

Grupos de Trabajo

Proyecto de Re-ingeniería del Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas en Apoyo de su Sostenibilidad Financiero

Introducción:

La República Dominicana está implementando una fase de Preparación de Proyecto (PPG, por sus siglas en inglés, Project Preparation Grant) para la elaboración de un proyecto en el área de biodiversidad, para catalizar la sostenibilidad del Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas. Específicamente, El “Proyecto de Reingeniería del Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas para Alcanzar la Sostenibilidad Financiera” apoya la reingeniería del Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas (SINAP) a través de dos tendencias complementarias: (a) mejorar la posición del sistema nacional como un componente integral del desarrollo de la nación; y (b) incrementar la participación de sectores productivos y la sociedad en aumentar la efectividad de manejo del SINAP y las Áreas Protegidas que lo componen, incrementando así la sostenibilidad del sistema. Para lograr esto, el proyecto simultáneamente apoyara intervenciones claves en el nivel sistémico y en el nivel de las áreas protegidas comprendidas entre 3 componentes (véase el documento conceptual –PIF- anexo):

- Aumentar y diversificar los fondos para el SINAP
- Aumentar la Efectividad y eficiencia de manejo de las Áreas Protegidas
- Arreglos de Co-manejo como medio para reducir los costos de manejo de las Áreas Protegidas.

El proyecto se enfocará en el objetivo estratégico No.1 GEF del área focal biodiversidad para “Catalizar la sostenibilidad de los sistemas de áreas protegidas.” Dentro del cual Se enfocará específicamente en la estrategia de prioridad No.1 (Sostenibilidad Financiera de los sistemas de áreas protegidas a nivel nacional), dados los inconvenientes para lograr fondos rentables y seguros, representa actualmente uno de los mayores obstáculos para el mejoramiento de la sostenibilidad y efectividad del SINAP.

Los Grupos de Trabajo: Propósito y Alcance

El objetivo principal de la fase preparatoria es lograr el diseño del proyecto y desarrollar un documento de proyecto (-PRODOC- por sus siglas en inglés) y un resumen ejecutivo denominado “CEO Endorsement Template” conforme a los requerimientos del Fondo para el Medio ambiente Mundial (FMAM) y el PNUD.

El propósito de los grupos de trabajo es proveer un foro para el intercambio de ideas, insumos, y experiencias por parte de un diverso grupo de actores reconocidos como expertos en determinadas aspectos del manejo y financiamiento de las Áreas Protegidas. Existen tres grupos de trabajo: Financiero, Efectividad de Manejo, y apoyo al Co-manejo con los siguientes tareas principales:

1. Apoyar el diseño del proyecto con información e ideas necesarias para determinar y validar los productos y las actividades específicas del proyecto.
2. Aportar conocimientos e información sobre productos, políticas, y programas existentes sobre los cuales el Proyecto de Re-ingeniería debe desarrollarse (línea base) y/o que sirve como potencial co-financiamiento para los componentes específicos del Proyecto.
3. Apoyar con ideas para el desarrollo de nuevas actividades o programas que no existen en la República Dominicana.

Los grupos de trabajo realizarán un estimado de 2 a 3 reuniones para trabajar en los aspectos técnicos del componente correspondiente, en preparación del grupo de trabajo para un Taller de Marco Lógico a celebrarse entre el 29 y 30 de Abril de 2009.

Plantillas para guiar el Marco Lógico, el diseño de actividades, y establecimiento de la línea base.

A. El documento conceptual del proyecto (-PIF- Anexo) contiene un esquema preliminar del Marco Lógico del proyecto. Las ideas presentadas en el documento conceptual están presentadas en una forma muy preliminar en una Matriz del Marco Lógico (Strategic Results Framework, Anexo). Nótese que el Matriz del Marco Lógico solo presenta el Objetivo Global, el Objetivo del Proyecto, y los Objetivos Específicos (Resultados). Los Productos Específicos (outputs) se presenta en el cronograma de productos y actividades (Anexo). Se presenta además el Matriz de Marco Lógico para dos Proyectos (a) Nicaragua y (b) Costa Rica se presenta como ejemplos.

B. El GEF solo financia los gastos incrementales que producen beneficios globales. Es decir, que financian acciones adicionales sobre los productos o actividades que ya están desarrollándose en el país. Es decir que sobre el esfuerzo (A) que produce un producto (AA) le agregamos un aporte del GEF (B) para producir (BB) que resulta en un beneficio global (C). En esta forma, demostramos al GEF los costos incrementales de la inversión del proyecto.

El grupo debe apoyar la identificación de: (A) los proyectos actuales en aporte del componente o las acciones que califica como aporte del componente. Para proyectos que comprende la línea base, necesitamos una breve descripción de la misma y los productos pertinentes a los componentes del Proyecto de Re-ingeniería. Si un proyecto independiente produce aportes a componentes del Proyecto de Re-ingeniería, se considera como co-financiamiento paralelo. Refiérase a Tabla ___.

Cronograma del Trabajo y actividades sugeridas:

Reunión 1: Entre el 25 y 30 de Marzo: Introducción y Metodología. Conocer el Documento Conceptual. Identificar Proyectos y Productos. Conocer el consultor encargado del componente y establecer una línea de comunicación. Identificar información requerida para desarrollar el componente.

Reunión 2: Entre el 5 y 15 de abril (2-4 horas): Validación de los Productos del Componente. Desarrollar ideas para actividades. Apoyo al consultor

Reunión 3: Entre el 20 y 25 de abril (2-4 horas): Desarrollar ideas para productos y actividades. Preparar presentaciones para el Taller de Marco Lógico.

Taller de Marco Lógico: 29 al 30 de abril, Santo Domingo, lugar a ser determinado.

Anexos:

1. Planilla para el Marco Lógico
2. Planilla para el Plan de Trabajo
3. Planilla para identificar acciones línea base
4. Ejemplo de Marco Lógico: Reorganización del SINAP Costa Rica
5. Ejemplo de Marco Lógico Nicaragua
6. Ejemplo del Plan de Trabajo

Anexo 1: Planilla Para el Marco Lógico

SECTION II. STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK (SRF) AND GEF INCREMENT

STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Project Title: Re-engineering the National Protected Area System in order to achieve financial sustainability.

SAMPLE: Logical Framework Analysis and Objectively Verifiable Impact Indicators From PIF

	Objectively verifiable indicators				
Goal					
Objectives/ Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Assumptions
Project Objective: <i>Consolidation of the financial sustainability of the National Protected Areas System</i>	Relate indicators to GEF BD indicators				

Outcome 1. Increased and diversified NPAS funding	Annual government funding for NPAS increased	3.0 M	\$5.1M by Q__ 1.5 M received from non-government sources annually by project end (private sector, (PES) Payment for Ecosystem Services, etc.).		
	Increase in UNDP Financial Sustainability Scorecard Rating	Baseline =	Target =		
Outcome 2. Improved effectiveness and efficiency of PA management	PAs have basic information on BD, natural resources, and stakeholders to allow management planning	45%	100%		
	Increase in the number of management plans for PAs	17 (20%)	37 (43%)		
	NPAS has a strategic financial Plan	0	50% of key PAs have financial plans		
	Increase in NPAS income invested in infrastructure.	10% (need dollar amounts)	25% of NPAS income invested in infrastructure.		
	Increase in the number of PAs with permanent staff presence	40% (put number here)	70% put target number here		
	Increase in PA management efficiency in PAs with high BD	Baseline METT scores	Target METT scores here.		
	Status of selected indicator species remains stable.	Baseline from representative sample of PAs (the species and the PAs (the species and the PAs, together with baseline values and targets to be defined during the PPG phase.			
Outcome 3: Co-management	The number of PAs with co-management agreements	13 PAs with co-management agreements	27 PAs with co-management		

arrangements to underwrite PA management costs			agreements		
	The number of Ha. under private reserves	0 Ha.	5,000 Ha.		
	The % of PA estate with tenure conditions resolved allowing co-management				
	Reductions in rates of natural ecosystem loss through agricultural encroachment in selected PAs				

Anexo 2: Planilla para el Plan de Trabajo: Indicative Quarterly Work Plan

DRAFT Indicative Work Plan RE: PIF	Q1 2009	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2010	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2011	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2012	Q2	Q3	Q4
Output 1.1- Permanent systems for valuation of PA benefits and channeling of information to decision makers																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
1.2 Visitation and service fees updated and piloted in public and private PAs																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																

DRAFT Indicative Work Plan RE: PIF	Q1 2009	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2010	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2011	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2012	Q2	Q3	Q4
Activity																
Activity																
1.3 Water-based PES piloted in selected PAs																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
1.4 Conservation Easement Schemes Piloted																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
1.5 Permanent private sector outreach program within SEMARENA																
Activity																

DRAFT Indicative Work Plan RE: PIF	Q1 2009	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2010	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2011	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2012	Q2	Q3	Q4
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
1.6 Protected Area Trust Fund regulated and capitalized																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Outcome 2-Improved Effectiveness and efficiency of PA Management																
2.1 Reviewed Staff Development and organizational plans in SEMARENA																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																

DRAFT Indicative Work Plan RE: PIF	Q1 2009	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2010	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2011	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2012	Q2	Q3	Q4
Activity																
Activity																
2.2 NPAS strategy document identifying PA investment priorities based on BD and threat levels.																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
2.3 Management Plans for key PAs																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																

DRAFT Indicative Work Plan RE: PIF	Q1 2009	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2010	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2011	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2012	Q2	Q3	Q4
Activity																
2.4 Strategic financial plans for the NPAS and Individual PAs																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
2.5 Administrative and operational regulations for PA staff																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity												*				
2.6 Revised sectoral PA Law in support of consolidation, decentralization, and tationalization of the NPAS																

DRAFT Indicative Work Plan RE: PIF	Q1 2009	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2010	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2011	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2012	Q2	Q3	Q4
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity												*				
2.7 100% of technical staff from PA and Biodiversity Subsecretariat with training in threats analysis, administration, and financial planning																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity												*				
Outcome 3. Co-management arrangements to underwrite PA management costs																
3.1 Co-management modules in training programs of SEMARENA staff																

DRAFT Indicative Work Plan RE: PIF	Q1 2009	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2010	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2011	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2012	Q2	Q3	Q4
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
3.2 Operational regulations and procedures in NPAS in support of co-management and private reserves																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
3.3 Regulatory Framework for the establishment of private reserves																
Activity																
Activity																

DRAFT Indicative Work Plan RE: PIF	Q1 2009	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2010	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2011	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2012	Q2	Q3	Q4
Activity																
Activity																
3.4. Clarification of tenure conditions in PAs																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
3.5. Others?																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Activity																
Project Management																

DRAFT Indicative Work Plan RE: PIF	Q1 2009	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2010	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2011	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1 2012	Q2	Q3	Q4	
5.1. Establish and maintain PMU																	
5.2.																	
5.3. Stakeholder Advisory Group, partners of the Project meetings					*				*				*				*
5.4. Inception and Steering Committee meetings	*				*				*				*				*

Anexo 3: Planilla para Identificación de actividades Línea Base

Favor de identificar los proyectos pertinentes y algunos de sus productos claves que apoyan el Componente GEF asignado a su grupo de trabajo.

El grupo debe apoyar la identificación de: (A) los proyectos actuales en aporte del componente o las acciones que califica como aporte del componente. Para proyectos que comprende la línea base, necesitamos una breve descripción de la misma y los productos pertinentes a los componentes del Proyecto de Re-ingeniería. Si un proyecto independiente produce aportes a componentes del Proyecto de Re-ingeniería, se considera como co-financiamiento paralelo.

Nombre del Proyecto (A)	Productos Pertinentes relacionados al proyecto de la re-ingeniería	Fecha de inicio y cierre estimado	Monto aproximado ejecutado hasta la fecha

PART II: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK PART II: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators													
Goal	Consolidating the National Protected Areas System (NPAS) as a key component of sustainable development in Costa Rica.													
Project Purpose	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions									
<p>Purpose (Objective): To develop the systemic and institutional capacities to overcome barriers to sustainability of the Costa Rican National Protected Areas System.</p>	<p>1. Amount of area (in ha) in protected areas that are legally incorporated into the SINAC PA System.</p>	<p>Several terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems in Costa Rica are currently under-represented in existing PAs. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Under-representation of semideciduous lowland forests and dry tropical forest - Under-representation of coastal and marine ecosystems. <p>Final report from GRUAS II available after October 2006 defining conservation priorities of Costa Rica as a basis for a national policy and a strategic plan for Pas.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least the following hectares will be (a) legally incorporated in the PA System at the End of Project; and (b) included in the <u>long-term</u> PA Systems Action Plan (15 years) with specific strategies for implementation: <table border="1" data-bbox="1039 860 1346 1117"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1039 860 1157 943">Hectares per ecosystem</th> <th data-bbox="1157 860 1268 943">EoP*</th> <th data-bbox="1268 860 1346 943">15-Year Plan</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1039 943 1157 1026">Total ha for PA System</td> <td data-bbox="1157 943 1268 1026">1,840,448</td> <td data-bbox="1268 943 1346 1026">Tbd*</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1039 1026 1157 1117">Marine and coastal</td> <td data-bbox="1157 1026 1268 1117">500,869</td> <td data-bbox="1268 1026 1346 1117">Tbd*</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target percentages for the marine and coastal ecosystems will be determined in the FSP as part of the long-term PA System Strategic Action Plan. <p>*Target amount of ha will be determined during the Inception Phase.</p>	Hectares per ecosystem	EoP*	15-Year Plan	Total ha for PA System	1,840,448	Tbd*	Marine and coastal	500,869	Tbd*	<p>New PA System Strategic Action Plan to be formulated; Gap analysis reports, Project Midterm and Final Evaluations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other relevant BD1 and BD2 GEF Projects within Costa Rica RAF are implemented successfully. • The new Government authorities support the de-concentration process of SINAC. • Key stakeholders effectively increase their capacities and employ these for improved management of the PA System. • SINAC, with the help of CCT, continues to monitor the management
Hectares per ecosystem	EoP*	15-Year Plan												
Total ha for PA System	1,840,448	Tbd*												
Marine and coastal	500,869	Tbd*												

	2. Level of SINAC's operational and management effectiveness.	The METT baseline for the 25 sample PAs were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 8 High - 8 Medium - 9 Low 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>By end of Project:</i> METT scores for the 25 sample PAs will have moved to a higher METT category as follows¹: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10 High - 10 Medium - 5 Low 	BD-1 Tracking Tools based on periodic application of the Management Efficiency Tracking Tool (METT) as per Project Work Plan.	effectiveness of the PAS through a periodic application of the METT. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The IADB Sustainable Tourism and Cadastre Programmes and related loans are approved by the Finance Ministry and ratified by the Legislative Assembly.
	3. Adoption of instruments which enable the incorporation of the eco-regional approach into the planning of the PA system, particularly through the existing legal framework provided by the Framework Law on the Environment, the Law on Biodiversity, the National Parks Law and the Forestry Law.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National and Regional Councils for Conservation Areas, Network of Biological Corridors, Inter-disciplinary Commission on the Exclusive Economic Zone of Costa Rica, are already-established mechanisms, which can help to operationalize cross-cutting environmental policies into other sectors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eco-regional management plans are defined by Year 2; • They are incorporated into other planning processes by Year 3. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal SINAC policy approved and implemented. 	

¹ By Project end (EOP) a net increase by ---% in the Management Effectiveness of the 25 PA selected, on the basis of the results of the METT during the PDF B preparatory phase, the distribution of points on management effectiveness between:

- 55-96 HIGH
- 45-54 MEDIUM
- Less than 45 LOW

(See Annex X Table X)

<p>OUTCOME 1: Costa Rica's legal and policy framework is reformed and enhanced to ensure effective management and long-term financial and ecological sustainability of the PA System.</p>	<p>1. Degree of adoption of a National PA System Policy, which 1) defines the PA System; 2) is based on the GRUAS II-promoted eco-regional approach; 3) defines a new sub-system for marine and coastal areas; and 4) defines how to integrate ecosystem functions into Costa Rica's territorial planning.</p>	<p>Currently, there is no official definition of the PA System; There is no national PA System Policy; There is only an incipient eco-regional approach; There is no sub-system for marine and coastal areas; Ecosystem functions are not integrated into Costa Rica's territorial planning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A National PA System Policy has been prepared by Year 2; • Validated by Year 3; • In force by Year 4. 	<p>Official gazette and territorial planning documents.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustained window of opportunity and political support to incorporate eco-regional approach into land use and regional planning. • Recognition of MINAE as promoter and driver of regional territorial planning. • Recognition by different sectors of the value of marine and
	<p>2. Degree of adoption of priority sites for re-classification and demarcation to achieve 10% coverage of each ecosystem/vegetation type to ensure conservation of globally significant ecosystem biodiversity.</p>	<p>Of the 52 major ecosystem/vegetation types only 12 are adequately (20%) covered by PAs in the PA System.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-classification of priorities and concrete proposal based on GRUAS II identified by Year 1; • Integrated into SINAC Strategic Plan by Year 1; • Integrated into PA System Action Plan by Year 2. 	<p>Official Government records, Project Mid-term Reviews and Final Evaluation.</p>	

	<p>3. Degree of preparation and implementation of project-supported SINAC Strategic Planning Tools (SINAC Strategic Plan and related PA System Action Plan).</p>	<p>The SINAC Strategic Plan is being prepared based on an old version from 2000; There is no PA System Strategic Action Plan.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SINAC Strategic Plan endorsed and operational by Year 2; • <u>Preliminary Short-term</u> PA System Action Plan (will cover initial period of 5 years) formulated by Year 2; • <u>Long-term</u> PA System Action Plan (15 years) prepared, which include (i) lessons and experience from pilot demonstrations (Outcome 4) and (ii) new regulatory frameworks and policies (Output 1.1 and 3.3) by Year 4; • Long-term Action Plan operational by Year 5. 	<p>Official Government records, Project Mid-term Reviews and Final Evaluation.</p>	<p>coastal resources in the development of the country through their conservation and sustainable use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership in SINAC to obtain support in Legislative Assembly and Executive.
<p>OUTCOME 2: SINAC's institutional PA System framework and capacity is enhanced for eco-regional planning and optimal management effectiveness.</p>	<p>1. Degree of institutional re-profiling process of SINAC personnel at central and regional levels as per new SINAC Strategic Plan and PA System Action Plan.</p>	<p>The Strategic Plan is not finalized and a PA System Action Plan does not exist; Existing SINAC staffing profiles are generally vague, lacking clear ToRs and do not respond to legally mandated de-concentration.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Year 3, roles and functions of SINAC personnel at central and regional levels have been re-defined/re-aligned as per new SINAC Strategic Plan and preliminary Short-term PA System Action Plan. 	<p>SINAC official records, Project Progress Reports, Mid-term Reviews and Final Evaluation.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key partners from civil society and private sector show continued interest in in situ conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. • IADB tourism and cadastre partner projects

	<p>2. Degree of implementation of an Integrated Knowledge Management System (KMS) and its level of integration of financial, ecological and sustainable tourism data.</p>	<p>The SINAC Financial Strategy is being formulated; There is no integrated Knowledge Management System in SINAC.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A KMS established by Year 2; • By Year 5, the KMS responds to the priorities and the needs of the PA System based on the new eco-regional approach and provides the needed data for the Annual Operational Plans, budget formulation and management. 	<p>SINAC financial records, Project Mid-term and Final Evaluation.</p>	<p>have been approved and votes in Legislative Assembly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal communications strategy successfully addresses resistance to change within SINAC
<p>OUTCOME 3: SINAC has the financial sustainability to effectively attain its strategic objectives and provide resources for long-term PA System</p>	<p>1. An Optimum Visitors Fee Policy, introducing a sliding scale for park entry fees with differentiated rates for nationals and foreign visitors.</p>	<p>There is currently no Visitors Fee Policy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Year 1, the new Policy is drafted; • By Year 2 it is politically endorsed and operational. 	<p>Official documents of Comptroller General's Office.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structural changes in the budget of SINAC have been authorized by the Ministry of Finance and are supported by a formal agreement with MINAE to strengthen

management needs.	2. % increase of the UNDP-GEF Financial Scorecard (see below).	<p>In 2006, the SINAC revenue was US\$ 21.09 million from regular budget sources, leaving a funding gap of US\$ 14.84 million; The Executive Decree on the Water Use Fee creates a new source of revenues for SINAC. In 2006, however, SINAC will not yet receive any funds from the new Water Tax (<i>Canon de Agua</i>).</p> <p>Income from total visitation reported in 2005 reached US\$ 5 million and the average annual growth rate for the past 10 years is 11%.</p> <p>SINAC's incipient Financial Information Management System does not allow for sufficient financial coordination and tracking between central, CAs and PA levels.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Year 1, tangible % project-specific targets for Year 3 and 5 have been included in the Scorecard; By <i>End of Project</i>, (Year 5): • SINAC staffing composition has changed to reflect the re-profiling process. • The Financial Scorecard will show a 50% improvement. • SINAC will receive 0.91 million/year in new revenue from the Water Tax and at least US\$ 6.9 million in visitors fees (See Base Scenario in Financial Sustainability Annex, <u>Section IV: Part VIII</u>). • By <i>End of Project</i>, under-spending is reduced by 50% to represent under 20% of SINAC's annual budget. 	<p>The Project-supported Capacity Assessment; Official documents of Comptroller General's Office; SINAC official financial records; UNDP-GEF Financial Scorecard ratings carried out as part of Project Mid-term and Final Evaluations.</p> <p>Annual Report of the National Park Foundation and Annual Operational Plans (POA) of the priority PAs.</p>	<p>the financial and fiscal autonomy of SINAC.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The re-structuring of MINAE under the current administration is consistent and compatible with a greater degree of financial autonomy by SINAC.
OUTCOME 4: SINAC tests new and innovative conservation approaches at the Conservation Area and PA levels.	Amount of unresolved land tenure conflicts within PA System.	A high number of unresolved land tenure conflicts within PA System, primarily related to the lack of legal land titling of some PAs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 SINAC PAs legally registered and demarcated by Year 3; this process replicated to at least 12 other PAs by Year 5. • By End of Project, all unresolved land tenure conflicts resolved in at least 8 of the 12 demarcated PAs. 	<p>Legal PA land titling documents;</p> <p>IADB Cadastral and FSP Project progress reports.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an enabling environment for reforming the legal framework in order to permit collaborative management of PA, through alliances and

	<p>Level of service provision to tourists, condition of the infrastructure within and accessibility of the 10 most visited PAs within the PA System.</p>	<p>Poor and insufficient infrastructure within and poor accessibility to 10 most visited PAs in PA System.</p> <p>Today, investment in infrastructure and improvement of facilities in PA accounts for 14% of SINAC's annual budget.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least XX* Works in tourism infrastructure and facilities have been improved or developed in at least 6 PA by Year 3; • At least XX* Works in tourism infrastructure and facilities have been improved or developed in at least 10 PA by End of Project. <p>(*No.s to be jointly defined with co-funding IADB Tourism Programme during Inception Phase)</p>	<p>Project M&E System; Project Mid-term and Final Report.</p>	<p>consortium organized around the long-term management of PA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New alliances and partnerships between SINAC and local stakeholders involved in PA management. SINAC staff work in close collaboration with networks of private reserves, NGOs, Municipalities, indigenous communities and community based organizations to improve their capacities and management effectiveness.
	<p>The number of public-private Concession agreements for provision of non-essential services developed and functioning within the pilot PAs and buffer zones in priority areas for biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>Sporadic, non-systematized pilot experiences of joint work with local stakeholders for the operation of Non-essential Services and PA management.</p> <p>Most of the PAs within the Tempisque Conservation Area are privately owned.</p> <p>The Pacific Coast of the Nicoya Peninsula is one of Costa Rica's fastest-growing tourism destinations.</p> <p>Hence, there is a significant, yet unexplored potential for fostering public-private partnerships for provision of non-essential services in PAs between local municipalities, private landowners and private sector.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 of public-private Concession Agreements organized for the provision of non-essential services to PAs have been created in the Tempisque Conservation Area by Year 3; • Approach replicated through at least 6 new Agreements in other PAs within the Conservation Area by Year 5. 	<p>SINACs operational records, Operational Reports for the PAs; Financial plans and Project reports</p>	

	No. of Co-management Arrangements operating effectively and level of capacity of PA staff in Pilot Sites to involve and work together with local stakeholders, such as local entrepreneurs, municipalities and indigenous organizations.	There is no official co-management arrangements between SINAC and local stakeholders for matters such as joint patrolling; There is limited capacity within SINAC to collaborate with municipalities and local stakeholders, and especially with indigenous communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to 10 Collaborative Management agreements of PA have been passed with municipalities, NGOs and indigenous communities in pilot areas by Year 3. A legal framework for Collaborative management of PA has been designed and approved by End of Project. 	Proceedings of the Network of Private Reserves, mid-term evaluations and Project reports by Year 2 and Year 4, Final Project Evaluation.	
OUTCOME 5: Successful PA System management models are scaled-up and replicated at the systemic level through partnerships with key stakeholders.	Level of multi-stakeholder consultation and coordination carried out through PA System bodies in all 11 Conservation Areas (CAs).	Legal mechanism established and 9 Regional Councils officially formed, but inactive; There are no Local Councils established yet.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11 Regional Councils (1 per CA) re-activated/established, realigned and operational by Year 3; At least 1 pilot Local PA Council within each Conservation Area formed and operational by Year 3 (11 total); Local PA Council approach and process replicated at least twice within each Conservation Area (i.e. 22 more) by Year 5. 	Decrees and SINAC administrative resolutions	<p>Acceptance and support of political authorities for collaborative PA management relationships.</p> <p>Collaborative PA management relationships between PAS and social stakeholders are established and maintained.</p> <p>Willingness of social actors and institutions to participate in and share</p>

	<p>Development of a model for public-private Concession agreements for provision of non-essential services and degree of its up-scaling throughout the whole PA System in priority areas for biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>Sporadic, non-systematized pilot experiences of joint work with local stakeholders for the operation of Non-essential Services and PA management;</p> <p>Based on Pilot Demonstrations in Outcome 4, there is a strong potential for creating a useful model for public-private Concession Agreements to be promoted throughout the whole PA System.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Year 3, a Model generated based on the initial 3 Pilot Demonstrations of public-private Concession Agreements organized for the provision of non-essential services to PAs in the Tempisque Conservation Area (OUTCOME 4); • The Model replicated through at least 15 new Agreements in PAs in other Conservation Areas by Year 5; • The model is fully incorporated into official SINAC policies by End of Project. 	<p>SINACs operational records, Operational Reports for the PAs; Project Mid-term and Final Evaluations.</p>	<p>PA management responsibilities.</p>
--	---	---	---	---	--

	<p>Development of a model for public-private partnerships established between municipalities and eco-tourism operators for building and maintaining biological corridors and degree to which it is up-scaled throughout the whole PA System in priority areas for biodiversity conservation.</p>	<p>GRUAS II stresses the importance of incorporating key biological corridors into the new eco-regional vision for the PA System; Biological corridors are already a part of SINAC in the Conservation Areas. Yet, much more work is needed for the recommendations of GRUAS II to be adequately implemented; Municipalities are not involved in the preparation of local Land Use Plans, which could provide a foundation for linking eco-tourism and conservation goals; The Araucaria XXI Programme of the Spanish Cooperation will assist initiatives in the Río Frío watershed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By Year 3, at least 4 public-private partnerships (municipalities-Eco-tourism operators) within Pilot Conservation Area to coordinate and integrate resource assignments to local biological corridor initiatives according to conservation priorities established by GRUAS II signed; • By Year 4, a Model has been created based on the initial Pilot Demonstrations and each new partnership has formulated a new local Land Use Plan for designated biological corridor; • By Year 5, these partnerships and Land Use Plans have been replicated elsewhere through at least 4 additional agreements. 	<p>Signed public-private agreements and new local Land Use Plans.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

Anexo 5: Ejemplo de Marco Lógico y Plan de Trabajo Nicaragua

Table 6. Logical Framework Matrix

Project Strategy		Objectively Verifiable Indicators			
Goal: Nicaraguan society conserves biodiversity <i>in-situ</i> through a sustainable National Protected Areas System					
Conceptual Framework	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Risks and Assumptions.
Project Objectives: <i>“The Nicaraguan Protected Areas System is effectively managed through legal reforms, strengthened institutions, sustainable financing and partnerships.”</i>	Number of PAs and Ha. with improved conservation management	1 PA (5100 Ha.)	50 additional PAs (321,813 Ha.) by S8	Financial statements from each PA. System-level METT scoring.	Inflation remains within predictable levels estimated at 4%/annum.
	Number of PAs with Management scores above 600 on TNC scale.	1 PA above 600.	4 additional PAs with scores above 600.	Bi-annual scoring of management efficiency at the site level.	Improved attitudes and lobby will increase the willingness to increase financing
	Reduction in financing gap.	SINAP 2007 baseline investment at June 2007 in \$U.S.	Target to be determined by CEO endorsement	MARENA budget dedicated to DGAP DGAP expenditures Congressional budget figures. Agreements to support mid-term financing plan	That political commitment to the project will continue.

<p>Outcome 1: Enhanced Policy and legal framework enables improved SINAP management and finances.</p>	<p>Legislation signed into law to enable effective PA management and overcome existing barriers caused by current legislation</p>	<p>Current legal framework causing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Undefined mandates 2. Low visibility for SINAP. 2. Inability to finance PAs through concessions and/or fiduciary mechanisms. 	<p>1 Protected Areas Law and 1 law on Natural Resources Tariffs passed by S8, clarifying:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Decentralized roles and responsibilities. 2) Increased visibility 3) financing of SINAP through GoN quota, concessions, and tariffs. 	<p>Protected Areas Law and Natural Resources Tariffs Law voted into force and published in the national Gazette</p>	<p>That political commitment to the project will continue.</p> <p>Increased awareness translates into political action by lawmakers.</p>
	<p>The level of awareness by policymakers of the importance of SINAP to the national economy</p>	<p>To be surveyed during the inception phase</p>	<p>90% awareness as measured by survey</p>	<p>Results of baseline and final survey</p>	
	<p>Increased cooperation for integration of biodiversity and PA management between MARENA and regional governments</p>	<p>Ratification of agreement for decentralization between by 0 parties (MARENA, SERENA, regional authorities, and SEPICA).</p>	<p>Five Authorities party to agreement by 2009.</p>	<p>Published agreement. Agreement on record in all institutions.</p>	

	The number of agreements expressing multi-sector support to a updated SINAP management strategy and framework.	0 Agreements from multi-lateral donors, GoN, Municipalities, NGOs, Municipalities, and Universities.	At least: 5 Agreements from Multi-lateral donors 5 Agreements from GoN Ministries 1 Agreement per Municipality with PAs in their territories 2 Agreements with National Universities	Published proposal for public review. Letters of ratification by stakeholders	
Outcome 2: PA management responsibilities are shared by key stakeholders.	Number of PAs with a functioning participatory (multi-sector) in communication with DGAP.	16 have partial structures and 0 are represented and actively communicating with DGAP in a system.	At least 40 PAs with local structures functioning and systematically communicating with DGAP at the national level.	Minutes of local municipal committees Mid-term Evaluation	50% of the local actors who do not recognize the legitimacy of the PAs on their land participate in the dialogue.
	Number of agreements with co-managers signed that include defined standards and protocols.	0. agreements/contracts with protocols or standards.	9 co-managed PAs with agreements/contracts that include protocols and standards by 2009.	Published methodologies and scores.	Continued co-manager compliance and participation. Co-managers do not opt-out of co-management agreements

	Multi-sector committee coordinates and analyzes the impacts and lessons learnt of model projects to convert present practices into biodiversity compatible production.	Impacts evaluated for 0 Projects in Agricultural conversion 0 Projects in improved fishing 0 certification schemes	Impacts quantified for: Agricultural conversion projects in 11 PAs Forestry impact reduction in 2 PAs Improved fishing project in 2 PAs Certification schemes in 2 PAs	Project Evaluations Reports and minutes from inter-agency committee meetings.	Continued commitment of participating agencies and donors.
Outcome 3: Capacities for sustainable financing of SINAP and PAs developed.	Number of PAs (both government and co-managed) reporting revenues and costs	No account reporting	3 Pilot PAs and 9 (100%) Co-managed PAs reporting revenues and costs by S4.	Independent audits reports. Central recorded data a DGAP Random annual audits Evaluation of system performance.	DGAP and PAs maintain human resources necessary to collect and report information.
	Increase in score in UNDP financial scorecard (see PRODOC Section IV for attached scorecard.)	Baseline score to be completed during inception phase	25% improvement over baseline score. Target to be adjusted between UNDP and stakeholders based on baseline scoring exercise	Scorecard evaluation	

	Revenue generated from concessions and retained by SINAP and the local PA	\$0.00 derived from concessions	A total of \$100,000 USD/year is generated from existing concessions by Q5.	Receipts Financial records SINAP financial audit	Concessionaires compliance with agreements Cooperation between co-managers and concessionaires.
	Increase in public investment over baseline to support PA management	2007 Counterpart funding expenditure of US \$400,000	Target to be determined by CEO endorsement	MARENA budget dedicated to DGAP DGAP expenditures Congressional budget figures.	
Outcome 4: Institutional management and learning within project and MARENA	Project financial management system	0	1 system	Audited statements Quarterly Reports	The project has had positive results to be replicated at both the national and regional level.
	Number of events for dissemination of lessons learned to Mesoamerican countries	0 events	1 event executed by project closing	Press and publications Event report	

Anexo 6: Ejemplo de un Plan de Trabajo Nicaragua.

Table 7: Indicative Outputs, Activities and Semester-based Work plan

Outputs	Activities	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8
Output 1.1: The quantitative economic contribution of Nicaragua’s protected areas to the national and regional economy is widely known	1.1.1 Estimate value of economic activities, within protected areas to the national economy	■	■						
	1.1.2 Estimate value for ecosystem services in SINAP using detailed values from 19 PAs.	■	■	■					
	1.1.4. Implementation of a consciousness raising programme				■	■	■	■	
	1.1.5. Seminars and workshops for national officials and local stakeholders.		■		■		■		■
Output 1.2: Legislation in place to legalize the agreements SINAP management and improved strategic and management framework.	1.2.1. Workshops to draft Protected Areas Law			■	■				
	1.2.2. Public consultation					■	■		
	1.2.3. Submission to congress and lobby for approval.					■	■		
Output 1.3: Legislation in force to enable increased revenues to SINAP and PAs	1.3.1. Revise draft Natural Resources Tariffs Law.			■	■				
	1.3.2. Support to the public consultation process				■	■			
	1.3.3. Submission and lobby for approval					■	■		
Output 1.4: SINAP has an improved strategic and	1.4.1. Gap analysis validates PA system boundary for protection of critical ecosystems and biodiversity.	■	■						

Outputs	Activities	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8
management framework	1.4.2. Prioritization of present and potential PAs based on bio-diversity requirements, values and conservation needs.								
	1.4.3. Technical assistance and negotiations to resolve de-concentration issues.								
	1.4.4. Design proposal for strategy and management plan (conceptual framework) with stakeholder input.								
	1.4.5. Negotiations to ratify the conceptual framework by key stakeholders (MARENA, Autonomous Regional Government, other Government institutions) and donors.								
Output 2.1: A participatory and integrated stakeholder governance and communication structure is functioning:	2.1.1. Diagnostic of local capacities for stakeholder (institutions, unions, etc.) participation within SINAP co-management governance structures at the local level.								
	2.1.2. Capacity building to enhance stakeholder participation in PA management, including representation.								
	2.1.3. Workshops for consulting and consolidation of the participation at the local, departmental, and national levels.								
	2.1.4. Technical assistance in organizational development at the municipal level.								
Output 2.2: Integrated stakeholder support for mitigating the impacts of economic development and integrating economic development with PA management objectives.	2.2.1. Productive conversion agriculture to agroforestry systems. (Cerro Musún, Kilambé, Tisey-Estanzuela, Tomabú, Quiabuc, Datanlí-El Diablo y Cosigüina)								
	2.2.2. Development of certification schemes for environmentally products for increase in conservation and ad valorem (Kilambé, Tisey-Estanzuela, Tomabú, Quiabuc y Tisma)								
	2.2.3. Development of improved fishing practices (Estero Real e Isla Juan Venado)								

Outputs	Activities	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8
	2.2.4. Development of sustainable forestry operations. (Tisma y Mombacho)								
	2.2.5. Coordination between INTUR and MARENA for ecotourism development in PAs.								
	2.2.6. Technical support in the design and implementation of projects for small and medium sized businesses and municipalities/ONGs, CBOs.								
Output 2.3: Protocols, standards, and indicators for co-manager performance established.	2.3.1. Workshops to draft protocol, standards, and indicators for successful co-management schemes.								
	2.3.2. Dissemination of protocols, standards, and indicators.								
	2.3.3. Compile management efficiency for system.								
	3.5.4. New contracts and agreements signed.								
Output 3.1: A long-range financing strategy and plan for SINAP in force	3.1.1. Creation of a multi-agency/private sector task force committee to support PA financing and application of private sector capital.								
	3.1.2. Improved financial gap analysis: (Estimate of non-government revenues).								
	3.1.3. Detailed Analysis of capital investments and financial mechanisms and potential at the national level.								
	3.1.4. Technical support to MARENA, DGAP, SERENA, RAAS, RAAN in Finance.								
	3.4.2. Identification and analysis of financial mechanisms to generate future revenues for SINAP (Including National Environment Fund).								
	3.1.5. Strategic financial plan developed, published and approved.								

Outputs	Activities	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8
Output 3.2: Increased annual government financing for SINAP	3.2.1 Revision of sector laws and programs to identify SINAP inputs that deserve greater budgetary assignment.								
	3.2.2 Lobby authorities and national assemblymen.								
Output 3.3 Concession payment mechanisms established and functioning	3.3.1. Inventory of productive activities within PAs.								
	3.3.2. Negotiations and agreements with corresponding agencies and with private sector to establish rates and payment mechanisms.								
	3.3.3. Financial system for management of revenues from concessions product of existing agreements.								
Output 3.4: Model PA management and business planning developed and implemented.	3.4.1. Workshops and fieldwork to update management plans in 3 protected areas updated and improved.								
	3.4.2. Technical support in the completion/updating of business plans in 4 PAs.								
Output 3.5: A administrative cost and revenue accounting system is implemented, functioning, and tested in the Pacific and central region.	3.5.1. Diagnostic of financial system and information needs for decision-making needs and capacities.								
	3.5.2. Development of financial system at system-level and site-level (4 PAs)								
	3.5.3. Development of a systems manual with procedures and guidelines for different management categories.								
	3.5.4. Audits of PAs.								
Output 4.1. Project management evolve through adaptive management	4.1.1. Project Management Unit established.								

Outputs	Activities	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8
Output 4.2. Project monitoring and evaluation system	4.2.1.. Publish a document of the systematization of the most successful experiences to be used at the national and international levels								