ¿Ha sido la ejecución del proyecto tan efectiva como fue propuesta originalmente (planeado vs. actual)?</li> <li>• ¿El cofinanciamiento ha sido según lo planeado?</li> <li>• ¿Los recursos financieros han sido usados eficientemente? Han podido haberse usado más eficientemente?</li> <li>• ¿Han sido las adquisiciones realizadas de manera que se haga un uso eficiente de los recursos del proyecto?</li> <li>• ¿Cómo ha sido usado el enfoque de <i>gestión basada en resultados</i> durante la implementación del proyecto?</li> </ul>	<p>gestión basada en resultados (reportes de progresos, monitoreo y evaluación).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ocurrencia de cambios en el diseño del proyecto o en el enfoque de implementación cuando ha sido necesario para mejorar la eficiencia del proyecto.</li> <li>• Costo asociado al mecanismo de “<i>delivery</i>” y estructura de gestión, en comparación con otras alternativas.</li> </ul>		
Criterios de evaluación Preguntas	Indicadores	Fuentes	Metodología
<p><b>Sostenibilidad:</b> ¿En qué medida hay riesgos financieros, institucionales, socioeconómicos o ambientales para sostener los resultados del proyecto a largo plazo?</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ¿Han sido integrados <i>conceptos</i> de sostenibilidad en el diseño e implementación del proyecto?</li> <li>• ¿Existe evidencia de que los socios del proyecto darán continuidad a las actividades más allá de la finalización del proyecto?</li> <li>• ¿Cuál es el grado de compromiso político para continuar trabajando sobre los resultados del proyecto?</li> <li>• ¿Cuáles son los principales desafíos que pueden dificultar la sostenibilidad de los esfuerzos?</li> <li>• ¿Se han abordado</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidencia/ calidad de la estrategia de sostenibilidad.</li> <li>• Evidencia/ calidad de las acciones llevadas a cabo para asegurar la sostenibilidad.</li> <li>• Nivel y fuente de soporte financiero a ser provisto en el futuro a sectores y actividades relevantes después del término del proyecto.</li> <li>• Evidencia de compromiso de socios internacionales, gobiernos y otros interesados para apoyar financieramente sectores/actividades relevantes luego de la finalización del proyecto.</li> <li>• Grado en que las actividades del proyecto</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentos de Proyecto</li> <li>• Entrevistas y grupos focales</li> <li>• Visita a campo</li> <li>• PNUD</li> <li>• Socios y Beneficiarios</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Análisis Documental</li> <li>• Cuestionarios</li> <li>• Observación directa</li> </ul>

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

durante la gestión del proyecto? • ¿Qué potenciales medidas podrían contribuir a la sostenibilidad de los esfuerzos logrados por el proyecto?	y los resultados han sido asumidos por las contrapartes. • Nivel de soporte financiero a ser provisto por el gobierno, una vez termine el proyecto. • Cambios que podrían significar desafíos al proyecto.		
<b>Criterios de evaluación Preguntas</b>	<b>Indicadores</b>	<b>Fuentes</b>	<b>Metodología</b>
Impacto: ¿Hay indicios de que el proyecto haya contribuido a reducir la tensión ambiental o a mejorar el estado ecológico, o que haya permitido avanzar hacia esos resultados?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ¿Qué impacto ha tenido el proyecto en términos de generación de capacidades?</li> <li>• ¿Qué resultados clave ha generado el proyecto (i.e. mejoras significativas en el estado de los recursos naturales, progreso substantivo en el logro de estos impactos)?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Normativas y políticas implementadas o adoptadas</li> <li>• Desarrollo de capacidades</li> <li>• Mejoras en calidad ambiental (por ejemplo, reducción de la erosión, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentos de Proyecto</li> <li>• Visita a campo</li> <li>• Equipo del proyecto</li> <li>• PNUD</li> <li>• Socios y Beneficiarios</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Análisis Documental</li> <li>• Observación directa</li> </ul>

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

### Annex 2: List of Individuals Interviewed

Nombre	Institucion	Cargo/Institucion	Correo electronico
Nelson Ulloa	SERNA	Asesor Ministro	<a href="mailto:nsulloa@yahoo.com">nsulloa@yahoo.com</a>
Manuel Lopez Luna	SERNA	Director Cambio Climatico	<a href="mailto:cambioclimatico.hon@gmail.com">cambioclimatico.hon@gmail.com</a>
Eva Gonzales	SEPLAN	Enlace Administrativo/SEPLAN	<a href="mailto:evmgonzales@seplan.gob.hn">evmgonzales@seplan.gob.hn</a>
Bertha Liliam Gutierrez	SEPLAN	Directora Ordenamiento Territorial	
Jaime Salinas	SEPLAN	Especialista Ordenamiento Territorial	
Luis Carlos Guardiola	SEPLAN	Tecnico Ordenamiento Territorial	<a href="mailto:luis79@yahoo.com">luis79@yahoo.com</a>
Nabil Kawas	UNAH	Director	<a href="mailto:nkawask@gmail.com">nkawask@gmail.com</a>
Tania Peña	UNAH	Asistente Tecnico	<a href="mailto:taniapena_83@hotmail.com">taniapena_83@hotmail.com</a>
Eva Matamoros	UNAH	Asistente Tecnico	<a href="mailto:evajoselina@hotmail.com">evajoselina@hotmail.com</a>
Irma Ayes	UNAH	Asistente Tecnico	<a href="mailto:ayesrivera@hotmail.com">ayesrivera@hotmail.com</a>
Yolanda Fletes	UNAH-ING	Asistente Tecnico	<a href="mailto:yolizethfra@yahoo.es">yolizethfra@yahoo.es</a>
Herson Homer Sierra	SMN	Jefe	<a href="mailto:hhsieras@yahoo.es">hhsieras@yahoo.es</a>
Emerson Gomez	SMN	Asistente Tecnico	<a href="mailto:gomez.emerson@gmail.com">gomez.emerson@gmail.com</a>
Hector Sanchez	SANAA	Jefe Depto Catastral	<a href="mailto:hector.sanchez@gmail.com">hector.sanchez@gmail.com</a>
Nelson Sevilla	UNAH	Asistente Tecnico	<a href="mailto:nsevilla@ihcit.edu.hn">nsevilla@ihcit.edu.hn</a>
Jose Nilson Castro	SERNA-DGRH	Asistente Tecnico	<a href="mailto:jnclizardo@hotmail.com">jnclizardo@hotmail.com</a>
Mario Murillo	SANAA-DCH	Jefe Departamento de Cuencas Hidrográficas	<a href="mailto:mariomurillo_78@hotmail.com">mariomurillo_78@hotmail.com</a>
Luis Miguel Flores	SANAA-DCH	Enlace Técnico SANAA	<a href="mailto:luismiguel79@gmail.com">luismiguel79@gmail.com</a>
Alba Alicia Albarenga	SANAA-DCH	Jefe de Unidad de Promoción Social	<a href="mailto:albalicia_albarenga@yahoo.es">albalicia_albarenga@yahoo.es</a>
Jainer Argeñal	SANAA-DCH	Jefe de Unidad de SIG y de Evaluación y Monitoreo Ambiental	<a href="mailto:jainerumanzor@gmail.com">jainerumanzor@gmail.com</a>
Khamila O'reilly	SANAA-DCH	Consultora	<a href="mailto:khami.oreilly@gmail.com">khami.oreilly@gmail.com</a>
Oscar Raudales	ICF-DCHA	Jefe del Departamento de Cuencas Hidrográficas y Ambiente	<a href="mailto:oscar_raudalesmartinez@yahoo.es">oscar_raudalesmartinez@yahoo.es</a>
Sandra Canales	ICF-DCHA	Asistente Técnico DCHA	<a href="mailto:casandra1905@yahoo.es">casandra1905@yahoo.es</a>
Douglas Cruz Martinez	ICF Administración	Asistente Técnico Administrativo	<a href="mailto:douglas_cruz_m@hotmail.com">douglas_cruz_m@hotmail.com</a>
Marlenia Acosta	ICF-RFFM	Responsable de Áreas Protegidas RFFM	<a href="mailto:marlenia.acosta@hotmail.com">marlenia.acosta@hotmail.com</a>

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

Denis Macoto	ICF-DCHA	Asistente Técnico DCHA	<a href="mailto:dmacotho2001@yahoo.com">dmacotho2001@yahoo.com</a>
Benedicto Gonzalez	Consejo de Subcuenca del Río Guacerique	Presidente de la Junta Directiva/Agricultor Sistema de Micro-riego	
Eber Daniel Amador	Consejo de Subcuenca del Río Guacerique	Secretario de la Junta Directiva	<a href="mailto:daniel_amador91@yahoo.com">daniel_amador91@yahoo.com</a>
Cintia Fajardo	Consejo de Subcuenca del Río Guacerique	Fiscalia de la Junta Directiva	
Ignacio Bautista	Junta de Agua de	Expresidente de la Junta Directiva	
Ingrid Ferrari	Junta de Agua de San Matias	Presidenta de la Junta Directiva	
Juan Rafael Martinez	Junta de Agua de San Matias	Secretario de la Junta Directiva	
Marla Puerto	Gerencia de Prevención y Mitigación AMDC	Gerente de la Gerencia de Prevención y Mitigación	<a href="mailto:marla.puerto@amdc.hn">marla.puerto@amdc.hn</a>
Luis Romero	Enlace Técnico para la Gerencia de Obras	Asistente Técnico de la Gerencia de Prevención y Mitigación	<a href="mailto:laramlp@yahoo.com.mx">laramlp@yahoo.com.mx</a>
José Alexander Ávila	Enlace Técnico del CODEM	Jefe de Logística del CODEM	<a href="mailto:alexanderavi@yahoo.com">alexanderavi@yahoo.com</a>
Ruben Hernández	Consultor del Proyecto del Fondo de Adaptación	Consultor para la Supervisión de Obras Civiles	<a href="mailto:hernandez_rh@yahoo.com">hernandez_rh@yahoo.com</a>
Mirian Benavidez	Junta de Agua de la Colonia Cantarero López	Secretaria de la Junta Directiva y Miembro del Comité de Ejecución y Monitoreo de las Obras	
Danilo Flores	Junta de Agua de la Colonia Cantarero López	Presidente de la Junta Directiva y Miembro del Comité de Ejecución y Monitoreo de las Obras	
Gerson Urtecho	Egresado de Diplomados en Cambio Climático	DIAT-SANAA	<a href="mailto:gurtecho@gmail.com">gurtecho@gmail.com</a>
Javier Salgado	Egresado de Facilitador de CdT4H	AMITIGRA	<a href="mailto:javiersal3@yahoo.es">javiersal3@yahoo.es</a>
Khamila O'reilly	Egresado de Diplomados en Cambio Climático	Consultora Ingeniero Forestal, Junta Directiva de Colegio de Ingenieros Forestales de Honduras	<a href="mailto:khami.oreilly@gmail.com">khami.oreilly@gmail.com</a>
Sandra Canales	Egresado de Diplomados en Cambio Climático	ICF-DCHA	<a href="mailto:casandra1905@yahoo.es">casandra1905@yahoo.es</a>
Carolina Godoy	Egresado de Diplomados en Cambio Climático	GWP Honduras	
Waleska Flores	Alcaldía Municipal de Tatumbra	Asistente del Alcalde	<a href="mailto:walef_7@yahoo.com">walef_7@yahoo.com</a>
Hugo Saul Ochoa Pinto	Alcaldía Municipal de Tatumbra	Alcalde Municipal	
Donato Ramon Irias	Alcaldía Municipal de Tatumbra	Encargado de la Unidad Municipal del Ambiente	
Ramiro Rodriguez	Sociedad Civil de Tatumbra-Consejo Consultivo Forestal	Colaborador Voluntario	
Delicia Tome	Sociedad Civil de Tatumbra-Consejo Consultivo Forestal	Colaboradora Voluntario	
Miguel Salazar	Alcaldía Municipal de Tatumbra	Asesor Técnico, Ingeniero Forestal, Consultor	
Nereyda	Escuela Agrícola	Enlace Técnico de la EAP-Z	

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

Estrada	Panamericana El Zamorano		
Santos Adalid Rodriguez	Secretaria Técnica de Planificación y Cooperación Externa	Enlace Técnico de SEPLAN, asignado a la UTPR-12 Región Centro	<a href="mailto:adalid98@hotmail.com">adalid98@hotmail.com</a>
María Auxiliadora Pineda	Fundación Vida	Directora Ejecutiva Interina-Directora Financiero-Administrativa	<a href="mailto:auxiliadora_pineda@fundacionvida.org">auxiliadora_pineda@fundacionvida.org</a>
Gianiana Alas	Fundación Vida	Responsable de Cambio Climático, Voluntariado, Educación Ambiental	<a href="mailto:gianina_alas@fundacionvida.org">gianina_alas@fundacionvida.org</a>
Milton Eduardo Domínguez Suazo Enlace Técnico	Fondo de Adaptación al Cambio Climático	Enlace Técnico	<a href="mailto:fafortalecimientoosocialhn@gmail.com">fafortalecimientoosocialhn@gmail.com</a>
Christian Rossi	Fondo de Adaptación al Cambio Climático	Especialista en Comunicación y Capacitación en Adaptación al Cambio Climático	<a href="mailto:facomunicacion.hn@gmail.com">facomunicacion.hn@gmail.com</a>
Irene Ortega	Unidad de Adaptación al Cambio Climático SERENA	Ingeniera	
Lizeth Gómez	Fondo de Adaptación al Cambio Climático	Enlace Técnico	
Sonia Suazo	Fondo de Adaptación al Cambio Climático	Coordinadora	<a href="mailto:sonia.suazo@gmail.com">sonia.suazo@gmail.com</a>
Noelia Jover	UNDP	Climate Change Officer Environmental and Risk Management Unit United Nations Development Programme	<a href="mailto:noelia.jover@undp.org">noelia.jover@undp.org</a>
Juan Fernando	UNDP	Coordinator of the Environmental and Risk Management Unit	<a href="mailto:juan.ferrando@undp.org">juan.ferrando@undp.org</a>
Ana Cáceres	Fondo de Adaptación al Cambio Climático	Administradora	<a href="mailto:fadaptacion.admhn@gmail.com">fadaptacion.admhn@gmail.com</a>
Dina Salinas	UNDP	Especialista de Evaluación	
Luis Espinoza	SERNA	Ingeniero Director General Recursos Hídricos de la SERNA	<a href="mailto:luisonespi@yahoo.es">luisonespi@yahoo.es</a>

### Annex 3 Publications Consulted

Argeñal, F. (2010). Variabilidad Climática y Cambio Climático en Honduras. Honduras: Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y Ambiente y PNUD

<http://cambioclimaticohn.org/uploaded/content/category/1688369313.pdf>

DCGWP-UE (2011) Situación de los Recursos Hídricos en Centro América: Hacia una Gestión Integrada Asociación Mundial para el Agua, capítulo Centroamérica (GWP Centroamérica), con el apoyo del Programa de Desarrollo de Zonas Fronterizas en América Central (ZONAF), de la Unión Europea (UE) y el Banco Centroamericano de Integración Económica (BCIE).

IISD (2013) Climate Risk Management for Smallholder Agriculture in Honduras. Prepared by the International Institute for Sustainable Development for UNDP Bureau of Crisis Prevention and Recovery [http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2013/crm\\_honduras.pdf](http://www.iisd.org/pdf/2013/crm_honduras.pdf)

República de Honduras (2012) Segunda Comunicación Nacional del Gobierno de Honduras ante la Convención Marco de las Naciones Unidas sobre Cambio Climático. Secretario de Estado en los Despachos de Recursos Naturales y Ambiente <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/natc/honnc2.pdf>

Rossi Christian (2014) Productos y Actividades de Comunicación y Capacitación del Proyecto Enfrentando riesgos climáticos en recursos hídricos en Honduras: incrementando resiliencia y disminuyendo vulnerabilidades en áreas urbanas pobres"

SERNA (2005) Plan de Acción Nacional de Lucha contra la Desertificación y la Sequía PANLCD Republica de Honduras Secretaria de Recursos Naturales y Ambiente (2005-2021) 2005 <http://www.fao.org/forestry/13214-0b54512539222481ea40707bff0ce5485.pdf>

World Bank (2012) Integrated Urban Water Management Case Study: Tegucigalpa, Blue Water – Green Cities. Washington,

### Project Documents Consulted

- Project Document (PRODOC)  
Operational Policies and Guidelines for Parties to Access Resources from the Adaptation Fund
- Progress Reports
- Budget
- Planes de trabajo / Planes Operativos Anuales
- Project Performance Reports (PPRs)
- Project products
- Materiales de comunicación sobre el proyecto
- Documentos de planificación del PNUD (MANUD, CPD, CPAP), tales como el Documento del Programa País 2012-2016 de PNUD Honduras y Plan de Acción del Programa de País de PNUD Honduras 2007 - 2011
- Estrategia Nacional de Desarrollo

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

---

- Legislación nacional
- Lista y detalles de contacto del personal del proyecto y de otros grupos de interés relacionados con el proyecto
- Guía de Evaluación del PNUD para Proyectos Financiados por el FMAM y la guía de AF sobre los MTRs.

#### **Annex 4: Project Publications and Communications Materials**

- Facebook page <https://www.facebook.com/pfacc>
- Communication strategy for the Subbasin of the Río del Hombre
- Brochure on the Management Plans of the sub-watersheds
- Brochure: Climate Change Adaptation Fund Project "Facing climate risks to water resources in Honduras: increasing resilience and reducing vulnerabilities in poor urban areas"
- Brochure: Activities in the Forest Corridor Project Communication Strategy
- Brochure: Watershed Council
- Brochure: Management Plan and Land Registry of the Sub-basin of the Guacerique River
- Brochure: Management Plan of the Sub-basin of the Guacerique River
- Brochure: Importance of the Management Plan and Cadastral Surveying in SCRH
- Document: Working Paper WP 4H (Guide to mainstream Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Management into development planning)
- Rapid Guide for elaborating Adaptation to Climate Change Plans
- Document: Roof Maintenance and Cleaning Manual (for houses with rain water catchment system)
- Reports: Project News Bulletin (Monthly)
- Reports: 1st Special Edition of the Adaptation Fund Project Achievements
- Article: Sustainable agriculture for climate change adaptation in the sub-basin of the Guacerique River
- Climate Change Talks at the University
- Participation in Environmental Fairs
- Document: UNAH CC University Programme
- Series Print media ads
- Series of Newsletters
- Maps and templates
- Media Interviews of project staff
- Project promotion related shirts, caps, hats, banners, posters, flyers and stickers
- Videos on topics such as Sub-basin of the Rio del Hombre

**Annex 5: Assessing the contribution of project's products to Outcome 5 and Outcome 3 Honduras Country Programme 2012-2016 and UNDP's Strategic Plan 2014-2017**

The project is being conducted within the framework and expectations of UNDP, specifically the mandate of the Department of Environment and Energy. The project is part of the portfolio of the Environment Unit of Honduras CO and is contributing to Outcome 3.2 of the Country Programme 2012-2016: It is achieving this through the engagement of the Government of Honduras, public institutions such as the Autonomous University of Honduras, and community groups in the pilot project zones in climate change adaptation and risk reduction activity. The project has promoted best practices through for example, its training activity that has involved some innovative practices such as in-depth six-month courses. The project has also sought to establish best practices through the building of consensus amongst government sectors on matters related to practices and policies related to mitigation and adaptation to climate change in Honduras.

The project is also contributing directly to UNDAF Outcome Five regarding building risk reduction capacity. Through the project the Honduran government has been able to create a technical platform, although not formal, for inter-agency coordination and cooperation on issues related to climate change and risk reduction. Regional Development Plans have been developed and formalized that have integrated climate adaptation considerations into the respective planning processes. The pilot activity of the project looks to promote ground level innovation in risk reduction through activities such as water harvesting practices.

In terms of the UNDP Strategic Plan for the 2014-2017 period and the matter of scaling up of actions on climate change adaptation and mitigation. The strength of the project has been its ability to create a dynamic of engaging a strong number of stakeholder organizations and individuals in the issues of climate change adaptation and risk reductions. Before the commencement of the project there was a great deal that needed to be accomplished before the scaling up of activities could even be considered. Filling this gap was what the project has sought to do. It has supported extensive training in relevant subject matters, research, pilot activity and the development of policy and planning tools. The achievements of the project will make it possible for a greater number and more structured endeavours to promote adaptation and mitigation measures.

## Mid-Term Evaluation of Adaptation Fund Project: Honduras

---

### Annex 6: AF Mid-term Evaluation Rating Scale

**Progress towards results: use the following rating scale**

<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	Project is expected to achieve or exceed all its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	Project is expected to achieve most of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve some of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	Project is expected to achieve its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

**Adaptive management AND Management Arrangements: use the following rating scale**

<b>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</b>	The project has no shortcomings and can be presented as “good practice”.
<b>Satisfactory (S)</b>	The project has minor shortcomings.
<b>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</b>	The project has moderate shortcomings.
<b>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</b>	The project has significant shortcomings.
<b>Unsatisfactory (U)</b>	The project has major shortcomings.
<b>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</b>	The project has severe shortcomings.