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# A. Basic Project and Finance Data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Implementing Partner: | MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT |
| GEF Focal Area: | Biodiversity |
| Country(ies) | (ECU) Ecuador |
| Project Start Date: | 05-May-2010 |
| Planned Project Closing Date: | 30-May-2015 |
| Revised Planned Closing Date: | 30-Nov-2016 |
| Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board meetings during reporting period: | March 2015 |
| Total GEF Grant (U$S) | $ 6,500,000 |
| GEF Grant Disbursed as of 30 June (U$S): | $ 4,637,204.45 |
| Total Co-financing (as planned in CEO endorsement request): | $ 9,000,000.00 |
| Overall Risk Rating | Moderate |
| Overall DO Rating | Satisfactory |
| Overall IP Rating | Highly Satisfactory |

# B. Project Contacts and Links

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Partner | Contact Name | Email Address |
| Project Coordinator / Manager | Zornitza Aguilar | zornitza.aguilar@ambiente.gob.ec |
| UNDP Country Office Programme Officer | Gabriel Jaramillo | gabriel.jaramillo@undp.org |
| Project Implementing Partner | Christian Teran | christian.teran@ambiente.gob.ec |
| GEF Operational Focal Point | SofÃ­a Panchi | sofia.panchi@ambiente.gob.ec |
| Other Partners | Pablo Drouet | pablo.drouet@ambiente.gob.ec |
| UNDP Technical Adviser | Ms. Helen NEGRET | helen.negret@undp.org |
| UNDP Programme Associate | Maria-Gabriela Pinto | mariagabriela.pinto@undp.org |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project website, etc. | Oficial Blog: www.psfecuador.com Youtube: www.youtube.com/user/psfecuador Facebook: www.facebook.com/psfecuador Website of the Ministry of Enviroment:http://www.ambiente.gob.ec/proyecto-de-sostenibilidad-financiera-de-areas-protegidas-del-snap/ Website of UNDP Ecuador: http://www.ec.undp.org/content/ecuador/es/home/operations/projects/environment\_and\_energy/proyecto-de-sostenibilidad-financiera-del-sistema-nacional-de-ar.html Website of the National Protected Areas System: http://areasprotegidas.ambiente.gob.ec/es/content/el-proyecto-de-sostenibilidad-financiera-psf-para-el-sistema-nacional-de-%C3%A1reas-protegidas |
| Links to media coverage |  |

# C. Project Summary

The project aims to strengthen the financial sustainability of EcuadorÃÃÃs National System of Protected Areas (SNAP) by increasing revenues, reducing costs, and improving financial planning and management at the level of the entire system and its constituent PA units. The project will also motivate an increase of Government funding for SNAP, which is the main sustainable result over the long term. In addition, activities in five PAs within the existing sub-system of public Natural Areas of National Heritage (PANE), at two Private Forest sites and at one community-managed conservation area, will provide demonstrations of financial planning, management and investment alongside testing of new revenue-generation mechanisms. Thus, the project ultimately aims to conserve globally significant ecosystems secured in protected areas by improving the financial sustainability of the national protected area system.

# D. Progress toward Development Objective

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective/Outcome** | **Description** | **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Target Level at end of project** | **Level at 30 June 2013** | **Level at 30 June 2014** | **Level at 30 June 2015** |
| Objective | A field-tested financial and operational framework is institutionalized for an expanded Ecuadorian National System of Protected Areas (SNAP) |  | The scores for scorecard component and total are shown below as % of the total possible score. (\*PANE is the sub-system of public protected areas). The baseline for the scorecard is for the SNAP in 2008, which then effectively covered only the PANE sub-system. | Target scores for scorecard components and total are shown below as % of the total possible score These targets are for the PANE sub-system. The scorecard will be applied to the complete SNAP when the APPRI and APC sub-systems are fully established. It will also be applied to the sub-systems separately to track progress. 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicators target level, based on administrative-financial information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. UNDP Financial Scorecard Component 1 Governance framework that enables sustainable PA financing - 61% Component 2 Financial planning and tools for cost-effective management - 61% Component 3 Tools and systems for the mobilization and income generation - 56% Total - 59% | The results from the UNDP Financial Scorecard ran in December 2012 showed the following at the level of the SNAP: 1. Governance frameworks that enable sustainable PA financing - 45 % 2. Business planning & other tools for cost-effective management - 34% 3. Tools and systems for revenue generation & Mobilization - 31% Total - 35% Although these percentages have not increased at the total SNAP level, we can say that the financial capacity of the SNAP has increased at least for components 1 and 2. Regarding governance frameworks, great efforts are being held to approve changes in legislation - as with the TULAS (Unified text of secondary environmental legislation). Regarding tools for cost-effective management, administrative capacities are being generated and specific tools like updated management plans for 3 pilot areas, management models for specific PAs and business plans have been produced. It should be noted that these documents were not ready at the time the data for the Scorecard data was collected. On another hand, the decrease for tools in resource generation is directly linked to the change in the management model of the SNAP which now has a fee 0 for the entrance to Protected Areas. The transition to adapt the SNAP to this model is being in progress and will essentially be tackled by the update of the Finacial Sustainability Strategy of the SNAP. | The UNDP Financial Scorecard results were evaluated in the late 2013, to design the Financial Sustainability Strategy for the National Protected Areas System (SNAP): 1 Governance framework that enables sustainable PA financing -. 47%, 2 Financial planning and tools for cost-effective management - 32%, 3 Tools and systems for the mobilization and income generation - 45%. The overall result of the financial scorecard was 43%. This is an increase of 8% since December 2012. This year, we have two key tools for sustainability: the financial gap analysis and Financial Sustainability Strategy for the SNAP, which increases the values of the UNDP Financial Scorecard. | The UNDP Financial Scorecard of Natural Heritage Areas of the State (PANE) was register online through the Biodiversity Information System (SIB) and the results for 2014 are: 1. Governance framework that enables sustainable PA financing - 50% 2. Financial planning and tools for cost-effective management - 41% 3. Tools and systems for the mobilization and income generation- 47% Thus, the overall result of the National Protected Areas System (SNAP) was 47% with an increase of 4% contrasted with the previous report. This increase reflects the policy planning and the public finance of the National Government. Regarding public policy, there are significant advances in the Organic Code of Planning and Public Finance (COPLAFIP) on programming, development, approval, allocation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the General Governmental Budget and the definition of tax revenue generation capacity. This year approximately 70% of protected areas (PA) have management plans which include clear guidelines for their development and are in process to be formalized. The budget reform is in force in the Public Financial Management System (E-Sigef) https://esigef.finanzas.gob.ec (Only authorized personal have access to this system, then you can see in annex the proposal of the budget reform) that makes visible the resources allocated to each PA. In addition, the methodology for the Development of Financial Sustainability plans was approved by the Ministry of Environment and the mandatory use of the methodology for the Annual Operational Management Plans (PGOA) was formalized trough the Ministerial Agreement N. 076. Currently, the head coordinators of the Protected Areas will familiarize with the implementation Annual Operational Management Plans through the Green Classroom Program (www.aulaverde.org.ec). |
|  |  |  | NWFR Total Ã¢ 20% The scorecard will also be applied to the entire Private Reserves Network RBPE (70 PAs) at the start of the project | Targets for the RBPE will be determined at project start Total Ã¢ 77% 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicators target level, based on administrative-financial information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. The UNDP Financial Scorecard is not applicable to private and community areas, since they are not part of the National Protection Areas Systema and do not have a management system established yet. Proposed target levels have been evaluated based on administrative-financial strenghthening of the institutions that manage these areas: CNBRPE Component 1 - 56% Component 2 - 59% Component 3 - 33% Total - 49% The Tembladera Wetland Component 1 - 36% Component 2 - 43% Component 3 - 31% Total - 36% | At the Steering Committee meeting of November 28, 2012 the exit of the Cordillera del Balsamo in ManabÃÂ­ was formalized. With this, it was decided to redirect the indicator to the Northwestern node of Pichincha. The UNDP financial Scorecard is hardly adaptable to the functioning of private areas as many of the questions do not apply because they have not yet been integrated into the SNAP. However, the financial capabilities of the Northwestern node have improved thanks to some tools for business planning and resource generation that are being implemented. For example, there were 16 business plans as a basis to compete in different funding mechanisms. Also, specific trainings have been conducted to improve reservistsÃ¢ productivity and added value such as the agro-ecology workshop and a first aid course. | The UNDP financial scorecard is not adaptable for private reserves of the Private Forests and Reserves National Corporation (CNBRPE), even if incorporated into the SNAP as an AP management mechanisms. The administrative financial strengthening has focused on the regularization of the organization and transparent financial management. The CNBRPE currently recognizes the importance of an effective and adequate financial management, for which they hired an accountant. | The Financial Scorecard methodology was adapted to the current situation of the National Corporation of Forests and Private Reserves of Ecuador (CNBRPE) and the Wetland La Tembladera considering the current political and environmental standards in the country. The CNBRPE results for 2014 are: C1 - 71.14% C2 - 37.22% C3 - 77,78% The overall result in 2014 was 62.05%, registering a significant increase of 42.05% compared to the project baseline. These results are the product of the implementation of national environmental policies such as the National Environmental Incentives Program through Socio Bosque Program (http://sociobosque.ambiente.gob.ec/) and the exoneration of the tax payment on rural land conservation through the Internal Revenue Service of Ecuador (SRI). Organizational strengthening in CNBRPE is evidenced through various actions such as: the implementation and management of an accounting system and an accountability system that includes administrative and internal control manuals. This latter system aims to provide a more efficient management. This stamen can be evidenced on the Ministerial Agreement No. 69; Reformatory Law for the Tributary Equity of Ecuador and the United Text of Secondary Environmental Legislation (TULAS). Additionally, a strategy for mobilization of volunteers was created . This strategy includes a platform for online registration and 6 interinstitutional agreements (This agreements are included as annex). The CNBRPE has 16 management and business plans for the private reserves of the Northwest of Pichincha. The results of the Wetland La Tembladera 2014 are: C1 - 68.83% C2 - 56.67% C3 - 47.22% The overall result for the reporting period is 57.57%, with an increase of 21.57% compared to the expected goal at the end of the project to 2016. In addition to this, positive increase the new social development model promoted by the National Government and the Code of the Territorial Organization Autonomy and Decentralization (COOTAD) allows greater independence of environmental management within each territory. Additionally, organizational strengthening in the wetland La Tembladera is evidenced through actions such as: the Wetland Protection Ordinance for La Tembladera (this document is on annex), issued by the Decentralized Autonomous Government (GAD) of Santa Rosa (this GAD counts with a legalized Board that plans its strategic management). Likewise, the Agriculture Artisan Producers Association La Tembladera (ASOGROTEM) was formed as a community body that implements development projects in the area. Besides, the wetland counts with technical documents such as: the Management Plan, Financial Sustainability Strategy and the Environmental Services Opportunity Cost study. Nowadays, La Tembladera is running the project for fish farming of the endemic fish "the Old Blue. Currently, the project has started its first touristic stage that includes the de development of financial mechanisms to ensure its sustainability. |
|  |  |  | The funding gap estimated in 2008 for PANE PA was US$ 2,752,454 Ã¢ or 41% - per year. (This will be reconfirmed by year 2 with updated basic scenario assessments for SNAP PA and a new scenario for climate change). | The funding gap is reduced in a 15% by the end of project and the capacities and mechanisms in place to reduce this further. Note: This reduction does not consider the resources that will SNAP receive in case of YasunÃÂ­-ITT initiative success. | In 2005 the first national baseline exercise and financial gap analysis of the SNAP was published with data from 2003. The results obtained for the 31 (Protected Areas) PAs that existed at that time showed showed that for the continental SNAP there was a total cost of $2.7 million with an estimated level of $6.2 million in needs to cover the basic scenario and $12.2 million for the ideal scenario. In 2012, the exercise was ran again with 47 PAs and it was determined that the basic scenario was widely exceeded by $21.6 million, almost 8 times more than the amount invested 10 years ago. This is why the scenarios were rethough with a consolidation scenario with a $44.1 Million gap and an ideal one witha a $66.8 Million gap. Although the budget of the State has considerably risen since the baseline exercise, the gap is higher than for several reasons. First, the number of PAs passed from 31 to 47. With this increase, the number of tourists is expected to grow up to 2 million. Also, most of the gap responds to investment needs especially in infrastructure to face the needs coming from the increase in tourism. Finally, although in a lower scale, current expenditure is part of the gap too, especialy regarding needs of staff and operative expenses of the SNAP. The systemic expenditure is is more stable compared to the increase of the gap. The reduction of the gap is directly linked to the identification of financial mechanisms that are feasible and viable taking into account the current regulations and this will be done with the update of the Financial Sustainability Strategy of th SNAP. | The reduction of 15% of the financial gap set at project end for the objective has been fulfilled. The SNAP budget for 2012 is $21,000,000, but there is a new financial gap of $26,000,000 evaluated in 2012. The Financial. Sustainability Strategy proposes three scenarios to reduce the financial gap updated on 2012: 1) Business as usual - implementing financing mechanisms, 2) A separate structure within the Environmental Ministry (MAE), 3) Creating a Public Enterprise SNAP, which is the most cost-effective option, but its implementation would go beyond the project time. These scenarios are being analyzed by the MAE. | Regarding the public budget expenditure, the SNAP reported in 2013 about US $ 30 million expenditure, meanwhile in 2014 it was reported USD 24 million that represent the 55% of the financial gap. Thus, in order to reach the minimum requirements (44 million) for the operation of the SNAP, The Ministry of Environment still need to get 20 million more. These information correspond to the first run of financial information generated by the Financial Scorecard, whose reports are in development. In 2014 it is evidenced a restriction on State resources, the country's economy prioritized national issues such as investment in multipurpose projects, health, education, road infrastructure, etc.; however, SNAP had the resources to maintain and cover the basic financial needs of PA. |
|  |  |  | - There are specific monetary resources allocated for communal biodiversity conservation in this PA, around US$ 400.000 - Communal work is not guided by conservation priorities. - Funding needs are not known. | Specific mechanism operating in FUNDAR for: - Providing monetary resources to famers in the communal reserve to improve biodiversity conservation and restoration. Increase by at least 50%. - Optimizing communal work to priority BD actions. - Capturing additional resources for PA management of the PA from local governments and other sources. - Estimates of funding needs are available for basic management for closing them 2014: FUNDAR retired from the Project in 2011. The Tembladera Wetland was selected as new pilot community protected area. The proposed targets for this area are: - Established mechanisms for capturing resources - Capturing additional resources for PA management of the PA from local governments and other sources. - Optimizing communal work with conservation priority. | In May of 2012 La Tembladera Wetland was selected as the new community pilot area of the project as a replacement of Abras de Mantequilla and strategic information for the sustainability of the wetland was collected. Taking this into account, baseline and target levels should be revised. The baseline for the existence of funds for biodiversity conservation in the area was determined to be inexistent. There were no specific resources for biodiversity conservation, community work was not guided by conservation priorities and funding needs were unknown. As the baseline level was changed (due to the change in the community area), the target level should be revised as well. In June 2013, the municipality of Santa Rosa passed the municipal ordinance to protect the wetland La Tembladera which implies that in the Annual Operating Plan and budget for next year the municipality will allocate funds for its protection. The financial sustainability strategy for La Tembladera estimated a necessary budget of $ 255,000 for five years in current expenditure, operating expenditure and investment with potential funding sources. | Santa Rosa Municipality pledged at least $ 20,000 for the TembladeraÃ¢s wetland conservation. The Steering Board of the TembladeraÃ¢s wetland now has a coordinator who helps with the organization and communication of the Board. In order to promote new productive mechanisms that support conservation of the Tembladera wetland the TembladeraÃ¢s Farmers and Craftsmen Association (ASOGROTEM) was created. This organization brings together 40 partners from five communities managing the wetland. Three additional communities are interested in participating in the conservation process of the wetland, the number of beneficiary families and conservation area may increase, including other wetland areas connected to the Tembladera wetland. The aim of ASOGROTEM is to manage funds for productive activities in favor of the conservation of the area. The organization will be financed through the Competitive Funding Mechanism to implement a project for the production of an endemic fish, the old blue. As a counterpart the Technical University of Machala is requesting $ 100,000 to the El Oro Province Government to support tourism activities in the area. | The ordinance for the Protection of the Wetland La Tembladera defines the financing and investment for the implementation of conservation projects in the area, through the budget certification for USD 35.000. For the implementation of the conservation project, for the production and marketing of the endemic fish (the old blue), an initiative that is part of the Competitive Funding Mechanism, the Provincial Government of El Oro contributed with a grant of USD 62.316. This grant includes equipment and payment of technical personnel, the ASOGROTEM contributed with USD 18.160 in manpower, infrastructure and granting of one hectare of land for 20 years where a station of breeding for the species has been constructed. In addition, ASOGROTEM as its own initiative has capitalized an investment fund for community based conservation and sustainable development projects, for surrounding communities to the Wetland. Up to now, the fund sums up an approximated amount of USD 5.800 which corresponds to the monthly contributions of its 51 partners by self-management activities. |
|  |  |  | Baseline to be determined by mid-term evaluation when the SNAP has defined the methodology it will adopt for measuring management effectiveness (this will include METT like parameters and will be defined as part of Outcome 2) | By end of project: - All PA in the SNAP will have improved management effectiveness by15% - The increased in pilot areas will be higher (see indicator 6) 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicators target level, based on information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. By the end of project: - Average METT for the SNAP will be &gt;5% | Along with the National Biodiversity Direction, in April 2013 the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) was validated and officialyzed to be used at a country level. The results of this adapted METT determined an average management efectiveness of 46,6% for the SNAP. These results will be used in the \"Biodiversity Information System\" of the National Direction of Biodiversity baseline for management effectiveness. | The midterm evaluation recommends evaluating the project Â´s results with the Tracking Tools by the end of the project to better assess the impact of the project Â´s activities. The 2013 results of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) for the SNAP is the baseline for the online System of Biodiversity Information (SBI). The SBI monitoring module is ready to gather information and generate METT and Financial Scorecard reports periodically. | The Ministry of Environment with the support of the project, through the Ministerial Agreement No.12 standardized the implementation of the Management Effectiveness of Evaluation (MEE) for the Natural Heritage Areas of the state (PANE), which is based on the original methodology METT. The gathering of this information has been done online through the MEE, module that is located in the Biodiversity Information System (SIB), which was transferred to the Unique System of Environmental information (SUIA). SUIA is the governmental platform that manages environmental statistics information. The Management Effectiveness of Evaluation (MEE) for the Natural Heritage Areas of the state (PANE), allows the evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the PA management. The evaluation analysis can be made through different areas as required by the original methodology. The analysis can be made in different units defined by the Environmental Management Authority such as: the Administration and Planning, Control and Surveillance, Communication, Environmental Education and Participation, Public Use and Tourism, Biodiversity Management). This exercise was made in 2013 and 2014 and the results were 48.00% and 50.95% respectively. The scores obtained in the six areas are: Context 62.17%, Strategic Planning 49.65%, Inputs 49.72%, Processes 49.65%, Outputs 47.28% and Results 73.40%. Thus, the overall result of the National Protected Areas System (SNAP) increase of 2.95% contrasted with the 2013. |
|  |  |  | PANE pilots (avg.) 2009 - 38% E.R. Cayambe Coca- 50% E.R. Illinizas - 33% E.R. Mache Chindul - 38% M.R Galera San Francisco - 20% W.P.R. Chimborazo - 40% W.P.R. Cuyabeno - 48% Yasuni - TBD APPRI (avg.) Baseline 2009 - 36% ManabÃÂ­ D.F. - 23% Northwestern C.F. 49% APC (avg.) Baseline 2009 - 28% Abras de Mantequilla Ã¢ 28% | PANE (avg.) pilots target 2015 - 82% E.R. Cayambe Coca - 84% E.R. Illinizas - 79% E.R. Mache Chindul - 83% M.R Galera San Francisco - 83% W.P.R. Chimborazo - 77% W.P.R. Cuyabeno - 83% Yasuni - TBD APPRI (avg.) Target 2015 - 82% ManabÃÂ­ D.F. - 81% Northwestern C.F. - 83% APC (avg.) Target 2015 - 80% Abras de Mantequilla Ã¢ 80% 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicators target level, based on administrative-financial information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. PANE (avg.) pilots target 2016 - 55% E.R. Cayambe Coca - 55% E.R. Illinizas - 50% E.R. Mache Chindul - 53% M.R Galera San Francisco - 42% W.P.R. Chimborazo - 65% W.P.R. Cuyabeno - 65% Yasuni - 53% APPRI (avg.) Target 2016 - 50% Northwestern C.F. - 50% APC (avg.) Target 2016 - 30% The Tembladera Wetland Ã¢ 30% | The results of the adapted METT ran in 2013 were as follows for the pilot areas: Cayambe-Coca: 45,9%; Ilinizas: 33,3%; Mache Chindul: 46,8%; Galera San Fco: 30,9%; Chimborazo: 58,7%; Cuyabeno: 56,35%; YasunÃÂ­ 42,1%; Northwestern node: 57,7%; La Tembladera 23,2% It should be noted that for the methodology was adapted to the reality of the SNAP, values are not totally comparable. To compare the real evolution of this tool, the original METT is being collected. | PANE average 48.36% N. P. Cayambe Coca 46.03% E. R. Ilinizas 41.27% E. R. Mache Chindul 52.83% M. R. Galera-San Francisco 20.63% W.F.R. Chimborazo 58.73% W.F.R. Cuyabeno 69.84% N. P. YasunÃÂ­ 49.21% Northwest Node CNBRPE 57.74% (97/168) as adapted The Wetland Tembladera 16 points In September of 2013 the METT SNAP produced an increase of 5.47% compared to the baseline. In Cayambe-Coca National Park we saw a 10.83% decrease. We found assessment errors for the baseline, mainly in the field of context. It is evident that Cayambe-CocaÃ¢s management has improved, given its large extension now has two administrative centers and therefore for future comparisons is important to take into account recent data. The Northwest Node yields a 57.74% for an adapted METT. When an equivalence of the indicators with original METT is tested, most questions are not applicable to private reserves. This is because the management of private areas is not comparable to the state protected area management. We are completing the assessment of private and community areas with the original METT. | PA pilots PANE average 61.11% N.P. Cayambe Coca 53.7% E.R. Ilinizas 88.10% E.R. Mache Chindul 50.79% M.R. Galera-San Francisco 53.17% W.F.R. Chimborazo 57.14% W.F.R. Cuyabeno 68.25% N.P. YasuniÂ­ 57.14% Northwestern C.F. CNBRPE 50.79% La Tembladera Wetland 50.00% The information generated by the MEE in 2014 for the pilots areas of the PANE shows that there was an increase of 23.11% and 6.11% in the average PA pilots, compared to the baseline and the expected goal at the end of the project in 2016, respectively. This result demonstrates the satisfactory achievement of the objectives for conservation and proper management of resources. In the northwestern of Pichincha an increase of 1.79% was registered, compared to the baseline, and an increase of 0.79% compared to the target expected by the end of the project in 2016. This shows that the activities were carried out successfully. As for the Wetland La Tembladera, the overall average is 50%, therefore there is 22% more in relation to the baseline and 20% compared to the the expected goal at the end of the project in 2016. This also means that the resources were handled satisfactorily. The METT was not applying last year to the community and private reserves because the financial mechanisms, national policies and concrete incentives were not yet defined. |
|  |  |  | At present the selection matrix for incorporation of new PAs into SNAP does not include cost-effectiveness or results based criteria not address other important factors such as connectivity. There are no private or communal PAs officially incorporated into the SNAP | All new PA (private; public and communal) included into the SNAP will provide additional conservation to key ecosystems by (a) closing existing gaps or (b) increasing connectivity across landscape and (c) have identified strategies to ensure the full covering of basic scenarios needs 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicator`s target level, based on administrative-financial information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. - Establish the legal framework for the incorporation of private, community and guvernmental subsystems to the SNAP and set clear guidelines for each to be incorporated. - Financial analysis tool to review the incorporation of new areas to the SNAP | In Ecuador the inclusion of private and community areas to SNAP has not yet been formalized. The Ministry of the Environment (MAE) is formalizing the legal and technical basis for this inclusion. It is important to note that there are new areas that have been incorporated into the SNAP such as the Marine Reserve El Pelado (13101.35 ha) in August 2012 or the Ecological Conservation Municipal Area Siete Iglesias (16224.14 ha) in May 2012. In La Tembladera the establishment of a commonwealth (of 5 communities) for the wetland management was consolidated. The CNBRPE approved four applications for the inclusion of new reserves and 2 honorary members were included since July 2012. Additionally, private reserves of the CNBRPE have been incorporated into municipal areas. For example: Mashpi (including the private reserves: Guaycucaycu, PambiliÃÂ±o, Mashpishungo, Mangaloma) and Pachijal in 2012 and Yunguilla in 2013. | The Ministerial Agreement No. 56, which provides guidelines for incorporating the private and community areas to the SNAP, was approved on June 4 of 2014. These legal documento will be complemented with the reform of the Ministerial Agreement No. 029 which establishes the legal framework for the subsystems inclusion to the SNAP. These two legal instruments make viable the constitutional mandate of the expanded SNAP. The CNBRPE has 47 formal partners legally registered, 13 of these were incorporated since July 2013. Around 20 new partners are in the process of regularization. Three neighboring communities of the Tembladera are interested in joining conservation efforts in the area. | In 2014 the Colonso-Chalupas Reserve was incorporated to the SNAP with a land area of 93.246 hectares. In addition, the Marine Reserve Cantagallo was also incorporated in January 2015, with a marine area of 142.266 hectares. Nowadays, the SNAP has 51 conservation units and it covers four geographic regions, representing approximately 20% of the total land of the country, with more than 19 million hectares. The official tool for mapping, characterizing and conceptualizing ecosystems at national level is the "Map of Continental ecosystems of Ecuador" (http://mapainteractivo.ambiente.gob.ec/). In addition, the MAE has generated a Coverage Map of the Land Use of continental Ecuador. This latter map was made to identify the most important conservation land of the country, becoming a crucial tool to determinate the gap between ecosystem and conservation areas Regarding the CNBRPE, in 2014 seven private reserves were added to the organization (total 56) and 2 partners are in the process of regularization. In 2014 three communities and one parish were added to the Board members of the Wetland La Tembladera (San Agustin, Las Crucitas, Jumon Bellevista and the Parish of San Antonio). Nowadays, ASOGROTEM has 11 more members compared to 2013 (total 51). The legal framework for the incorporation of private, community areas are still being discussed by the National Authority. |
| Outcome 1 | Laws, standards and institutional guidelines for improving the financial sustainability of the PANE, private and communal sub-systems of the SNAP, are formally put in place with the technical support of the project. |  | - Legal, policy and regulatory support for revenue generation by Pas - 33% - Leggal, policy and regulatory support for revenue sharing within the PA system Ã¢ 11% - Legal and regulatory conditions for establishing endowment or trust funds- 78% - Legal, policy and regulatory support for alternative institutional arrangements for PA management - 42% - National PA financing strategies - 54% - Economic valuation of PA systems -50% - Improved government budgeting for PA systems - 50% - Clearly defined institutional responsibilities for PA management and financing - 33% - Well-defined staffing requirements, profiles and incentives at site and system level - 44% - Total for Component 1 Ã¢ 45% | - Legal, policy and regulatory support for revenue generation at PA 83% - Legal, policy and regulatory support for revenue sharing within system 78% - Legal and regulatory conditions for establishing trust funds 78%- Legal, policy and regulatory support for alternative institutional arrangements for management 83% - National PA financing strategies 100%- Economic valuation of systems 83% - Improved government budgeting for systems 100% - Clearly defined institutional responsibilities 67% - Well-defined staffing requirements, profiles and incentives at site and system level 68% - Total 85% 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicators target level, based on administrative-financial information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. - Legal, policy and regulatory support for revenue generation at PA 50% - Legal, policy and regulatory support for revenue sharing within system 44% - Legal and regulatory conditions for establishing trust funds 56% - Legal, policy and regulatory support for alternative institutional arrangements for management 67% - National PA financing strategies 67% - Economic valuation of systems 67% - Improved government budgeting for systems 75% - Clearly defined institutional responsibilities 67% - Well-defined staffing requirements, profiles and incentives at site and system level 52% Total 61% | \\\\\\\"The UNDP Financial Scorecard was ran only in the pilot areas of the project but results can be extrapolated to the SNAP since the situation in terms of institutionality is the same for the whole system: - Legal, policy and regulatory support for revenue generation by Pas - 33% - Legal, policy and regulatory support for revenue sharing Within the PA system - 11% - Legal and regulatory conditions for Establishing endowment or trust funds-78% - Legal, policy and regulatory support for alternative institutional arrangements for PA management - 42% - National PA financing strategies - 54% - Economic valuation of PA systems - 50% - Improved government budgeting for PA systems - 63% - Clearly defined institutional responsabilidades for PA management and financing - 33% - Well-defined staffing Requirements, profiles and incentives at site and system level - 44% - Total for Component 1 - 46% For the community and private areas, answering all the questions given that these areas are not yet integrated into the SNAP, does not provide significant results. However, it should be mentioned that for La Tembladera, where initially on legal and institutional matters there was nothing, there is now an ordinance for the protection of the wetland and a Management Committee has been put in place. Also, an economic valuation of environmental services and an opportunity cost of the use of the ground studies were conducted. All these elements support the strengthening of the governance of the wetland. Also, at he level of the CNBRPE a plan to strengthen the institutionality of the organization is in process and it will support the generation of productive initiatives for private reservists. Besides, thanks to the CNBRPE management, Ecuador became part of the Iberoamerican Model Forest Network. \\\\\\\" | - Legal support, policy and regulatory framework for revenue generation by the AP-33.33% - Legal support, policy and regulatory framework for revenue sharing within the PA system 11.11% - Legal and regulatory conditions for establishing endowment or trust funds 66.7% - Legal support, policy and regulatory framework for alternative institutional arrangements for PA management 58.33% - National strategies for PA financing 50%, - Economic valuation of PA systems 16.7% - Allocation of improved government budget for PA systems 100% - Clearly defined institutional responsibilities for the management and financing of AP 66.7%, - Staffing requirements, profiles and incentives at site and system level, well-defined 37.5% Total component 1-47% The work on the legal framework has focused in positioning biodiversity as a part of the new production model of the country. An economic framework was agreed and established as part of the SNAP Financial Sustainability Strategy (ESF). One of the scenarios of the ESF proposes the creation of a Public Enterprise SNAP, with a better-oriented and independent financial management and revenue reinvestment in the system. The study for an updated economic valuation of SNAP started in February 2014 using the Target Scenario Analysis methodology that will provide results based on economic indicators. The project will focus on the economic contribution of SNAP for hydropower and tourism, both part of the alternative production model of the country, that seeks to reduce the current economic dependence on oil production. The MAE is reforming its internal structure; the new proposed structure includes a landscape unit for PA management and a financial sustainability unit that will support all units. The Santa Rosa GAD agreed to allocate $ 20,000 for the Tembladera Wetland conservation. The UNDP Financial Scorecard is not suitable for evaluating private and community areas, therefore it hasnÃ¢??t been used to assess the CNBRPE and the Tembladera Wetland, but there is progress on the legal framework for the inclusion of these subsystems to SNAP. | - Legal support, policy and regulatory framework for revenue generation by the AP 50% - Legal support, policy and regulatory framework for revenue sharing within the PA system 22% - Legal and regulatory conditions for establishing endowment or trust funds 56% - Legal support, policy and regulatory framework for alternative institutional arrangements for PA management 67% - National strategies for PA financing 65% - Economic valuation of PA systems 50% - Allocation of improved government budget for PA systems 67% - Clearly defined institutional responsibilities for the management and financing of AP 67% - Staffing requirements, profiles and incentives at site and system level, well-defined 29% Total component 1 - 50% Legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks through the publication of the Financial Sustainability Strategy for the SNAP was continued and strengthened, while at the country-level the National Biodiversity Strategy was completed. The PGOA (Annual Operational Management Plan) methodology was validated by the national authority. This latter methodology permits a better articulation of planned activities with the related financial resources of each PA. Additionally, this methodology will be complemented with the Financial Sustainability Plans, whose methodology was developed and approved at the level of SNAP. The budgetary report of the PA was individualized within the E-sigef (On line finance management system) report, through a budget reform. A reform of the Ministerial agreement NÂ° 158 was developed. This reform regulates concessions and collaboration agreements for the management of public infrastructure with the aim to obtain economic returns and cost reduction in operation and maintenance for its services (i.e. high mountain refuges ). Regarding trust funds options, options are analyzed through UNDP, with the aim to accelerate the flow of resources that let cover the operating expenses for the PA. The Analysis of the SNAP economic assessment was completed in the sectors of tourism and hydropower, in accordance with the new production and energy matrix of Ecuador. |
|  |  |  | Currently the SNAP, has been defined as the union of Public PA (PANE), Private PA (APPRI), Communal PA (APC) and Sectional Government PA (APGS). Its creation and composition has been mentioned on the 2008 Constitution and National Policies documents as the SNAP Strategic Plan. Nowadays, despite been defined and mentioned, there isnÃ¢t a law or regulation that make possible the incorporation of APPRI, APC and APGS to the System. | A General Law of SNAP approved to the National Congress by end of 2010; and operational by end of project including regulations and financial strategies for overall system and for private and community sub-systems. The law incorporates clear criteria to include APPRI, APC and APGS to the SNAP, with the objective of reducing the ecological gap. By the end of the project, at least 1 area of each sub-system will be part of the SNAP. 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicators target level, based on administrative-financial information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. - Aprove Ministerial Agreement that regulates the inclusion of subsystems to the SNAP - Aproved guidelines for the inclusion of private and community areas to the SNAP | Regarding the current legislation for PANE areas, an study on the legal gaps in the TULAS was hold and proposed changes in the legislation to fulfill those gaps. At the moment, thanks to the hiring of a legal advisor, positive discussions are being held with the legal team of the MAE to approve the proposed changes and review the entire text of the TULAS. There is a high possibility that these changes will be approved by the environmental authority. Regarding legislation for the inclusion of pirvate and community areas, the MAE is working on the technical basis through the creation of a vegetation map and a study on conservation gaps and very recently, the arrival of new authorities has brought the subject to light. The supporting programs of the MAE are working on the definition of guidelines for the inclusion of private and community areas based on the exercise developed for autonomous governments. It should be noted that in the project there is no power to influence the approval of laws at the National Assembly level but work will continue to be done to create regulations for the sub-systems. | The guidelines for the inclusion of private and community areas to the SNAP, which were agreed at the local level, were adopted and established through the Ministerial Agreement No 56. These inputs along with the guidelines for Autonomous Decentralized Governments (GAD), feedbacks the Policy Proposal to include the subsystems to SNAP. | The Project defined a minimum package of institutional rules and guidelines according to the recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation. It was done with the aim to strengthening the planning, management, monitoring and evaluation of the National System of Protected Areas to contribute to the process of institutionalization of the system. Several Ministerial Agreements (MA) were issued in order to standardize strategic tools such as: MA No. 012 call Management Effectiveness Evaluation and the MA No. 076 Annual Operational Management Plan (PGOA) and guidelines for the formulation of plans for financial sustainability. Moreover, the project is now working on the Frame Agreement that recognizes formally the SNAP and its management tools. Also, the project has been working on the amendments to the content of the Book III (Forestry regime), IV (Biodiversity) and IX (Fees and Tariffs) of the United Text of Secondary Environmental Legislation (TULAS), with the aim to change the legal rules for the declaration of the PA and its incorporation to the corresponding subsystems of SNAP (GAD, private or community). Additionally, the project has been working in the proposal of the reform of infrastructure concessions of goods or touristic services on the Heritage Natural Areas of the State. In addition, the project has collaborated with the development of the Executive Decree which approves the "2015-2030 National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2020". |
|  |  |  | Management of SNAP is currently under the authority of the Under-Secretariat of Natural Heritage, and delegated to its directorate in charge of DNBD. The MAE also has regional directorates on each province of Ecuador. Based on the location of the PA, they depend on each regional directorate. Approximately less than 10%have specific skills for financial management and financial sustainability of the SNAP. | Targets will be determined by year 2 once the once the Law is declared; the institutional reforms completed in the MAE and full results framework has been defined under Outcome 2. At end of project staff positions include at least one post for financial managers at Central and regional levels and 50% of all staff tables and procedures are tailored to new financial frameworks 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicators target level, based on administrative-financial information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. - Available information throught the Biodiversity Information System for planning, management and budget allocation of PA - 100 Park Rangers trained in administrative-financial issues by the training program Green Classroom | The MAE developed an assessment of the training needs based on the roles and functions of the SNAP personnel. The result of this exercise was the establishment of a training program called Aula Verde (Green Classroom) for APs managers and park rangers that started in 2012 and will end in 2018. The Project negotiated the inclusion of administrative and financial modules in this program and also created an additional training program for administrative and accounting profiles for the FAP (Protected Areas Fund). | The Green Classroom training program for SNAP staff includes an administrative- financial management module. A first generation of 23 graduated in May, and 50 additional will graduate until the end of the year. Through the Center of Popular Education the profile of the National Area Fund (FAN) administrator- accountant for PA was defined, a dictionary of administrative and financial terms and a training module was developed. In the development of this consultancy profile gaps were identified in relation to the organizational structure in PA, the National Biodiversity Direction (DNB) is defining the best structure for all PA to have the support of an administrator-accountant and clearly define its competence. | The Department of Human Resources from the MAE was supported by the project through a workshop for reviewing the use of the Positions Classification Manual of. This workshop was made with the 23 Heads of the Financial Administrative Units of the Provincial Offices, which detailed the skills required for each occupational profile of staff to work in the PA. In addition, the payroll for 2015 was reviewed and validated. In 2014 through the Green Classroom Program, an additional group of 75 rangers were trained, representing a total of 148 to date. Therefore 48% more rangers were trained than the expected goal at the end of the project to 2016. In addition, 50 heads of areas were trained in management, planning (PGOA), financing and executive coaching. Due to the impact generated by the coaching course, this was replicated and adapted to the needs of 30 decision makers officials from MAE. |
|  |  |  | Currently none of the private reserve network have access to funding from the Socio Bosque Programme | 14 of the private reserve network have access to funding from the Socio Bosque Programme At least one other funding mechanism for RBPE is designed | The situation of the CNBRPE was regularized: its statutes were approved by the MAE as well as its current directory. Its information was also updated in the SRI (Internal Revenue Service) and at the moment, the organization is being inscribed on the RUOSC (Registry of Civil Society Organizations), which is an essential requirement to receive public funds. There are 10 private reserves that are already part of the Socio Bosque program and 10 more are in the process of integration. In La Tembladera, the Management Committee for the protection of the wetland was reactivated, has a coordinator and is comprised by the following institutions: Provincial Council (Secretary of Environmental Management), SENAGUA (DemarcaciÃÂ³n hidrogrÃÂ¡fica Jubones), Risk Management Secretariat, MAE, Technical University of Machala, Municipality of Sta Rosa, Junta Parroquial of Bellavista, representatives of the owners of the land and community representatives. The statutes for an organization of popular and solidary economy to generate revenue for conservation in the communities surrounding the wetland will be development starting August. | A compilation of all existing environmental incentives was published in November 2013, as a user-friendly guide. The book was accompanied with training on fiscal incentives for the CNBRPE members. In January, private and community reservists participated of a fundraising workshop. Furthermore the Directive Board of the CNBRPE is currently working on identifying strategic partners and establishing agreements to develop specific topics with the organization. A workshop with the CNBRPE Directive Board was implemented to identify projects and develop profiles. These tools along with the administrative and financial capacity of the organization are transforming the CNBRPE in an institution entitled to access funds. Even though, the number of CNBRPE reserves benefiting from Socio Bosque hasnÃ¢t increased from last year, the CNBRPE has met with the National Incentive Program for the incorporation of new areas to the recently added programs of ecological restoration, forest management and bio commerce. The TembladeraÃ¢s Artisans Farmers Association (ASOGROTEM) and the Board were established as organizations that support the Tembladera Wetland conservation and governance. | During 2014, 17 members of the CNBRPE were benefited of the Socio Bosque Program. In total 4.598,50 private hectares are under this conservation scheme. The CNBRPE has several management tools that improve its administrative and financial management. In the process of strengthening they were funded by the Schimtz Foundation to do Minga workshops of mushrooms production and the use of bamboo for construction. In addition, 6 inter institutional agreements were signed to mobilize volunteers to the private reserves. Moreover, the CNBRPE identified as a priority the construction of the Interpretation Centre, Tour Operator and Marketing (CICOP) as financial sustainability strategy of private reserves in the Northwest of Pichincha. The Center will provide a space to market agricultural products and tourism services from the private reserves and also it will be used to boost the economy of the entire region. This initiative had generated inter institutional agreements with the Parrish of Nanegalito, the Metropolitan District of Quito, CONQUITO and the Ministry of Tourism (MINTUR). |
| Outcome 2 | Strengthened capacities for results-based financial planning, management and monitoring, are set for improving sustainable net income accounting of SNAP. |  | - Site-level business planning - 44% - Operational, transparent and useful accounting and auditing systems - 44% - Systems for monitoring and reporting on financial management performance - 25% - Methods for allocating funds across individual PA sites - 0% - Training and support networks to enable park managers to operate more cost-effectively - 28% - Total for Component 2 % - 34% | - Site-level business planning - 78% - Operational, transparent and useful accounting and auditing systems - 100% - Systems for monitoring and reporting on financial management performance - 92% - Methods for allocating funds across individual PA sites - 100% - Training and support networks to enable park managers to operate more cost-effectively - 78% - Total for Component 2 % - 85% 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicators target level, based on administrative-financial information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. - Site-level business planning - 56% - Operational, transparent and useful accounting and auditing systems - 67% - Systems for monitoring and reporting on financial management performance - 67% - Methods for allocating funds across individual PA sites - 50% - Training and support networks to enable park managers to operate more cost-effectively - 61% - Total for Component 2 - 61% | The results collected in 2012 for the UNDP Financial Scorecard at a system level were the following: - Site-level business planning -44% - Operational, transparent and useful accounting and auditing systems - 44 % - Systems for monitoring and reporting on financial management performance - 25% - Methods for allocating funds across individual PA sites - 0% - Training and support networks to enable park managers to operate more cost-effectively - 28% - Total for Component 2 - 34 % The no charge for entrance fees to PAs has involved a change in the management model that requires the updade of management and business plans. This is directly reflected in element 4 of the scoreacrd. The project has updated 3 management plans of our pilot areas so far. | - Business Planning at site 38.89% - Systems and operational accountability, transparency and audit votes 33.33% - Systems for monitoring and reporting on financial management performance of 33.33% -Methods for allocating funds across individual PA sites 0% -Training and support networks to enable park managers to operate more profitably 83.33% Total Component 2 - 32% The financial mechanisms proposed in the Sustainable Financing Estrategy that support business planning are grouped into four areas: use of environmental services, tourism, biodiversity management and marketing. The uses of environmental services include water services, bioprospecting, royalties, offset and certificates. Regarding tourism, entrance fees, tourism fees, tourism taxes and conventions of use arises. As biodiversity management, agreements and productive community projects are identified. And finally as cause marketing: volunteering, donations, brand marketing and Punto Verde sponsorships Green. The administrative-financial module of the Biodiversity Information System (BIS) will monitor management, financial and human resources of the AP. Additionally a submodule for annual planning is included. This module will be operational by the end of 2014 and will provide information for decision making based on the implementation level and management effectiveness. It is important for the MAE to allocate resources for the BIS. | - Business Planning at site 28% - Systems and operational accountability, transparency and audit votes 33% - Systems for monitoring and reporting on financial management performance 33% - Methods for allocating funds across individual PA sites 25% - Training and support networks to enable park managers to operate more profitably 67% Total Component 2 - 41% The update and standardization of the management plans in coordination with the PGOA and the financial sustainability plan; effectively contributed to the financial planning at the site level. Therefore, the Project provided technical advice to the National Biodiversity Direction in terms of the protected areas management following the intuitional planning of MAE of 2016. In order to institutionalize this technical advice a tutorial video was developed. This tutorial shows how to include the PGOA methodology into the institutional annual operation plan of MAE (https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AWCa6ESVPWk&feature=youtu.be). Evaluation Management Effectiveness of 2014 was applied, that allowed the decision makers guide their actions for management and spending amount made in each protected areas. The transfer from SIB to SUIA (Unique System of Environmental Information) did not allow further progress in the development of the financial administrative module. Instead, the efforts were channeled into the implementation of budget reform of the Public Financial Management System (E-Sigef) to enable a better management and visibility of the implementation of the fiscal budget at the site level of the SNAP. Through the Green Classroom Program the financial administrative strengthening continued, as well as other topics such as the executive coaching, the use of the PGOA. The Green Classroom Program was also directed to different actors such as: rangers, area managers and officials of the Undersecretary of Natural Heritage. Moreover, the responsible of PA within the National Biodiversity Direction (DNB) will participate in the Protected Areas Management course (Colorado - USA) that will allow a better management and cost-effective PA management. |
|  |  |  | RBPE / NWFR (Cloud Forest) Element 1- 6% Element 2- 42% Element 3- 25% Element 4- 50% Element 5- 47% Total Ã¢ 30% Manabi (Dry Forest) Element 1- 33% Element 2 - 0% Element 3 - 0% Element 4 Ã¢ 0% Element 5 - 0% Total Ã¢ 10% Communal Abras de Mantequilla Element 1- 39% Element 2 - 58% Element 3 - 92% Element 4 - 50% Element 5- 47% Total Ã¢ 56% | RBPE / NWFR (Cloud Forest) Element 1- 71% Element 2- 65% Element 3- 65% Element 4- 90% Element 5- 87% Manabi (Dry Forest) Element 1- 70% Element 2 - 50% Element 3 - 50% Element 4 Ã¢ 50% Element 5 Ã¢ 54% Total Ã¢ 10% Communa Abras de Mantequilla Element 1- 78% Element 2 - 92% Element 3 - 95% Element 4 Ã¢ 95% Element 5- 95% Total Ã¢ 92% 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicators target level, based on administrative-financial information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. The UNDP Financial Scorecard is not applicable to private and community areas until these are incorporated to the SNAP. The goal es evaluated base on administrative-financial strengthening of the institutions that manage these areas. The only private pilto area in Northwester Node of the CNBPRE and the new community area is the Tembladera Wetland. CNBRPE / NWFR (Cloud Forest) Element 1- 61% Element 2- 59% Element 3- 56% Element 4- NA Element 5- 67% Total - 59% APC / Tembladera Wetland Element 1- 44% Element 2- 44% Element 3- 33% Element 4- NA Element 5- 42% Total - 43% | As commnity and private areas are not part of the SNAP yet, answering all the questions for these areas, there are no significant results. Due to the withdrawal of the Cordillera del Balsamo in Manabi (ratified by the Steering Committee in November 2012) and the Community area change of Abras de Mantequilla to La Tembladera wetland, the indicator will now evaluate the levels in the Northwestern node and in La Tembladera. With regards to capacity building for business planning and cost effective management of the SNAP, in private and community areas information was collected regarding the opportunity cost of land use and productive alternatives were identified in the two areas. Both in the node and in La Tembladera, business plans were made in a participatory manner. For the Northwestern node, data from participatory management plans for each of the reserves was collected and the owners of the reserves were trained in financial management of productive activities in their property. There are also management plans for both areas. The capacities that were created improve revenues for the owners and reduce pressure on the ecosystems. | Most of the UNDP Financial Scorecard questions do not apply to the CNBRPE and the Tembladera wetland. There has been a significant administrative and financial strengthening of the CNBRPE, they are updated with the organizations tax and administrative duties. The organization has hired accounting staff and has a manual of accounting processes and management. The Board of the Tembladera wetland meets regularly supported and promoted the creation of ASOGROTEM and keeps regular auditing mechanisms. | - Business Planning at site 44.44% - Systems and operational accountability, transparency and audit votes 44.44% - Systems for monitoring and reporting on financial management performance 33.33% - Methods for allocating funds across individual PA sites - Training and support networks to enable park managers to operate more profitably 26.66 % Total Component to 37.22% The rating was made considering the access to incentives and state policies implementation that favor private conservation. The administrative-financial capacity of the CNBRPE improved significantly due to the use and implementation of the administrative accounting system. The strengthening of key areas for accountability and transparency within the Board and in the General Assembly of the organization were improved. Based on the recommendations provided by the micro evaluations made by the project, several instruments were developed in order to improve the administrative and financial management, among them is the development of an Administrative Manual of internal control that includes procedures for purchasing goods and recruitment. Additionally, the CICOP management model was also developed, among other documents. The results concerning to the wetland La Tembladera are the following: - Business Planning at site 83.34% - Systems and operational accountability, transparency and audit votes 66.67% - Systems for monitoring and reporting on financial management performance 50.00% - Methods for allocating funds across individual PA sites 50,50% - Training and support networks to enable park managers to operate more profitably 33.33% Total Component to 56.67% These results are thanks to the wetland management plan that was used by the GAD of Santa Rosa and the Board members of ASOGROTEM as a tool that allowed them to development 5 additional plans for other business. These plans have allowed the implementation of 2 projects, one of the conservation of an endemic fish, the old blue, and the other, of a touristic project. On the other hand, the ASOGROTEM made its annual operational planning (POA), which allow them to have an ordered and strategic execution of its resources. Considering this latter, ASOGROTEM currently has adequate staff for this purpose and has an accounting system. |
|  |  |  | PANE Management Plan - 0% Business Plan - 0% RBPE Management Plan - 0% Business Plan Ã¢ 0% | PANE Management Plan - 20% Business Plan - 20% RBPE Management Plan - 25% Business Plan Ã¢ 25% After the 2014 midter review we have set a new goal for PANE Business Plan - 14% | PANE: Management Plan - 43% of our pilot areas (3 of 7) have updated management plans It is woth to note that both in Ilinizas and in Mache Chindul it was necessary to review the management models before developing management plans. Business Plan - The Charapa business plan for Cuyabeno and Yasuni was completed and the Financial Sustainability Strategy of the SNAP is under construction and will give the foundations for the development of business plans in each area. Work has also been done on the creation of guidelines for the development of business and management plans to be published by the MAE. CNBRPE: Management Plan - There are 16 management plans for the 16 reserves involved in the project in the Northwestern Node, ie 100% of the pilot reserves have updated management plans. Business Plan - There are 15 business plans for the reserves in the Northwestern node, ie 93% of the reserves have updated business plans. In the Northwest Node, 18 out of the 21 reservists have management plans and business plans up to date, ie 87%. | MAE implemented for 2014 Annual Operational Management Planning (PGOA) for 20 PA, all the projectÃ¢s pilot areas were included, this methodology includes budget planning. Next yearÃ¢s planning is expected for all AP using the same methodology but through the BIS. The DNB is developing guidelines to standardize AP management plans, when this are approve all pilot areas management plans will be updated. At the same time the project is developing guidelines for business plans for PA. The development of the managerial model for the Interpretation and Marketing Centre of Northwest will promote the individual reserves management plans implementation and has to be coordinated with the reserves business plans. Regarding the Tembladera, the Secretary of Marine and Coastal Resources agreed to update the management plan. The financial strategy is being implemented through various productive initiatives, one is financed through the competitive funding mechanism and the other initiatives are seeking local financing through neighboring institutions. | 70% of PA of PANE has management plans. 100% of the pilots PA of the project has management planes CNBRPE: 16 Node reserves of Northwestern Pichincha have management plans / business plans TEMBLADERA: 1 Management Plan and 5 Business Plans Guidelines for the development of the SNAP management plans were developed with the DNB, which includes a specific chapter of financial sustainability. This chapter summarizes the most important aspects of the Financial Sustainability Plan. It is important to mention that the methodology for developing the sustainability plan has been approved and it is expected its formalization via Ministerial Agreement. The review of the financial sustainability plans of the 7 pilot areas finalized. It was carried out through a joint work with PA managers and the heads of the Administrative-Financial Units of the Provincial Directions. This information will be used to plan activities and budget for 2016, constituting a major advance in the budget information management and the coordination for its planning and management. In November 2015, 7 sustainability financial plans will be finished for the pilot areas. The Management Plan of the Wetland La Tembladera is being updated with the support of the Secretary of Marine and Coastal Resources. |
|  |  |  | Baseline value TBD by Year 1 of project. Based on a pre-design of the RBM and M&amp;E system once METT information has been collected. The project will then define the standards and required competencies and skills needed for this system at MAE, PANE, Private and Community levels. | By end of project; - 50% (41) Site Level, (At least one person from each PANE area) - 50% (5) MAE (At least 50% of the DNBD personnel that is in charge of PAs) - 50% (23) MAE provincial directorates (At least 1 person of the MAE Provincial Directorate) - 100% (22) RBPE (The project will train the coordinators, and they will train at least one person from each reserve) - 100% (3) The Tembladera (At least 3 people involve in the Project Coordination of the Area will be trained) | The SNAP staff increased to 512 people including Area Managers, Technical staff and Park rangers. Furthermore, there are 30 PAs with administrative / financial support from the FAP (Protected Areas Fund), this is 10 more than last year. Thanks to the program \"\"Aula Verde\"\" (Green Classroom), a training process in administrative and financial matters will begin in july 2013. The program is comprised of two subprograms: a) for parkrangers , and b) for PA managers and wildlife responsibles. The first has a target population of 475 participants, and the second includes 50 administrators and 23 provincial officiers in charge of wildlife. At the moment there are two groups of 25 rangers who are being trained. Additionally, there have been capacity building processes to the MAE staff (central plant and field personnel) hold under the update of the financing needs of the SNAP. More than 120 people were trained in the generation, interpretation and analysis of data in management effectiveness issues, financial analysis and financial gap calculation. Also, with the collection of strategic information for the financial sustainability of the Northwestern node and La Tembladera, workshops with 25 and 30 people respectively (ie 100% of the node reservists) for creating business plans were hold. For the CNBRPE, a capabilities assessment was ran which concluded that there is a weakness in administrative issues so that a person in charged of making a situational analysis of the financial and organizational aspects of the organization will be hired. Work will also be done to make an administrative strengthening plan with a procedures manual to train people in the directory of the organization in these matters. | 73 PA technicians are being trained in administrative and financial topics through Aula Verde. The project with GIZ is proposing a training program for financial champions. 30 CNBRPE members attended a fundraising workshop and financial administrative training should be included as part of the managerial model of the Northwest Interpretation Center. 100% (40 members) of ASOGROTEM have been trained by the Technical University of Machala in administrative and financial aspects of project management. | Through National Workshops, 23 Heads (100%) of Finance Administrative Units of the Provincial Directorates of the MAE were trained to implement the budget reform of 2015. The Financial Board and 23 provincial directors of MAE were trained in the new SNAP management model. In addition, 30 officials of the Undersecretariat of Natural Heritage, National Biodiversity Direction (DNB) and Forestry Direction of MAE, were trained in executive coaching. This course was made in order to improve performance and manageability through improved decision-making skills and lead teams with guidance to get better results. Additionally, 50 responsible for PA, 2 CNBRPE members and 4 representatives of the ASOGROTEM received management training modules and Coaches Leaders for Strategic Communication in the Green Program Classroom. 2 members of the Board of the CNBRPW were trained in tax accounting and tax base and 26 partners of ASOGROTEM participated in courses of business plans, basic finance for non-financial people, marketing introduction and production initiatives. These courses were organized by the Department of Production from the Municipal GAD of Santa Rosa. |
|  |  |  | MAE, RBPE, FUNDAR, do not have an integrated Results based management &amp; M&amp;E System that links expenditures and Management effectiveness. The status of essential components for a future system are: | By end of project, the SNAP has an integrated financial, operational and results based information (METT and key indicators) and is being used to undertaken M&amp;E of efficiencies and determine resource allocation all M&amp;E components are established and the following will be operational: | An adapted METT tool was institutionalized as a management effectivenes tool which includes variables that reflect the reality of the country. Besides, this tool will be included in the \"Biodiversity Information System\" (SIB) in order to generate a mechanism for long-term monitoring. At the moment, the SIB is in its pilot phase. | Management effectiveness and financial management of PA will be monitored through the BIS monitoring module. This annually updated information will feed the process of programmatic and budgetary planning. Along with information on the financial gap and projections from the annual planning, budget allocation is expected to be the result of an analysis of needs and management effectiveness of PA. | In order to have an agile and standardized administrative and financial management for the PAs, several modules in SIB were developed: - Management Effectiveness Evaluation module - Financial Board sub module - Registration of visitors (http://sib.ambiente.gob.ec) |
|  |  |  | Financial: - Financial baseline: SIGEF; SIGOB at highest level but no specific system for SNAP - No financial reporting from regional directorates - Preliminary Financial Scorecard for SNAP which contained PANE PAs | Financial: - Financial baseline based on solid data - All regions reporting in agreed upon format Basic financial M&amp;E operational based on Annual Operational Plans, budget formulation and management - Financial Scorecard systematized and institutionalized 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicators target level, based on current information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. - Financial reports and financial gap analysis are updated periodically throught the administrative-financial module of the Biodiversity Information System. - METT and UNDP Financial Scorecard are updated annually through the monitoring module of the Biodiversity Information System - Management Tool systematized and institutionalized | With regards to the existence of financial reporting tools, financial forms were run at the PA level and at the provincial level to systematize the operational management regarding the financial management of the SNAP. The aim is to integrate this into the SIB within its administrative component. In addition, the MAE provided training to all PA managers for the elaboration of annual operating plans and budgets, and these plans will be conducted for 20 PAs. The project is providing technical support for the development of these workshops and their socialization. Besides, the UNDP financial scorecard was ran in 2012 for all the pilot areas. | The UNDP Financial Scorecard will be periodically assessed by the (Biodiversity Information System) BIS monitoring module, which is currently in the testing phase. This information provides feedback to the administrative and financial module to implement a cost-effective PA management. | The Financial Scorecard allows MAE to gather, monitor and evaluate information from all sources of income and expenses of each protected area of the SNAP. The estimated budget savings of the Ministry of Environment for the implementation of the Financial Board is USD 90.000. This number represents the cost/year of a consultant for the development and implementation of the module. |
|  |  |  | Resource allocation: - Budget allocated based on size of PA - The efficiency of resource allocation is not linked to management effectiveness or conservation benefits/accomplishment | Resource allocation: - Resource allocation based on new RBM system | The MAE is developing the management model of the SNAP which, through the update of the financial needs developed by the project and along with the design of a Financial Sustainability Strategy, will determine the guidelines for resource allocation. With the updated financial needs of the SNAP, a matrix for prioritizing areas taking into account several variables (size, visitation, management effectiveness, category, etc.) was done and can help determine resource allocation. | Through the BIS will be possible to analyze current resources, planning objectives and management effectiveness for individual PA budget allocation. This depends on the budgetary independence of SNAP, which is currently under the authority of the Provincial Directions. | The project developed a proposal to implement a budget reform in the Public Financial Management System (E-Sigef) to keep detailed cost control and budgetary analysis of the tax funds, accounting for 94% of total expenditure of PANE. This action was made due to previously it was not possible to identify these expenses in the old system. This budget reform is in place since 2015. |
|  |  |  | Operational: - Preliminary METT scores for pilot projects; no system wide methodology for measuring management effectiveness | Operational: - SNAP Management effectiveness tool institutionalized | The Management Effectiveness Tool (METT) has been institutionalized so it can be run once a year in all SNAP PAs. The programs defined by the tool have been approved and aligned with those used by the National Direction of Biodiversity. This year\'s information is currently being collected and results will be available in July 2013. | The METT will be assessed annually through the monitoring module of the Biodiversity Information System. The adapted methodology for Ecuador is under revision, to publish a guide for PA staff to help them with this tool. | The Management Effectiveness Evaluation module: the estimation of savings in the annual budget of the Ministry of Environment for the implementation of the METT in the system was USD 169.053. This tooluse 4 source of information such as:fees, workshops, mobilization, and per diem. |
|  |  |  | Ecological: - Biological indicators defined through GEF 3 project but not fully developed or in use - Established GIS system that is capable of measuring vegetation cover change | Ecological: - Indicators of representative species/ecosystems selected during Year 1 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicators target level, based on current information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. - Conservation objects identified and used for PA planning | A biomass stock assessment was conducted for mangroves and moretales with emphasis on carbon quantification. A study of water quality in La Tembladera is also beeing hold. In addition, the MAE has created a map of vegetation and elaborated a conservation gaps study that identifies where it is necessary to create new areas based on ecosystem prioritization. | The biomass stock information was used as input in the process of creating ecosystems, carbon and basal areas maps and were published by the MAE between 2013 and 2014. The competitive funding mechanism includes in its monitoring methodology indicators that measure the reduction of pressure on fragile ecosystems in PA. The Tembladera wetland water quality assessment results are the baseline to evaluate at the end of the project if the change in productive activities has improved water quality. | MAE has a unit for biodiversity monitoring . This unite provide geo referenced information of plant coverage and ecosystem coverage. |
|  |  |  | Overall: - There is no institutional interpretation of data to support decision making | Overall: - RBM system and institutional capacity that allows for interpretation of data to support decision making. | Since January 2013 the Biodiversity Information System (SIB) is being developed and its goal is to have a single platform, within the Single System of Environmental Information (SUIA), to record all issues related to biodiversity management. The project has supported the implementation of the registry module for tour operators, reserves information (including information gathered with management effectiveness evaluations) and registry for research and exports. These modules are all in their pilot phase and the contract for the programmers was extended for 1 year for the development of missing modules, including the administrative module, and their implementation. It is expected that upon completion of the project, the SIB will be fully operational. | The Biodiversity Information System (BIS) is developing 3 modules with information and analysis for decision making in AP. The tourism module is operating since November 2013 it handles the guide, visitors and tour operatorsÃ¢ registration and manages patents applications for tourism operation in PA. The latest reports are: 175 tour operators, 819 naturalist guides, 231.900 visits were reported by tour operators and 703 visitors were registered as users of the PA. 114 patents have been approved that have contributed with over a $ 100.000. The monitoring module, which is its final testing phase, includes the Management Effectiveness Evaluation, UNDP Financial Scorecard and the analysis of financial needs and gap for the SNAP. These assessments will be updated annually to create an historic archive file. The administrative financial module is under development and will be operational/functional in late 2014. This module will support planning and financial management of the SNAP. The update of the Economic Valuation started based on the UNDP Target Scenario Analysis methodology. The MAE retained this methodology as the standard for all studies of economic valuation of ecosystems. | The registration of visitors allows immediately management of tourism information in protected areas of the Natural Heritage Areas State (PANE). The savings estimate of MAE budget is $ 190.396. This action is a key for strategic planning of tourism activity within the protected areas (reports in annex). |
| Outcome 3 | The value of SNAP is better recognized among communities living in protected areas, public authorities and private and public investors (National and International). |  | Baseline Ã¢ Budget 2008 SNAP - US$ 1,160,000 | Target - Budget 2015 - % Increase SNAP - US$ 1,450,000 Ã¢ 25% | At the end of the year 2012, the budget executed at the SNAP level was $21.6 million, which includes current and investment spending. Current expenditure in 2012 was of $10,696,330.23. | This goal has been achieved, in 2012 the government investment in the SNAP was $21,00,000. The SNAP is currently recognized as a crucial part of local and national development. $24,524,512 has been invested in infrastructure and 240 additional technicians will be hired for 2015. The SNAP budget increase will be evaluated at the end of 2014 through updated information of the Biodiversity information System. | In 2014 the Government investment in the SNAP was $ 24 million. This investment includes current and investment expenditure. Additionally, in the same year about 300 people were incorporated into the Ministry of Environment who respond to the profiles of rangers and technicians, which cover almost all personnel gap. |
|  |  |  | Baseline - Budget 2008 SNAP Ã¢ US$ 1,470,000 | Target - Budget 2015 - % Increase SNAP - US$ 1,837,500 Ã¢ 25% | Public information sources suggest that some resources are committed to the YasunÃÂ­ ITT Initiative. This commitment is not effective yet, therefore it is not registered as a contribution to the Financial Sustainability for the SNAP Project. However, there are other sources of external financing and for example, in 2012, 8% of the budget spend on the SNAP came from international cooperation. In parallel, the FAP budget in 2011 increased of $5 million (funds from KFW) to finance the entry of 10 new areas in 2012. Now, all PANE pilot areas can benefit from the FAP. It should also be noted that a study was held for the identification of new mechanisms to finance the SNAP. Ten mechanisms were identified among which there are: the creation of a \"SNAP label\" allowing financing from privates which could in turn use the label; a tax for the installation of antennas (for TV and celphone) in PAs; a donation of 25% of the income tax for conservation in PAs or service concessions as what is being done with high mountain shelters for Cotopaxi, Chimborazo and Cayambe-Coca. For this last point, the savings generated due the elimination of maintainance costs are of about $25.000 a year for each PA. | Financial contribution of cooperation projects for the SNAP for this period is $ 1,621,268. The Yasuni ITT initiative was not successful, but from the funds raised there is a proposal to create a specific trust fund for the PN YasunÃÂ­, no financing for the SNAP is planned. The carbon market through REDD is in diagnostic phase and no results will be observed during the projectÃ¢s implementation. The midterm evaluation recommended removing this indicator because there are not new mechanisms for international investment considered for the SNAP. | Although the Midterm evaluation recommended not to move forward with this issue, in June 2015 Ecuador started the preparation of a proposal to be presented to the Green Climate Fund for around USD 50.000.000. This proposal is mainly focused in the implementation of the REDD + Action Plan of Ecuador. In this context, the project has been supporting the proposal through technical review and recommendations for positioning the results of the study of the Economic Valuation of the SNAP to show how the SNAP contributes in greenhouse emissions reduction expenses caused by deforestation and forest degradation. |
|  |  |  | Area - # Visits PANE - 110,116 E.R. Cayambe Coca - 8,561 E.R. Illinizas - 2,676 E.R. Mache Chindul - 100 M.R Galera San Francisco - - W.P.R. Chimborazo- 84,000 W.P.R. Cuyabeno - 9,336 Yasuni - TBD APPRI - 4,343 ManabÃÂ­ D.F. - 1,463 Northwestern C.F. - 2,880 APC - 1,100 Abras de Mantequilla - 1,100 | Area - % Increased PANE - TBD E.R. Cayambe Coca - TBD E.R. Illinizas - TBD E.R. Mache Chindul - TBD M.R Galera San Francisco - TBD W.P.R. Chimborazo - TBD W.P.R. Cuyabeno -TBD ManabÃÂ­ D.F. - TBD APC - TBD Abras de Mantequilla - TBD Note: The Target will be determined, once the management plans have developed studies that include carry capacities. 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicators target level, based on current information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. In this case the indicator does not measure the impact of the project because since the elimination of entrance fees in 2012 the number of visitors to PA have increased to over 1 million. The proposal is to measure the following indicators that measure the external benefits from the SNAP current management model: - Increase in registered tourism operating patents in pilot PA The baseline for 2013 is: E.R. Cayambe Coca - 6 E.R. Illinizas - 19 E.R. Mache Chindul - 0 M.R Galera San Francisco - 0 W.P.R. Chimborazo - 50 W.P.R. Cuyabeno -22 N.P. Yasuni - 11 Increase in visitors will remain as indicator for private and community areas CNBRPE/Northwestern Node - 5.000 visitors per year Community Area/ The Tembladera Wetland - 1.000 visitors per year | \"From july 2012 until may 2013, the number of visitors in PAs reached the following results: PANE - 983.431 E.R. Cayambe Coca - 139.664 E.R. Illinizas - 13.354 E.R. Mache Chindul - 4.403 M.R Galera San Francisco - 297 W.P.R. Chimborazo - 70.635 W.P.R. Cuyabeno - 13.854 Yasuni - 9.140 Regarding PANE areas, the project financed the creation of a spot and a documentary of Cayambe-Coca as part of a broader video campaign of the Ministry to market the areas and increase tourism. The Minitry of Tourism will support this initiative both nationally and internationally. The webpages of La Tembladera and of the CNBRPE are now active and are an important source of information and promotion of both areas. A social networks strategy for both La Tembladera and the CNBRPE was stablished via Facebook. In La Tembladera, the publication of a legends book was also conceived as a way of marketing the area and increasing its perceived value.\" | With the elimination of entrance fees the number of visits to PA was increased in a tenfold. This is not a measurable result of the project, reason why is recommended that we donÃ¢t take into account this indicator and rather evaluate the socio-economic benefits of the SNAP. We propose to evaluate indicators for this purpose: 1. Increase in PA tour operating patents For these indicators there is a 2014 baseline value and its increase will be assessed again in 2016. | Through the Biodiversity Information System (SIB), a greater number of companies obtained the patent for tourist operations. This is equivalent to a 68% of increase compared to 2013. This is due to improvements in the information management and timely responses provided by the MAE through this system. The MAE developed the Destination Management Methodology, a tool that contributes to integrated destination management and planning on tourism management in the SNAP. It also allows generating a visitor management plan. At this moment, the 4 pilot areas of PSF (Cayambe Coca National Park, Wildlife Reserves Production of Chimborazo and Cuyabeno and Yasuni National Park) are using this tool. In April 2015, the website of the National System of Protected Areas was presented during the International Conference on Sustainable Tourism and Ecotourism. This tool has an application of protected areas for smartphones and mobile devices that can be used off line. This APP contains specialized and comprehensive audiovisual and promotional material of the protected areas. |
|  |  | 4. Increase on Budget from new sources based on intersector partnerships in Pilot Pas Municipal | Baseline 2009 Ã¢ Private - Municipal PANE E.R. Cayambe Coca Ã¢ 23,069 - 0 E.R. Illinizas Ã¢ 8,580 - 0 E.R. Mache Chindul Ã¢ 340 - 0 M.R Galera San Francisco Ã¢ 0 - 0 W.P.R. Chimborazo Ã¢ 85,110 - 0 W.P.R. Cuyabeno Ã¢ 151,060 - 0 Yasuni Ã¢ TBD - TBD APPRI ManabÃÂ­ D.F. - 11,700 -0 Northwestern C.F. - 14,400 - 0 APC Abras de Mantequilla Ã¢ 16,500 Ã¢ 0 | Target Ã¢ Private - Municipal PANE E.R. Cayambe Coca - &gt;100,000 - &gt;50,000 E.R. Illinizas - &gt;100,000 - &gt;50,000 E.R. Mache Chindul - &gt;50,000 - &gt;10,000 M.R Galera San Francisco - &gt;50,000 - &gt;20,000 W.P.R. Chimborazo - &gt;135,110 - &gt;10,000 W.P.R. Cuyabeno - &gt;180,000 - &gt;30,000 Yasuni APPRI Northwestern Node &gt;20,000 &gt;10,000 APC La Tembladera 0 &gt;10,000 | In the case of PANE all resources are channeled through the central plant within a single account. According to the UNDP financial scorecard of 2012 (Part I.1 (2b)) which indicates the funds channeled through third independent institutional arrangements, these are the results: E. R. Cayambe Coca - 15,000 E. R. Illinizas - 0 E. R. Mache Chindul - 2500 M.R Galera San Francisco - 318 092 W.P.R. Chimborazo - 0 W.P.R. Cuyabeno - 5000 Yasuni - 0 For La Tembladera, the baseline was 0 but as of June 2013, a municipal ordinance for the protection of the wetland was approved and will sustainably provide an annual budget for conservation (the amount is yet to be determined). For the Northwestern Node, by June 2013 $211611 of municipal resources had been invested. Also, advances have been done for the municipal tax exemption for private areas within the ACUs (areas of conservation and sustainable use). |  | In 2014 the contribution of local partners to manage the pilot areas has been recorded: N.P. YasuniÂ­: USD 236.074,00 (GIZ, USAID, WSC, others) W.F.R. Cuyabeno: USD 235.903,00 (others) M.R. Galera-San Francisco: USD 0,00 E.R. Illinizas: USD 58.000,00 (KF W) W.F.R. Chimborazo: USD 790.305,68 (GIZ, KFW, MINTUR, GAD Provincial ) E.R. Mache Chindul: USD 500,00 (GAD Municipality) N.P. Cayambe Coca: USD 144.275,80 (GIZ, KWF, Others) Total contribution USD 1.465.058,48 Together with the United Nations Volunteers Program, the CNBRPE implemented a voluntary platform that benefits to 56 private reserves. Volunteers contributions are both intellectual knowledge and practical skills assistance in the development of projects in private reserves. For this latter the CNBRPE signed six inter institutional agreements with: 1. Universidad Internacional SEK 2. Universidad Tecnologica Equinoccial 3. Universidad de Especialidades Turisticas 4. Escuela Superior Politecnica del Ejercito (ESPE) 5. Programa de Voluntariado para la Ayuda de Accion Social (VASE) 6. Programa de Voluntarios Frances Until the time of writing this report 16 volunteers were mobilized to two private reserves in Manabi and 3 volunteers collaborated through the online volunteering platform of United Nations. The cost-benefit of these activities shows a net annual saving of $ 64.411,20 for the private reserve, corresponding to support conducting paths (basic salary, mobilization, food). Meanwhile the savings per technical voluntary assistance was approximately USD 55.319,04 attributed to the volunteers expertise and experience. Due to the registered impact of this initiative, the platform will be replicated in the Wetland La Tembladera. The Wetland La Tembladera received an input from the Provincial GAD of El Oro and the Municipal GAD of Santa Rosa for USD 98.000 for conservation projects. Besides, the Universidad Tecnica de Machala signed an interagency cooperation agreement with ASOGROTEM for technical support and capacity strengthen, until now this contribution has been estimated in USD 45.000 . In parallel, ASOGROTEM has received the technical assistance of: MINTUR- SENAGUA-MAGAP- Superentendia de Economia Popular y Solidaria SEPS- Secretary of Marine and Costal Resources. The contribution from these institutions is about USD 5000. |
| Outcome 4 | Replicable cost-effective management models is field-tested through community-based and cross-sector partnership approaches. |  | Element - % - Component 3 Ã¢ 39% | Element - % - Component 3 Ã¢ 60% 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicators target level, based on current information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. -Number and variety of revenue sources used across the PA system 58% -Fixing and establishment of user fees across the PA system 53% -Effective fee collection systems 45% -Marketing and communication strategies for revenue generation mechanisms 44% - Operational Programs of Payments for Environmental Services for PA 42% -Concessions to operate within the PA 58% -PA training programs on revenue generation mechanisms of 67% Total component 3-54% | These were the results for component 3 : - Number and variety of revenue sources used across the PA system - 42% - Setting and establishment of user fees across the PA system - N/A% - Effective fee collection systems - N / A - Marketing & communication strategies for revenue generation mechanisms - 17% - Operational PES schemes for Pas - 50% - Within operating Concessions Pas - 8% - PA training Programmes on revenue generation mechanisms - 33% - Component 3 total 21% It should be noted that nowadays there is no payment for admission to the PA so that some of the evaluation criteria on this scorecard does not apply to the national context. This is the main reason that explains the decrease in the totals of component 3, compared to the baseline values. This will be tackled with the update of the Financial Sustainability Strategy of the SNAP. In parallel, to improve the tools to generate income, a competitive funding mechanism is being defined for the implementation of pilot projects that will begin operations in July-August 2013. These revenues will reach social organizations and rarely will be reported within the budget of the PA but they imply a reduction in the PA\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\'s spending (control and monitoring, maintenance of infrastructure, tourism services, etc..). | -Number and variety of revenue sources used across the PA system 50% -Fixing and establishment of user fees across the PA system 47% -Effective fee collection systems 33% -Marketing and communication strategies for revenue generation mechanisms 50% Operational Programs of Payments for Environmental Services for PA 25% -Concessions to operate within the PA 58% -PA training programs on revenue generation mechanisms of 67% Total component 3-45% The use of public infrastructure (shelters, cafÃ©, handicraft shop) is ready for concession with new infrastructure and profitable management models. For these models implementation was necessary to fill the legal gap with respect to the concession model, resulting in an approved Ministerial Agreement to regulate concessions within PA. These models increase revenue and reduce infrastructure maintenance costs, ensuring quality services for tourism, and social and environmental benefits for communities living near or within the PA. | - Number and variety of revenue sources used across the PA system 42% - - Fixing and establishment of user fees across the PA system 47% - - Effective fee collection systems 50% - Marketing and communication strategies for revenue generation mechanisms 50% - Operational Programs of Payments for Environmental Services for PA 33% - Concessions to operate within the PA 67% - - PA training programs on revenue generation mechanisms of 33% Total component 3 - 47% The Financial Sustainability Strategy of the SNAP was developed with the aim to generate resources for the SNAP. This strategy proposes mechanisms to enable resource generation, from the MAE mechanisms portfolio, the development of corporate social responsibility mechanisms was prioritized, that is being development at the moment. At the end of 2014, six business units were granted (high mountain shelters, cafes and restaurants and a souvenir shop) in pilot areas, in which the project generated management models. These areas are: National Parks Cotopaxi and Cayambe Coca, Reserve Production of wildlife Chimborazo and the National Recreation Area El Boliche. The main benefit of these concession/grant agreements focuses on the provision of a tourist service that considers criteria of quality and functionality of the built and / or remodeled infrastructure. Another benefit is the creation of 20 permanent jobs and 78 temporary jobs, of these positions, 50% in average is people living in communities near to PAs. Some other benefits include the compensation mechanisms for payment of environmental services, such as water companies of Quito and Guayaquil which are contributing with economic resources to reserves that are close to them, such as: Cayambe Coca, Antisana and Churute. With regard to capacity building through the Aula Verde program, the rangers were trained in administrative and financial matters, as well as the FAP (Protected Areas Fund) accountants and PA managers. |
|  |  |  | BASELINE 2009 Area - Funding Gap PANE - 26.4% E.R. Cayambe Coca - 38.3% E.R. Illinizas - 23.5% E.R. Mache Chindul - 24.5% M.R Galera San Francisco - 11.2% W.P.R. Chimborazo - 25.5% W.P.R. Cuyabeno - 35.7% Yasuni - TBD APPRI - 15.6% ManabÃÂ­ D.F. - 11.2% Northwestern C.F. - 19.9% APC - 33.2% Abras de Mantequilla Ã¢ 33.2% | TARGET 2015 Area - Funding Gap PANE E.R. Cayambe Coca -10% E.R. Illinizas - 10% E.R. Mache Chindul - 10% M.R Galera San Francisco - 10% W.P.R. Chimborazo - 10% W.P.R. Cuyabeno 10% Yasuni - 10% Northwestern C.F. - 10% Abras de Mantequilla - 10% 2014: The midterm evaluation recommended a review of the indicators target level, based on current information generated by the Project, to set a realistic goal. The current structure of the SNAP does not allow the retention of resources at the site levels. We propose to remove this indicator and keep the indicators for the productive projects of the Competitive Funding Mechanism that will be determine by october after analysis of the baseline and will measure the following: 1. Reduced AP cost management 2. Direct economic benefits of organizations and families 3. Reduced pressure on fragile ecosystems where initiatives are implemented . | The financial gap analysis was ran again in 2012 (the previous one dated back to 2003). It was determined that the basic scenario was widely exceeded by $21.6 million, almost 8 times more than the amount invested 10 years ago, reason why two new scenarios were redefined. The consolidation one determined a gap of $44.1 million and the ideal one determined a gap of $66.8 million. With this in mind, in 2013 the new gaps are: PANE: 51.9% E. R. Cayambe Coca: 60.3% E. R. Illinizas: 38.7% E. R. Mache Chindul: (-) 22.9% M.R Galera San Francisco: 79.3% W.P.R. Chimborazo: (-) 23.8% W.P.R. Cuyabeno: 15.2% Yasuni: 65.9% Information was not collected in the community and private areas. However, for the two areas business plans (5 and 16 respectively) were created, to be the basis for the participation in the competitive funding mechanism which will be launched in July-August 2013. Moreover, at the level of PANE, technical support is being given for the preparation of project profiles in Galera San Fco, Cuyabeno, YasunÃÂ­ and Chimborazo and a monitoring and evaluation NGO will be hired to provide technical support in the development of the selected projects. | The current structure of the SNAP does not allow the retention of resources at the site level; the financing mechanisms do not contribute to specific areas. We propose to assess the effects of productive initiatives financed by the Competitive Fundind Mechanism in pilot PAs through the following indicators: 1. Reduced pressure on fragile ecosystems where initiatives are implemented 2. Direct economic benefits of organizations and families 3. Reduced AP cost management | The specific impact indicators for each of the 18 projects (including CICOP + Balsamo) supported by the Mechanism of Grant Funds ( MFC), are: 1. Reduced PA cost management. With the implementation of MCF has reduced the financial gap of protected areas pilot: N.P. Cayambe Coca: 3% E. R. Illinizas: 3% E. R. Mache Chindul: 9% M.R Galera San Francisco: 32% W.P.R. Chimborazo: 11% W.P.R. Cuyabeno: 23% N.P Yasuni: 3% Funding Gap 7 pilots PANE - 12% The projects that have a clear reduced PA cost management are: Quilotoa (Satisfaction visitors). ESPOCH (Managing native wildlife). Heifer (Managing native wildlife). ASOGROTEM (fish diversity). Artelangosta (Monitoring biodiversity). CORDTUCH (Satisfaction visitors). CICOP (Environmental Education). 2. Direct economic benefits of organizations and families: The 17 projects have at least one indicator related to direct economic benefits of organizations and families . One of the fundamental objectives of the MFC / PSF is to support the generation of stable income communities. The economic benefit reported is USD 475 253 3. Reduced pressure on fragile ecosystems Flor Andina (decrease of cattle in the AP). Paquiestancia (reduction burning, deforestation containment). Artelangosta (Good responsible fishing practices). Quilotoa (reduction burning). San Gregorio (Use of bio- supplies). Projects that support curb deforestation are Kawsay Cortus, Tamboloma, AGRODUP. It has detailed reports with the indicators project, including the progress of each indicator, when it has been possible to have that information. |
|  |  |  | Baseline level will be determine by october 2014 | Target levels will be determine by october 2014 | The project will validate these indicators once the projects are selected, however, the following indicators have been pre-identified: - Income generated as part of the productive initiatives - Diversification of sources of income for the creation of alternative productive initiatives - Number of replicated initiatives The call for proposals will open in the end of July and the start of August 2013. Also, specific indicators regarding community management of the PA are to be defined. | The Competitive Funding Mechanism has selected 16 productive projects in pilot PA. Baseline is currently being evaluated and will be reported next year with the proposed target levels | Investments made through the Competitive Funding Mechanism (MFC) in the pilot projects have reduced management costs (management programs) for protected areas and increased the benefits listed below: Administration and Planning: USD 81.000 Communication, education and environmental involvement: USD 1.449.741 Public Use and Tourism: USD 16.368 Biodiversity Management: USD 176.626 Total Benefits for the 9 pilot AP: USD 1.723.735 + USD 475.253 economic benefits for communities. This means that of the total investment USD 1.096.899, including the operational management of the MFC and grants for each project, reported a return of USD 2,00 for every dollar invested. Beyond these estimates, the MFC has helped to change the perspective of about 3,000 families involved in the 20 existent projects, from a negative perception of the protected area as the origin of limitations for their way of life towards a positive vision that considers the protected areas as a source of sustainable development for their families. There is a particular interest for projects like Quilotoa and Artelangosta as models that can be replicated in other AP of the SNAP. These models and learned lessons from the MFC in general, and they are being used in the proposal of the institutionalization of the MFC that is coordinated between the MAE and the National Preinvestment Institute (INP). |

# E. Progress in Implementation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Project Outcomes | Description | Outputs Reported as of 30 June 2015 |
| Outcome 1 | Laws, standards and institutional guidelines for improving the financial sustainability of the PANE, private and communal sub-systems of the SNAP, are formally put in place with the technical support of the project. | Outputs Reported To strengthen the institutional foundations of the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP), several actions were done: - Framework Ministerial Agreement (AM) that recognizes the institutions of the National System of Protected Areas (including subsystems), and the joint management instruments. This AM will facilitate the planning, management, monitoring, and evaluation of the SNAP. - Ministerial Agreement No. 012, that allows the institutionalization of the Management Effectiveness Evaluation (EEM) of Natural Heritage Areas of the State (PANE), which was published in Official Registration No. 322 on 26 May 2015. This tool allows assess the strengths and weaknesses of the PA management. - Ministerial Agreement No. 076 that establishes the mandating use of the Annual Operational Management Plan (PGOA), which was published in Official Reg istration No. 534 on July 1, 2015. Currently, the head coordinators of the Protected Areas will familiarize with the implementation Annual Operational Management Plans through the Green Classroom Program . - Ministerial Agreement to standardize and institutionalize the guidelines for the development of financial sustainability plans for protected areas of the Natural Heritage Areas of the State - PANE, which is currently under review of the Legal General Coordination of MAE. In addition, the project work together with MAE in the development of Executive Decree. This document was approved in the "2015-2030 National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2020". |
| Outcome 1 | Laws, standards and institutional guidelines for improving the financial sustainability of the PANE, private and communal sub-systems of the SNAP, are formally put in place with the technical support of the project. | Outputs Reported Several ministerial agreements are in the process of harmonization with the law of the Organic Environmental Code project, such as: - Updating of the book III (Forestry Regime), IV (Biodiversity) and IX (Fees and Tariffs) of the United Text of Secondary Environmental Legislation TULAS . - Reform of the legal regulations for the incorporation of the subsystems (GAD, private and community) to the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP), which is scheduled to be validated by the Environmental Authority until July 18, 2015. |
| Outcome 1 | Laws, standards and institutional guidelines for improving the financial sustainability of the PANE, private and communal sub-systems of the SNAP, are formally put in place with the technical support of the project. | Outputs Reported The update of the publication "Environmental incentives for conservation" was made on June 2015. Currently, 17 members of the CNBRPE have access to funds from the Socio Bosque Program with a total of 4598.50 hectares. The CNBRPE received specialized assistance from the project: to legalize the donation of land where CICOP will be built;to process all the building permits (Colegio de Arquitectos, Municipio de Quito, Registro de la Propiedad); and, to have clarity in several legal and tax aspects. In 2014 three communities and one parish were integrated to the Board of the wetland La Tembladera (San Agustin, Las Crucitas, Jumon Bellevista and the Parish San Antonio). Nowadays, ASOGROTEM has 51 members which shows an increase of 11 people more than in 2013. The provided provided technical assistance to the City hall of Santa Rosa in order to formalize the declaration of public utility of the land where the Wetland tourist will be built. A larger number of companies (68% compared to 2013) obtained the patent for tourist operations, due to the improvements in management information and timely responses provided by the National Biodiversity Direction (DNB) through the Biodiversity Information System. |
| Outcome 2 | Strengthened capacities for results-based financial planning, management and monitoring, are set for improving sustainable net income accounting of SNAP. | Outputs Reported The Financial Sustainability Strategy (ESF) of the SNAP, proposes three funding scenarios that consider different financial mechanisms. This was made in order to improve the financial system resilience through the diversification of sources of funding. The first two scenarios propose improvements to the current management model; while the third scenario proposes a total change to the current model through the establishment of a public company (EP). Currently some priority mechanisms (Competitive Funding Mechanism (MFC), Corporate Social Responsibility, concessions, etc.) are in development as well as technical analysis to achieve the ideal scenario. The guideline Methodology for the preparation of the financial sustainability plan was approved by MAE in order to achieve a standardized management tool to improve the budget formulation and execution within a protected area. Nowadays, 7 pilots are running within the PANE area. Since January 2015 the budget reform in the Public Financial Management System E-Sigef is in ongoing. This reform individualizes the resources allocated to each protected area, instead to have a general report for all the areas. This individual report per PA contributes to a better planning, operational management, and monitoring of budget execution. With this reform the MAE has accurate information about the fiscal resources for the SNAP. |
| Outcome 2 | Strengthened capacities for results-based financial planning, management and monitoring, are set for improving sustainable net income accounting of SNAP. | Outputs Reported The Management Model for the Ecological Reserve Mache Chindul (REMACH) was done. This study was developed for: updating the status of land tenure within the area, identificating the main socio environmental conflicts, preparing a proposal for zoning and identificating financial mechanisms. This reserve is developing productive activities through the project "Improvement of the productive and commercial capacity of the cocoa (Theobroma) production, promoting the conservation of natural resources" thought the Competitive Funding Mechanism. The project "Revitalization and improvement of community tourism services in the lagoon of Quilotoa" continues running normally and it will complete its implementation in the coming months. The Institutional strengthening of the organization Lago Verde Quilotoa is based on: strengthened local capabilities, safety instructions and first aid . The construction of booths and the provision of kayaks equipment had been done. |
| Outcome 2 | Strengthened capacities for results-based financial planning, management and monitoring, are set for improving sustainable net income accounting of SNAP. | Outputs Reported The CNBRPE Board Members were trained in accounting, taxation and tax management (Leaders Coaches and Strategic Communication) through the Green Classroom Program. In addition, it was purchased an accounting program and the bookkeeper was trained in its use. This program allows the generation of monthly and annual reports for the Corporation. During the period of 2014 the CNBRPE applied the administrative and financial advices from the Micro evaluation which was conducted by the project in 2013. Currently, the organization has a manual of internal control and cash flow; also it is an approval on their legal and tax obligations that allows its correct operation. The implementation of the fund granted by the Schimtz Foundation allowed them to access to other funds and the experience developed in the use of bamboo allows them to contribute in building the CICOP, which will be built with this material. Organizational strengthening in the wetland La Tembladera evidence the following results: Wetland Protection Ordinance La Tembladera issued by the City hall of Santa Rosa. The creation of a Board members and the legalization of it, brings strategic management to the Agriculture Producers Association Artisan La Tembladera (ASOGROTEM). This Community body implements and develop projects in the area, shape local leaders by providing them executive training. The Wetland has technical documents such as the Management Plan, which is being updated with the support of the Secretary of Marine and Costal resources as part of the Financial Sustainability Strategy. Currently, the Wetland is running an aquaculture project with an endemic fish "the Old Blue" and started the first phase of the tourism project to ensure sustainability. As a result of this capacity building, the organization will be applying to projects grants in MINTUR and in SENAGUA, complementing the other actions developed in the territory. |
| Outcome 2 | Strengthened capacities for results-based financial planning, management and monitoring, are set for improving sustainable net income accounting of SNAP. | Outputs Reported The training course for Leaders was addressed to 50 managers of protected areas and to representatives of the Wetland La Tembladera and CNBRPE. Due to the positive impact generated by this course, it was replicated and updated to the needs of 30 decision makers of the MAE. This course was focused in developing leadership skills, communication, strategic management, finance and negotiation. In 2014 an additional group of 75 rangers were trained in an administrative and financial module, representing a total of 148 rangers and 50 heads of areas with their administrative leaders are currently under a training process on how to use the tool of Plan Annual Operational Management (PGOA). During the first semester of 2015, the transfer of information was conducted from SIB to SUIA (environmental information platform of the Ministry of Environment). This process ensures the long-term sustainability and institutionalization of the modules developed by the project. The transfer of information included a training process for technical and technological level. The SIB provides the authorities of MAE updated statistical information which facilitates the decision-making. The developed modules are: Tourism, Assessment of Effectiveness Management and Financial Board submodule. Each one of the generated modules reports the following data: - Number of visitors to protected areas - Visits by tour operators - Registry of Tourist Operators - Patents of Tourist Operators - Financial Analysis of Patent - Naturalist guides list - Management Effectiveness Evaluation and programs by area - Financing Scorecard |
| Outcome 3 | The value of SNAP is better recognized among communities living in protected areas, public authorities and private and public investors (National and International). | Outputs Reported The Economic Valuation for the SNAP was concluded, this valuation was made in the sectors of tourism and hydropower. The results of this study were used as inputs for the SNAP visible contribution to the economy in the new joint production and energy matrix. Furthermore, the results of this study will enrich the analysis of the initiative of the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB) in Ecuador. One out of two tourists that comes to the country has visited at least one protected area. The SNAP contributed with approximately USD 446 million of the national tourism revenue in 2013. The change of the national energy matrix depends on the SNAP, in other words, the SNAP guarantee the supply of environmental services. At least 20 of the country's hydropower supply come of the watershed of the PANE. The procedures to obtaining the values of the patents of tourism, complementary services, films and photographs for commercial purposes was approved by the Environmental Authority. Its results were socialized and received acceptance from the Ministry of Tourism. In the current context, this study needs to be supplemented with an analysis of rates of use of tourist service. Both studies are complementary and contribute to the definition of Book IX of TULAS. Based on the study of valuation of environmental services and cost of land use opportunities it was possible to shift the focus from conventional to organic farming production, therefore improving the environmental conditions of the wetland. Furthermore, it was strengthen the commitment of the public institutions through the agreement between the municipality of Santa Rosa and ASOGROTEM in order to protect the wetland. Based on the actions taken by the project within the private reserves in the Northwest of Pichincha, the National Authority considered the inclusion of this area as priority for the REDD + Action Plan. |
| Outcome 3 | The value of SNAP is better recognized among communities living in protected areas, public authorities and private and public investors (National and International). | Outputs Reported Several communication pieces with advocacy approach and positioning actions were introduced among the decision makers and authorities. This year, the website of the National System of Protected Areas (http://areasprotegidas.ambiente.gob.ec), which also has an APP (APROTEGIDASEC) for smartphones and mobile devices, was presented in an international event. The website contains tourist information, geographic location, photographs, videos, topics of interest, recommendations and technical and statistics information (reports SIB-Tourism). In addition, visitors of protected areas have the chance to share and rate their experience. Ecuador hosted the International Conference on Sustainable Tourism and Ecotourism; strategically the project used this space to present the website for this target (approx. 600 representatives of the tourism sector worldwide). Among different events the project was able to influence with strategic topics, for instance, in the World Biodiversity Day, the Financial Sustainability Strategy for the SNAP was presented and in the World Wetlands Day was reactivated the Wetland Board, that resulted in the signed interagency agreement for the implementation of tourism projects in La Tembladera. The quarterly newsletter SOMOS SNAP was born as an initiative of the project to spread their actions. However, under the need to institutionalize this processes developed by the project; from Issue No. 3 its approach is wider towards an integrated management of protected areas. In this newsletter the actions of various programs and projects for the conservation of state, private and community protected areas were shown. In addition, communication strategies for private and community conservation through constant and responsible media use were displayed in: websites (www.latembladera-ecuador.com / www.reservasprivadasecuador.com) updated facebook, brochures, newsletters, flyers and promotional videos. |
| Outcome 4 | Replicable cost-effective management models is field-tested through community-based and cross-sector partnership approaches. | Outputs Reported In mid-2014 the Competitive Funding Mechanism for project implementation was launched and their implementation is progressing as planned. The Conservation Project and management of biodiversity and sustainable production in the Cordillera del Balsamo fulfilled 100%. The results achieved are: maintenance and ecological connectivity, improved income for the 8 private reserves who participated in the project, creating the brand "Cordillera del BalsamoÃ¢ÂÂ, improved environmental education programs and organizational strengthening. The contribution of the partners, in cash or other resources, reaches more than USD 2 million coming from GAD, ONGs, universities and communities. The Earth Day Network chose the project to apply the experience gained through the scheme of the MFC for projects that promote sustainable livelihoods for YasuniÂ­ Biosfera Reserve. The projects selected to get these funds were the solid waste selective collection strengthening project in the city of Puerto Francisco de Orellana and also the strengthening Project and implementation of an Amazonian gourmet restaurant. These projects were chosen to implement these initiatives with remaining funds of the initiative YasuniÂ­ ITT. |
| Outcome 4 | Replicable cost-effective management models is field-tested through community-based and cross-sector partnership approaches. | Outputs Reported Business models for the management of high mountain shelters are being used as the basis for bidding. Currently, there is a concession to the Cotopaxi shelter and two cooperation agreements in the Chimborazo shelter and one for the Cayambe shelter. The initiatives are starting with the support of the private sector, local ONGs and individual partners. Income through these mechanisms must be monitored. Through the management model and operation of the visitor center of Arenal (RPFCH), MAE has signed a cooperation agreement with the Association of Integral Development Urku Wuayra in order to give them the administration of the Handicraft Shop. The income distribution through this mechanism, should be monitored. |
| Outcome 4 | Replicable cost-effective management models is field-tested through community-based and cross-sector partnership approaches. | Outputs Reported The construction of CICOP was prioritized by the private reserves in the Northwest in order to generate sustainable patterns of net income. According to the results of the management model and investment project, it has been estimated a positive VAN, TIR (internal rate of return) of 14% and ROI of 22% from the sixth year of operation. These data supports this long-term strategic project profitability and financial sustainability for CNBRPE. Furthermore, these studies ensure proper operational functioning, a cost - effective administration and a process of transparent accountability among the members of the CNBRPE. At the same time, the architectural design project and its complementary studies were approved by the competent authorities, while structural engineering plans are currently under review. This design includes the use of alternative and sustainable building materials which is the predominant in the area such as the bamboo. This material can fix the CO2 in their structures and is produced locally. In late July this year the call for tender the construction will be launched. |
| Outcome 4 | Replicable cost-effective management models is field-tested through community-based and cross-sector partnership approaches. | Outputs Reported The City hall of Santa Rosa GAD allocated US 35,000 for the tourism project in the wetland La Tembladera, this amount will be used for the construction of a tourist dock. The project finances the soil studies and tourism management model for the implementation of the enterprise. In addition to this, the Delimitation and Tourism Promotion PANE project provides advice on the design and construction of dock. Finally, ASOGROTEM compensated private owners of the wetland because of the land use for the implementation of the project. Therefore, the city hall has been declared this area as public utility . ASOGROTEM will also assume some of the costs of the project implementation. 6 kayaks were imported in order to be donated to ASOGROTEM to promote tourism activities in the area. The joint work of public institutions with competence in the environment and tourism field is highlighted, which are generating actions for the implementation of this Community project. |
| Outcome 4 | Replicable cost-effective management models is field-tested through community-based and cross-sector partnership approaches. | Outputs Reported The MAE approved the Marketing Strategy and Marketing of the brand Punto Verde. This mechanism promotes income generation to protected areas through the revitalization of handicraft shops and the standardization of their products and even proposes channels of product distribution. As a result of this mechanism, three lines of products were generated such as souvenirs, our hands and artisanal line. Currently, this mechanism is being analyzed with the Environmental Authority for its implementation. |

# F. Ratings and Comments on Project Progress

**Project Progress toward Development Objective**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Role | 2015 Rating | 2015 Comments |
| Project Manager/Coordinator | Satisfactory | In 2014, the Financial Sustainability Project (PSF) was recognized as the greater financial implementation project among other UNDP projects, reaching a financial performance with 95% (without budget adjustments) while the programmatic implementation has reached 99%. These results demonstrate a strong management in order to get the results. In the first semester of 2015, the programmatic implementation was of 48% and 44% financial performance and 31% of committed funds. The full financial implementation of the project is 73%. Finally the projection at the end of December is about 86%. The major milestones are the following: â¢ Update of the publication "Environmental incentives for conservation" â¢ Ministerial Agreement No. 012, this agreement allows the institutionalization of the Management Effectiveness Evaluation (MEE). â¢ Ministerial Agreement No. 076 that establishes the mandating use of the Annual Operational Management Plan (PGOA as the Spanish acronym). â¢ Publication of the Financial Sustainability Strategy (FSS) of the SNAP. â¢ The Methodology guideline for the preparation of financial sustainability plan was approved by MAE (for expedition Ministerial Agreement) â¢ Several modules were developed such as: Management Effectiveness Evaluation module, Tourism module and Financial Scorecard sub module that are part of the Biodiversity Information System (SIB). The SIB was transferred to the Unique System of Environmental information (SUIA) that is managed by MAE. â¢ The Economic Valuation of SNAP was concluded in to strategic sectors: tourism and hydropower. â¢ The website of the National System of Protected Areas (English and Spanish) (http://areasprotegidas.ambiente.gob.ec), was developed and it has its own APP (APROTEGIDASEC) for smartphones and mobile devices. â¢ 16 projects are currently running under the Competitive Funding Mechanism â MFC. â¢ 2 projects of Sustainable Livelihoods in the YasunÃ­ Biosphere Reserve were selected and their will fund. â¢ The architectural design and Management Model for CICOP were developed. â¢ Implementation of the first phase of the tourism project in Tembladera is ongoing. â¢ The quarterly newsletter edition of "SOMOS SNAP" (10th exemplar) was issued. â¢ The websites developed and updated the following items: www.psf.ecuador.com http://reservasprivadasecuador.com http://latembladera-ecuador.com Management of new funds: US $ 22,000 German Foundation Schimtz for the implementation of Workshops under an innovating methodology called âMinga Tallerâ by the CNBRPE US $ 35,000 for the GAD Municipal Santa Rosa for the Implementation of Tourist Pier in La Tembladera was gained. US $ 160.184.12 of Earth Day Network for the development of productive projects in the YasunÃ­ Biosphere Reserve under the concept of MFC were allocated. â¢ A Volunteer Platform for CNBRPE was developed with 6 framework agreements with academia and organizations of international volunteering. |
| UNDP Country Office Programme Officer | Satisfactory | The rating for this period of report will be maintained as Satisfactory (S), coinciding with the Project Coordinator and the MAE as the Implementing Partner. The reason of this score is in accordance of the well-structured, planned and achieved milestones of the project. The majority of global environmental objectives and benefits have been achieved, including minor shortcomings related mainly to the common dynamics not only of the project, but also of the implementing partner. It is important to remark the adaptive capacity of the project that carried out its Mid-term Evaluation in 2014 which had as result, different recommendations for re-defining targets to be achieved at the end of the project, as well as for extending the project duration, which were all reflected during the present report without any problem. The reporting of these new targets, and the ones un-altered let see a positive trend in the majority of the indicators, and in some case targets to be achieved at the end of the project were completed. Despite the satisfactory achievement of results, there is one risk that need to be addressed. This risk is related to the CICOP construction which due to administrative issues related to approvals and permits, is delay. Even although the project has made all that was needed to mitigate this risk, the dynamics of different institutions related to this topic are different and cannot be managed by the project. Additionally, a possible risk that could affect the development of public policy related to the project, is the approval of the Environmental Organic Code which will direct all the environmental actions in the country. So, possible changes and updates can be seen as a result of this Code approval. In general, it could be said that the project apart of what was stated has been seen as a technical support branch for the Government of Ecuador through the Ministry of Environment, specifically for the Protected Areas related issues, not only in the preparation of public policy, but also in creating the mechanisms and tools for giving sustainability to the PAs in the country. For this latter, the capacities created by the project are one of the main inputs for guaranteeing the SNAP sustainability which have been directed to different actors at different levels. In addition to this, the MFC has been seen also as a demonstrative way to give productive options to the people living near to the PAs, and nowadays, the first fruits of this mechanism can be seen from testimonials from different beneficiaries that seen the PAs as an attractive option for self-subsistence. Another important point that need to be raised is the coordinated work that the project has been done with other initiatives not only from UNDP, but also from MAE and other institutions, generating shared products/results that evidence the well-use of resources at technical and budgetary level. Finally, the CO encourages to the project to continue with the high performance in term of technical and financial execution, with a well-coordinated work carried out by the Project Management Group, becoming one of the best executors within the UNDP projects portfolio. |
| Project Implementing Partner | Satisfactory | The rights of the Nature in Ecuador, as part of the National Constitution, are manifested as a reality through the commitment of the Ecuadorian State in the management of the National Plan for Good Living. In fact, the Ministry of Environment of Ecuador (MAE) with the technical support of the Project of Financial Sustainability (PSF) is implementing strategic actions towards minimizing the financial gap in the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP), developing a legal framework and the conceptual base for the application of mechanisms that optimize the existing resources and, reduces costs of process that tend to generate sustainability that contributes to straighten the capabilities of the actors involved in the management of the protected areas, as well as the use of ways that allow visualization of the benefits that the System provides to society. In order to straighten the legal framework of the National System for Protected Areas, the PSF provided norms and institutional guidelines which had improve planning and management, monitoring and evaluation for an adequate administration of the protected areas, It is important to highlight various ministerial agreement (MA) like: (MA) 012 that approves the effectiveness management evaluation of protected areas, the (MA) 076 that requires the use of the Annual Operational Management Plan (PGOA), a proposal of MA that recognizes the structure, administration and management of the System with all its instruments. Additionally, the Project has work in the proposal of the MA that reviews the contents of the United Text of Secondary Environmental Legislation (TULAS) on its III, IV and IX charters, and the legal document for the inclusion of the subsystem in the National System of Protected Areas, among others. In relation of the straighten of capabilities for the management of the SNAP, it was necessary to construct academic contents for training directed to Rangers and Responsible of Protected Areas trough the National Educational Program called âAula Verdeâ. It is important to mention that now, there are 659 workers of the protected areas, 540 rangers and 110 specialist; it means 295 more than 2013. Also, in order to strengthen the management abilities to raise new funds, effective communication and to lead teams, the PFS implemented the executive coaching module directed to 30 managers of the Natural Patrimonial Sub secretary. Further, with the purpose of support the financial planning, the management and outcome monitoring, the PFS developed the Biodiversity Information System (SIB) that is part of the Unique System of Environmental Information (SUIA), that contributes to the decision making process of different authorities from the Environmental Authority. In addition, the Ministry of Environment with the support of the Project and in coordination with the provincial departments, constructed a proposal for the budget reform of 2015 with the aim of visualizing the resources designated to protected areas, trough the government system called E-sigef. In reference to the acknowledgement of the SNAP, the Ministry of Environment prioritized the Financial Sustainability Strategy of the System, as an instrument of planning, which proposes several options for sources of financing to consolidate and visualize the contribution of the SNAP. In this context, the Project generated the study of economic validation of the System for the sectors of hydroelectricity and tourism and the Marketing strategy for the brand called Punto Verde. Also the Project has implement the website of protected areas which contains relevant information that positions the SNAP as a strategic sector that directly contributes to the national productive and energetic matrix (this is the most important economic strategy of Ecuador nowadays). Finally, actions related with the application of cost model for management, it is important to stand out the 16 productive initiatives that are part of the Competitive Funding Mechanism which contributes to the sustainability of the protected areas and the development of the communities that live there, as well as the strategies of sustainability developed in the territory by the National Forest Corporation and private reserves of Ecuador and the Wetland La Tembladera. Thanks to the implementation of the different financial models and technical tools generated for the Project of Financial Sustainably, the operative costs for management of the Ministry of Environment have been reduced by about US $ 480.000. |
| GEF Operational Focal point | Satisfactory | At international level Ecuador is one of the pioneering countries in the construction of new models of development that recognize the Rights of nature and the potential of the biodiversity. Within the United Nations Development Framework (UNDAF) 2015-2018 for Ecuador, it was reaffirmed the commitment to strengthen the âenvironmental sustainability, resilience and management of risksâ and to encourage the sustainable use of natural resources according to the National Strategy for the Productive Matrix Transformation. In this sense, the technical contribution of the Project of Financial Sustainability (PSF in Spanish) for the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP) is significant; the institutional strengthening for the appropriate planning and management of protected areas is evident through the achieved outcomes: i) Ministerial Agreement 012 Efficiency Assessment of the State Natural Areas Heritage Subsystem (PANE in Spanish) management ; ii) Ministerial Agreement 076 for the development of Operative Management Plans of Protected Areas ; iii) Publishing of the Financial Sustainability Strategy for SNAP ; iv) Approved guidelines to develop financial sustainability of protected areas ( this is about to be published as a Ministerial Agreement) and v) Module for the Efficiency Assessment of the State Natural Areas Heritage Subsystem (PANE in Spanish) management, which has been incorporated to the Single System of Environmental Information (SUIA in Spanish). The project conducted a study that determined that the contributions of the SNAP to the new Strategies for the National Transformation of the Productive and Energetic Matrixes. The analysis showed that at least 20 hydroelectric plants of the country are supplied by watersheds which vegetation cover are under PANE and its economic contribution to the watersheds that supply the Coca-Codo Sinclair and HIDROPAUTE hydroelectric plants is USD$3,800,000, per year for operation and maintenance costs. This will definitely contribute the global initiative study called The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB), which aims at showing policy makers the contribution of nature to the national economy, through its biodiversity and ecosystems. The Strategy of Financial Sustainability of the SNAP contributes to diversify the portfolio of financing sources, through a model of efficient management that demonstrates an optimal management consistent with the planning of the protected areas. Hence during this period the project has been able to leverage new resources and different types of support: i) USD$22.000 from the Schmitz-Hille Foundation to develop training programs through mingas mobilization ( a type of labor in which a community works together to achieve a common goal) ; ii) USD $35.000, as a contribution of the Municipal Autonomous Decentralized Government of Santa Rosa for the construction of a tourist sight in La Tembladera wetland Ramsar site : iii) USD $160.184.12 from the Earth Day Network for the development of two productive projects in YasunÃ­ implemented under the competitive fund mechanism ; iv) Support to the National Corporation of Forests and Private Reserves of Ecuador (NCFPRE) by implementing agreements with the Academy and International Volunteering institutions for technical and touristic topics and translation of information. The implementation of the protected areas web page and app for smartphones through which this zones are advertise has increased trips to these places. For each dollar thatÂ´s invested in tourism USD9 are going to the countryâs economic growth. Finally, capacity building and the implementation of the competitive fund mechanism have become the means through which productive initiatives contribute to the sustainability of communitarian protected areas and of the natural and cultural heritage of the country. Up until now, there are 16 productive projects of communitarian tourism, environmental education, agro ecological production, and research, use of biodiversity, livestock management, recycling and sustainable fisheries. A feasibility analysis for the institutionalization of this competitive fund mechanism is being prepared, and that is why it has been presented to the National Institute for pre investment. |
| Other Partners | Highly Satisfactory | Together with the Financial Sustainability Project we have identified opportunities to work articulately in favor of the conservation of protected areas of the State Natural Heritage (PANE). One of the main aspects is the support for granting the management of high mountain shelter of the Provincial Directorates. In addition, the construction of tourist facilities for Laguna Quilotoa community in order to improve the tourist operation kayaks of community. Besides the Program to support the National System of Protected Areas (PASNAP) provided technical advice to review the architectural design and structural engineering of the Interpretation Centre, Marketing and Tourism Operator (CICOP). The program also provides advice in the design of the pier infrastructure for the development of community tourism project which will be located next to the wetland of Tembladera. Working closely both projects can strengthen the regulatory framework of the Ministry of Environment with the aim to strengthen capabilities, raise the awareness of nature conservation and the value of protected areas. In addition generate local business cases with potential for replication in other protected areas. This interaction can enhance and increase the effectiveness of our interventions at the institutional level and in territory. |
| UNDP Technical Advisor | Satisfactory | The project is supporting the GoE develop the framework for financial and operational efficiency of a new SNAP and facilitate integration of private and community sub-systems with aligned standards and efficiencies. One premise of the project is that criteria on financial sustainability should be used for incorporating new protected areas (PA) into the SNAP (be they public, private or community). Once in the SNAP there will be additional State obligations for funding and hence there needs to be clear signs of sustainability of each PA before incorporation. Another is that management of PAs already in the public system (PANE) and other sub-systems can be improved to reduce the funding needs and hence increase the financial sustainability overall. A third is that new revenue streams can be mobilized for the financing. The project has made good progress on all three fronts and there are clear signs that these results will enable the project to meet its objective. The RTA is in agreement with the Satisfactory awarded by both the CO, PM. MAE and GEF focal point. In terms of financial criteria for inclusion the SNAP: The project has developed criteria that could be applied for incorporation into the SNAP. Of these two key criteria are a management plan and associated sustainable finance plan that follow the guidelines and standards developed with support of this project. This requirement is expected to be made official shortly through a ministerial agreement. Also there is recognition that because of the existing funding gap in the PANE (55%) , and once Aichi 11 has been reached, the remaining ecosystem gaps would be covered by PAs in sub-systems be these private, community or GADs. The project has thus has developed criteria for private reserves to be created independently or as part of the SNAP. These include a financial plan and the commitment of reserve owners to administer, management and control the area to guarantee conservation. To support this the project has built capacities in the private reserves for management and financial. It has also piloted cost reduction approaches and revenue stream for these private reserves. In terms of increasing efficiencies and hence cost reduction, significant advances have been made at different levels. One is the support provided to improve budget allocation to individual PA. One criteria used is the delivery rate of the previous yearâs annual budget. Until recently this has not been possible to apply because the ESigef which is the Public Financial Management System, does visualize separate budgets for individual PA but rather that of the entire system. The project has worked with ESigef reform and resources allocated to each PA and expenditures can now be tracked and thus linked to budget allocation in the following year. In the same vein the project worked with the MAE to link budget allocation to conservation objectives. A Financial Sustainability Plan methodology developed by the project has been approved by the MAE and is now mandatory use for Annual Operational Management Plans (PGOA). The PGOA budget is now linked to conservation objectives and needs identified in the AP based on the application of the METT. This linking of financial plans, annual operations, budgets and management effectiveness as measured through the METT is a clear step towards a system that enables allocation based on conservation gains- a ground breaking approach to sustainable finance. Project support to automated data through the SIBânow part of the SUIA Unified System of Environmental Information- also provides for efficiencies and cost reductions. Having information on finance and administration and other aspects including tourism is expected to facilitate processes and reduce costs. An example can be seen already with the saving of an estimated USD 100,000 annually in the MAE based on the efficiencies gained using the SIB-tourism module for the monitoring and control of visitors and an online application of tourist operators to request operating permits. Cost reduction through reducing management costs has adopted an innovative approach- setting up a competitive bidding mechanism for funding community and cooperative projects in AP (MFC). These are reported in the DO tab. Whilst there is high level support for this approach and significant socio-economic co-benefits for communities still more work is need to measure its effects on cost reduction (see IP). In terms of increased revenues: A proposal related to tourist operation and filming fees was developed approved by the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Tourism. It will be made official through Book IX of the new environmental legislation TULAS. A further approach under development is to channel these resources to a separate fund (possibly the FAN) and directly onto PA and not through the national treasury. This would signify an increase of revenues. The support to the Punta Verde initiate with 3 new products the artisanal craft shops are expected to generate some US$ 4.6 million for the 9 PANE PAs during the first year, including costs and with an estimated US$ 0.95 of initial investment.The proposal for a public enterprise for the SNAP â reported last year- is being further developed will include direct reinvestment of revenues generate on site to the PA. The project work on the Targeted Scenario Analysis on the link between PA and the production of water for hydroelectric power has been shared with the MAE and is expected to generate more interagency cooperation regarding funding for the SNAP. For example hydroelectric companies such as Hydro Alto provides USD 65,000 annually of funding to the Cayambe Coca PGOAs; the Municipal Water and Sanitation of Quito, contributes to salaries of around 20 rangers and the cost of infrastructure maintenance of Antisana Reserve; the Municipal Water Company Guayaquil donates USD 250,000 annually RE - Mangrove Churute. In terms of private and community revenues. For the private reserves in the NE the strategy is to co-fund a community and tourism centre that would provide an outlet for private reserve owners to sell their products and increase tourism, hence generating revenues to compensate for set-asides for conservation in production farms declared private reserves. The analysis have shown that this is financially viable project and can be sustainably operated (the NPV is positive; internal rate of return 14% and the return on investment reaches 22% in the sixth year with the cash flow versus investment being stable for the lifetime thereafter). For the other private reserve network - Cordillero de Balsmo - there has been an improvement of tourism revenues in 2014 of 176% compared 2012 due amongst others to improving trails and visitor facilitates. For the Community Reserve Tembladera a wetland volunteer network, supported by agreements with university and the UNV, has been set up and is increasing the revenue of production projects funded through the MFC. For example in the "Conservation, production and marketing of old blue" which is a native species, typical fish of the Wetland has a positive NPV for a period of five years of USD 72,096, but with the volunteers this value increased to USD 163,228. This project commits that of 10% of the profits 3% is channeled to protection of wetlands. These advances indicate progress towards the Outcomes and their contribution to the Objective is corroborated as measured by the main higher level indicators. The financial scorecard for private reserves show positive figures this year and for the Tembladera the overall has already reached the end of project target. For the PANE PAs the value is up 4% from last year but still some distance from revised end of project results. Of more concern is the Funding gap indicator. With a 2014 resource allocation of 24million, 20 million more is needed to reach the minimum requirements (44 USD million) for SNAP operation. On the other hand the resource allocation to the SNAP has increased from a baseline of USD 1.16 million annually to USD 24 million in 2014 which is up 3million from last yearâs report. Restriction on State resources, the country's economy and investment priorities for health, education, road infrastructure, mean additional Government allocation is likely to be constrained. This underlines still more the importance of the multiple pronged strategy of reducing the gap by increasing efficiencies, reducing cost and sharing the cost burden through other sources. The relevance of this project to the sustainability of the SNAP is higher than ever. |

**Project Progress in Project Implementation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Role | 2014 Rating | 2015 Rating | 2015 Comments |
| Project Manager/Coordinator | Highly Satisfactory | Highly Satisfactory | The Project Financial Sustainability of Protected Areas - PSF is characterized for its proper and timely execution based on its objectives. Its intra and inter-positioning is becoming increasingly strong. With the approval of this extension the project will have the necessary time to finalize successfully the activities planned and to comply the commitments set in the Project Document in agreement with the GEF/PNUD. It is important to reiterate that this extension will generate superior results than the already successfully achieved. Studies such as the Financial Sustainability Strategy (ESF) and the Economic Assessment of the SNAP Strategy and Marketing of Punto Verde Products constitute relevant information for the Ministry of Environment and other ministers such as: the Minister of Coordinating for Strategic Sectors, Ministry of Tourism, Ministry of Finance and the SENPLADES. It is worth to mention that the PSF has developed an expertise to coordinate actions with other programs and projects within the Ministry of Environment and / or UNDP. This effort of coordination of the activities avoids the duplication of work and allows the project to get advantage of the experience of other professional profiles in order to achieve project goals. For example, the project receives advice in the design and monitoring of infrastructure projects in the Northwest Pichincha Node and the Tembladera wetland. The PSF skills are also shared with similar projects such as the development of Executive Decree for updating National Biodiversity Strategy; and even provided advice in the use of several of our tools that are being share with the GEF project for Wildlife and Marine - Coastal. The join work with the National Corporation for Forests and Private Reserves of Ecuador is going through a good period of collaboration; a cordial relationship, collaboration and effective communication that allowed us to join forces and pull together to solve the administrative requirements. For example, to get all the paper work for the land in order to guarantee to obtain all the construction permits for the Interpretation Centre and Tourist Operation of Northwestern Pichincha - CICOP. In order to continue with the development of the CICOP several socio-environmental agreements were signed. These signatures reaffirm the commitment of local actors. Thus, it is crucial to continue the construction of this infrastructure as soon as possible as result of this positive response. The actions in la Tembladera has been done as planned in order to achieve the implementation of sustainable practical actions on-site. These actions have led to catalyze actions with local GADs, SENAGUA, etc. |
| UNDP Country Office Programme Officer | Highly Satisfactory | Highly Satisfactory | The rating for this period of report will be maintained as Highly Satisfactory (HS), coinciding with the Project Coordinator. The reason of this score is in accordance of the high level of implementation achieved by the project. All the components have a substantial compliance with what was planned, for that reason, the project is used as a good practice on how an implementation must be done among the UNDP projects portfolio. Additionally, its monitoring and planning tools are recommended by the CO for being used by other projects. Regarding the annual progress, it can be summarized pointing the following milestones, since June 2014 until June 2015: Outcome 1: Institutional Foundations worked with Framework Ministerial Agreement (AM) that recognizes the SNAP institutions and the joint management mechanisms; AM 12 for the institutionalization of the Management Effectiveness Evaluation of PANE; and AM 076 establishes de mandatory use of PGOA, and other under preparation. Public policy ammonization with the Environmental Organic Code (Book III, IV and IX of TULAS and reform of the legal regulations for the incorporation of subsystems to the SNAP). Technical support to put in place SNAP subsystems, CNBRPE and ASOGROTEM received it through the project in different topics. Outcome 2: Financial planning, management and monitoring: For this the Financial Sustainability Strategy was launched and different mechanisms to find an ideal one are in place (MFC, Corporate and Social Responsibility, among others). The guideline methodology for preparing the Financial Sustainability Plan was approved by MAE and now is being run on 7 pilots within PANE. And E-Sigef platform now presents an individualized report of fiscal resources allocation by each PA. Capacity building and institutional strengthening: REMACH, Lago Verde Quilotoa Organization, CNBRPE, ASOGROTEM, MAE received training in different topics, at different levels, as well as received support for institutional strengthening. Outcome 3: Value of the SNAP better recognized: The Economic Valuation for the SNAP for tourism and hydropower concluded, being both a principal input for the national strategy for diversification of the energy and production matrix. Additionally, a study of procedures for tourism patents and other services for commercial purposes were approved by MAE, and currently a study for defining the rates of uses of tourist services is being developed. Both studies will be inputs for the Book IX of the TULAS. Communication: The SNAP website was launched, as well as a mobile application for this same end. The newsletter SOMOS SNAP continues its spread, and social media sites are being updated. Outcome 4: MFC: The MFC continues its operation as was planned, including an input from the Earth Day Network for projects located in Yasuni Biosfera Reserve. All these milestones were executed according to the Annual Work Plan on time. Regarding the financial performance, until the end of June 2014 the accumulated budget execution was 64% since the beginning of the project, and currently, the execution at the end of June 2015 has reached 69%. Finally, it is important to remark that the project has been a very good rate of implementation in technically and financially; so, the CO encourages the project team to maintain this high performance. |
| Project Implementing Partner | Highly Satisfactory | Satisfactory | The extension of the project until November 2016 is properly to ensure completion of the outputs and to incorporate the protected areas pilot experience in the system. In 2014, the impact of the actions taken by the PSF was satisfactory. The role of the Project has been important to the achievement of corporate goals of the Ministry of Environment (MAE). Also, is evident the solid work with the Secretariat for Natural Heritage and the National Directions of Biodiversity, Planning and Financial. In order to have a defined, articulated and adequate administrative and institutional structure for the National System of Protected Areas, the PSF supported in the development of standards and guidelines to improve the management of protected areas. About the actions to straighten the institutional capabilities, the Project has institutionalized guidelines for the implementing of financial sustainability plans, this tool has been implemented in the pilot areas of PSF and aims to replicate in other PA. The Biodiversity Information System (SIB) is an iconic result, giving authorities updated, truthful and systematized statistical information which facilitates decision making. It continues the support for the construction of academic contents for the National Educational Program called âAula Verdeâ with the proposal of strengthen the financial and administrative capacities of rangers and managers. An important coaching module from this Program was implemented to allow managers of protected areas to have a lot of knowledge in strategic management and to improve their communication skills. Furthermore, the website of protected areas and its APP for smart phones allows public dissemination of specialized information to different targets (foreign tourists, local visitors, scientists, students and other government institutions). The launch of this platform was held at the International Conference on Ecotourism and Sustainable Tourism - ESTC15, which is part of the strategy of positioning and incidence of the National System of Protected Areas. The publication of the Economic Valuation of SNAP; in the sectors of tourism and hydroelectricity, is an important tool that shows clearly the contribution to the economy of the protected areas in the new productive and energy matrix (This is the most important economic strategy of the Ecuadorian State nowadays). Each dollar invested during 2014 in our protected areas, returned $9; a few investments from the public sector have reach this, that is why we work jointly with PSF to multiply efforts and visualize this contribution, in order to become a sustainable system and the best preserved in Latin America. The productive projects implemented in topics like community tourism, environmental education, ecological production, applied research, use of biodiversity, livestock management, recycling and sustainable fishing; that are part of the Competitive Funds Mechanism are running successfully, and are the best reflection of the fundamental role that protected areas have and their contribution to maintain biodiversity and the economic and social development of citizens. |
| GEF Operational Focal point | Highly Satisfactory | Highly Satisfactory | The projectÂ´s deadline has been extended until 2016 due to projectÂ´s positive cost effective regarding the resources invested in it and the achieved outcomes. This will allow to consolidate the processes developed in this project beneficiating the sustainability of protected areas. This project shows coherence between GEF and the Ecuadorian Government Strategy for the Transformation of theProductive and Energetic Matrixes, because of the key role played by protected areas through their contribution to biodiversity and ecosystems. The impact of the actions conducted by the Project of Financial Sustainability is reflected in the institutionalization of several legal instruments, in the strengthening of institutional and staff members from the Protected Area National System (SNAP in Spanish) capacities, to achieve conservation goals and in the active roles played by private and communitarian stakeholders at local level, in order to support the sustainable development of SNAP. |
| Other Partners | Highly Satisfactory | Highly Satisfactory | Between the PASNAP and the Financial Sustainability Project has an excellent communication flow and we focus our efforts in an active involvement within the protected areas, especially those that both projects have intervention as well as on other issues such as: institutional strengthening in the legal framework, concessions and the inclusion of the subsystems into the SNAP. Both projects have joint discussions forum at political and strategic level to strengthen the territorial work. The result of this forum is the achievement of the expected results and strategic partnerships to achieve cost-effective actions. |
| UNDP Technical Advisor | Satisfactory | Satisfactory | The project team continues to be strong and works efficiently under sound leadership. Implementation has maintained the upward improvement that can be seen both in the delivery of individual outputs and the increasing evidence of internal cohesion linking outputs of different Outcomes to collectively deliver increased impact. For example Protected Areas coordinators are being trained under outcome 2 in the used the PGOA methodology developed under Outcome 1. Studies under Outcome 3 are being used to advance policy and strategies under Outcome 1 etc. This is the result of careful planning and programing but also indicates the maturity of the project team and a sound command of the underlying principles of the project. Although the priority is implementation to ensure the completion of results prior to project end, efforts have been made to strengthen monitoring and to provide evidence of how project products are being used to create changes in cost efficiencies; in revenue generation and in policy for strengthening the sustainable finance of the expanded SNAP. One area that needs additional strengthening in monitoring is related to the MFC- competitive funding mechanism for community projects in PAs. At project design the underlying principle for this mechanism was to provide alternative incomes to those living in PAs and in doing so reduce the potential for unsustainable land uses in their bid to maintain livelihoods. In turn this should reduce PA management costs. The project has made efforts to ensure these projects are up and running this year so as to measure potential impacts before project end. In many cases the socio economic benefit is clear however the effect on reducing management costs, either through increasing revenue to the PA or by reducing threats and hence PA cost, is not as clear. In some cases the different elements are there but more work to assess the impact potential on the entire PA. For example it is clear that there is a direct return of the profits from the Old blue project in Tembladera to wetland protection (see DO tab) but what is the significance of this to management costs of the reserve? In the case of the Amazon Gourmet restaurant the project should improve the conservation of wildlife by reducing hunting for bushmeat thus complying with the biodiversity element of the MFC. It is not clear how that translates into reducing management costs of the Yasuni. In other cases the potential link to the MFC biodiversity criteria is not clear for example the case of the waste recycling by the AsociaciÃ³n de Recicladores de Orellana. Data on these aspects may well be available but the project needs to assess and present this more systematically to fully capture the benefits of this innovative approach. The RTA recognizes that as these MFC projects started later than originally expected it is unlikely that full cost and biodiversity benefits can be measured during the life of the project. Thus as part of the codifying the results the RTA suggests that the âtheory of changeâ be made more explicit for each MPC and that within this variables be identified that can be measured the life of the project and that would better support the supposition of an eventual contribution to PA management cost reduction and to biodiversity. In regards financial aspects, delivery at midyear including commitments was 45%. However cumulative delivery was 75% which is under the expected 85% at this stage in the revised project duration. Every effort should be made to increase delivery so as to complete the outstanding project interventions and allow sufficient time for systematizing and packaging the wealth of information and completing the measurement of changes achieved by this worthwhile project. The RTA is rating implementation as satisfactory which is lower than the CO and other partnerâs ratings. This is because Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the formally revised plan however Outcome 4 requires additional work on monitoring and the slightly low cumulative delivery rates will put pressure on the completion of the main project actions within the revised project duration. Also there is a risk of increasing demands on the project team because of Government spending restrictions which may reduce the capacities for project implementation. Moreover there is a critical operational risk related to the delay of legal permits for the construction of Centre and Tour Operator Marketing (CICOP). While the project is working to facilitate this (see risks) these permits will need to be obtained quickly if project funds are to co-finance the construction. Default on this would not only reduce project impact but also financial delivery as well as undermine the trust built up with private reserve owners. The RTA is confident that the project team and the well-oiled implementation procedures are strong enough to overcome these challenges and shortcomings. Because of this the RTA is not overriding the CO rating and as a result the overall rating for implementation is HS. This is well deserved especially considering the enormous challenges the project was experiencing in implementation only a few years ago. |

# G. Project Planning

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Key project milestone** | **Status** | **Original Planned Date (Month/Year)** | **Actual or Expected Date (Month/Year)** | **Comments** |
| **Inception Workshop** | **delayed/completed** | **July - 2010** | **July - 2011** | **Although the Project Document was signed and the commitment was made official , the project execution did not start immediately because the Project Management Unit was not hired. This was not because of lack of action. Rather a fully competitive process was undertaken and a coordinator selected. However the candidate did not accept the offer; the process was declared invalid as runners up were considered not to be fully suitable. A second competitive process was launched and successfully completed but a delay of over 6 months had already incurred. In addition as indicated in other tabs the long delay meant initial planning took longer than normal because of the need to adjust activities to the new context and reactivate the interest and understanding of the implementing partners from ten private reserves and community protected area.** |
| Mid-term Review | delayed/completed | 5 - 2013 | 3 - 2014 | The Project accomplished with the management response to the Mid-term Review Report |
| Terminal Evaluation | on schedule | May - 2015 | November - 2016 | The Project Steering Committee approved the request for an extension of time for the implementation of the project until November 2016, without a budget increase. This approval responds directly to the recommendations of the Mid-Term Rating, to comply all the objectives and proposed results. It will begin with the preparation of the Terms of Reference for the Terminal Evaluation Report |

# H. Critical Risk Management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Critical Risks Type(s) | Critical Risk Management Measures Undertaken in 2015 |
| Operational | A delay in obtainment of legal permits has occurred, for the construction of Centre and Tour Operator Marketing (CICOP). This delay had happened because the approval of the construction permit depends on other institutions. In order to get the permits for the construction of the CICOP, the Project working together with UNDP, Ministry of Environment and the CNBRPE had send official communications to several local institutions. This communications allow the project to lead some meetings with the College of Architects of Pichincha and the Metropolitan District of Quito which allows approvals procedures in less time. However we still working in order to get the final permit for construction of the CICOP. It is worthwhile to mention the collaboration and advice received by the Project of Physics Delimitation and Development of Sustainable Tourism for Heritage State Natural Areas of the Ministry of Environment in order to review all the architectural plans and the structural engineering of the CICOP before submitting them in the local entity for final approval. |

# I. Environmental and Social Grievances

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Related environmental or social issue |  |
| Status |  |
| Significance |  |
| Detailed description |  |

# J. Communicating Impact

|  |
| --- |
| Tell us the story of the project focusing on how the project has helped to improve peoples lives. |
| The Andean bear "Oso de Anteojos"ÂÂ, the jaguar, the Orchids, the Condor and other thousands of species of flora and fauna live in the cloud forest, in the Amazon, in the mountains and in the wetlands of Ecuador, which is the country with the highest biodiversity per unit of area in the world. Although the Ecuadorian State protects 20% of its territory under a Protected Area, these natural spaces are not free from deforestation, poaching, wildlife trade and various economic and production pressures that affect the natural resources. That is why it is essential to ensure the necessary resources to manage protected areas in an appropriate manner in order to conserve and preserve endangered species, animals, plants, and their active principles that can save us from diseases. Water is the mainly element that is provided by the highlands from Cayambe, Antisana, Chimborazo; among others. The objective of the Project of Financial Sustainability (PSF) for the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP), is to find the best way for protected territories to have all the inputs, resources, agreements and the adequate staff to deemed really protected areas. In these processes, local communities play a decisive role. As Rogelio GualavisiÂ­ from the community of Paquiestancia located on the Cayambe Coca National Park, said: "Before, our ancestors cut down trees to make carbon. Now we are planting native trees so there is water for our crops down here." In addition, of reforesting and managing organic farming, with the support of the Project, this community is finishing to build a tourist cabin that help to increase the number of young tourists coming from far away to know and share with the nature of Ecuador. Along with Rogelio, 20 other organizations that live near the protected areas, supported with the Project, are working in tourism, coffee, cocoa, organic vegetables. They have also learned how to fish so that does not end with this activity. Others are cultivating fish in fresh water. In Chimborazo, communities learn how to care and take the vicuna fiber from the vicuna a long neck beautiful animal that live high up in the mountains. Although the support of the communities living near the protected areas is very important to ensure the necessary care of resources. The contents of laws for the conservation and management of the protected areas are important in order to know how they should support the productive initiatives of the communities; so then the State should prioritize their finances in these issues, also with the support of the youth, civil society, private enterprises. In May 2015, the Project launched the publication of the Financial Sustainability Strategy for the National System of Protected Areas, in the presence of government authorities and partner organizations, as a tool that allows the implementation of several financial mechanisms for the economic sustainable development. This proposal includes a specialized computing platform that manages complete information of the protected areas, the official website (http://areasprotegidas.ambiente.gob.ec). The project along with several professional institutions, who know the subject, also presented technical documents that guide the administration and management of protected areas and works together with the Environmental Authority in the implementation of the training school for rangers and Responsible of the areas, that is called "Aula Verde". Finally, it is important to remark tht actions carried out by the project had an impact in various laws, many of which are already in effect. |
| What is the most significant change that has resulted from the project this reporting period? |
| In a digital world that bases its communications in the technology and virtual resources in order to strengthen the management, the Project for Financial Sustainability of Protected Areas contributes to the Ministry of Environment in consolidating results through the generation of tools that have allowed the Environmental Authority to plan, systematize and visualize their actions through monitoring for results. So, through the Biodiversity Information System (SIB) and its operating modules, it was standardized assessment tools for management effectiveness that generates tourist and technical information timely for the decision-making. The website of protected areas, integrate the Biodiversity Information System to generate reports of visits to protected areas. Moreover, it is a tool that makes visible the importance and value of the National System of Protected Areas to the stateâs economy and for the effective achievement of the objectives for conservation. Aldo this tool becomes crucial to planning the management mainly of the tourism sector. |
| Describe how the project supported South-South Cooperation and Triangular Cooperation efforts in the reporting year. |
| The Project of Financial Sustainability for Protected Areas has shared with other GEF projects in Latin America and the Caribbean, processes and management methods that have been useful to positioning the importance of their actions with the Ecuadorian State and the strategic actors. In fact, the communication strategy implemented in the Project had generate interest, mainly due to the construction of communication products such as the Newsletter called we Are the National System of Protected Areas (http://psfecuador.com/somos-snap-boletin-informativo/) press releases, publications and information that is shared on social networks. The project also participated in spaces for the exchange of experiences with representatives from Latin America working in the management of protected areas, as in the case of the Regional Course of tools for conservation that took place in Peru. |

# K. Partnerships

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Partners | Innovation and Work with Partners |
| Civil Society Organisations/NGOs | The usual meetings with the strategic partners are maintained: Conservation International (CI), The Nature Conservancy (IC), National Environmental Fund (FAN), National Forestry Corporation and Private Reserves of Ecuador (CNBRPE) and Tembladera Wetland communities to established synergies to work. Together with the Public and Popular Education Center (CEPP), Foundation Ecofondo and the German Cooperation Agency (GTZ) had been developed some academic modules like administrative, financial, executive coaching and the use of the annual operational management plan as part of the Training Professional Program , called Aula Verde. The organization Earth Day Network made an additional contribution to the Project (PSF) by US $ 160,184 to finance projects in the YasunÃ­ Biosphere Reserve under the actions for the models of sustainable income. In this way, the Recycling Association (ARO) of Orellana and the Association of Women Kichwas Challuwa Mikuna, were selected and the cooperation agreements are ready to be signed. CNBRPE signed some agreements. One with the German Foundation Schimtz for the implementation of Workshops under an innovating methodology called âMinga Tallerâ and other with the Ecuadorian Center for Environmental Biotechnology (CEBA) in order to develop training workshops in production methods. 19 organizations selected by the MFC are implementing the productive projects in coordination with the Responsible of the PA, under the technical support of the Corporation Ecopar. |
| Indigenous Peoples | The local organizations that are implementing the 20 projects that were selected by the MFC/PSF, have been consolidated, in particular those who demonstrate a clear institutional strengthening, including: CORDTUCH, Cortus, Tamboloma , ESPOCH, Kawsak Sacha and Quilotoa. The new local organizations from the YasunÃ­ Biosphere Reserve, are conformed by native population. In the coastal region, there is an important participation of afro Ecuadorian and montuvios population, for example representatives of Caimito Artelangosta (local organizations from Galera San Francisco Marine Reserve) and San Gregorio in Mache Chindul Ecological Reserve. The 20 projects selected by the MFC / PSF are conformed by this ethnic composition: 55% are indigenous, 5% are afro Ecuadorian and 40% are mestizos and montuvios. |
| Private Sector | To ensure the participation and commitment of the private reserves in the implementation of the Interpretation Centre and Tour Operator Marketing (CICOP), 21 environmental agreements were signed with the next reserves: Cedral, Centauro, Higueron, Bellavista, Dos Rios, Bella Maria, La Bocana, A Life, Intillacta, El Encuentro, El Rosario, Pambilino, Mangaloma, Guaycuyacu, Mashpi Shungo, Nueva Esperanza, La Guana, Quinde. |
| GEF Small Grants Programme | There is a close communication with the PPD to develop coordination and technical advice with the 20 projects supported by the Competitive Funding Mechanism. For example a project that finished already called Coordillera del Balsamo, was coordinated directly with this Program. The rest of the projects (19) use 2 tools which have been adapted from the Small Grants Program: SIMONA and the Manual with Financial Instructions. In addition, we supported and coordinated a publication of the National Waorani Women Association from the Ecuadorian Amazon (AMWAE), called âWeaving for Life ", a Guide of the waorani knowledge. |
| Other Partners | Register as effective counterpart Competitive Funding Mechanism to MAGAP, MINTUR, GAD, academy ESPOCH, FIDES, Heifer, among others. In order to consolidate a strong management for La Tembladera Wetland, many public entities of the central government are supporting this zone with technical advice. (MAE El Oro, SENAGUA, MINTUR, MAGAP, SecretarÃ­a Nacional de Riesgos. Other entities: GAD Provincial El Oro, Santa Rosa Municipal GAD, GAD Parroquial Bellavista, San Antonio and Jumon and 8 communities. The Technical University of Machala provides ongoing training support on issues related with wetland conservation studies in La Tembladera. In addition, the provincial government, through an interagency agreement with the Science Museum of Quito, developed research on birds, amphibians and reptiles of the wetland, the study estimated amount is USD 3.500. This study contributes to the preservation and promotion activities of the wetland. We worked jointly with the Ministry of Tourism (MINTUR) at: Patent of tourism, complementary services, films and photographs for commercial purposes. It was also prepared the launch of the website of protected areas under the Ecotourism and Sustainable Tourism International Conference held in April 2015, as a tool to strengthen the tourism and promotion of these natural spaces. The strategic alliances of the CNBRPE are: GAD Parroquial Nanegalito, Universidad Internacional SEK, Universidad Tecnologica Equinoccial, Universidad de Especialidades Turisticas, Escuela Superior Politecnica del Ejercito (ESPE), Programa de Voluntariado para la Ayuda de Accion Social (VASE), Programa de Voluntarios Frances |

# L. Progress toward Gender Equality

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Has a gender or social assessment been carried out this reporting period? | Was previously carried out |
| If a gender or social assessment has been carried out what where the findings? | In order to support the gender indicator its important to notice that the Board members of the CNBRPE counts with the participation of 3 women that allow them to participate in the decision making process. This space allows them to make strategic decision on the future of the organization. Additionally, CNBRPE was successfully represented by two women in international events (International Conference of Ecotourism and the United Nations Forum on Forests). ASOGROTEM is led by five women holding power positions of President, Vice President, Board members, Member of Surveillance and Administrator. In August, the board members, who directly affect the decision making and management of the organization, generated additional income for the economy of families. Additionally, out of 51 members of the ASOGROTEM 37.25% are women. The SNAP has 6 rangersÂâ¢ women and 16 women are managers of the protected areas equivalent to 32% of the total staff. |
| Does this project specifically target woman or girls as direct beneficiaries? | Yes |
| Please specify results achieved this reporting period that focus on increasing gender equality and improving the empowerment of women. | The 20 projects supported by the MFC / PSF have a direct stake of 55% women. Out of 20 projects 4 organizations have a stake greater than 65% of women in management: Caimito, Kawsay Andean Flower and Paquiestancia, which shows a clear female leadership. In February 2015, the PSF team, ECOPAR and the CNBRPE have received training by UN Women team on gender issues. As part of the SIMONA tool for monitoring, ECOPAR includes a qualitative gender analysis for each project where the degree of participation of women in decision-making, activities and the impact on the project is explored. |

General Comments

This target can be seen in the support to the publication âThe Guide for the development of handicrafts based on knowledge Waorani "Weaving for Life". This publication was carried out with the Association of Women of the Waorani Nationality of the Ecuadorian Amazon (AMWAE)

# M. Annex 1 - Ratings Definitions

**Development Objective Progress Ratings Definitions**

*Highly Satisfactory (HS):*  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'.

*Satisfactory (S):* Project is expected to achieve most of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.

*Moderately Satisfactory (MS):* 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.

*Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):* Project is expected to achieve of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives.

*Unsatisfactory (U):* Project is expected not to achieve most of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.

*Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):* The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, any of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

**Implementation Progress Ratings Definitions**

*Highly Satisfactory (HS):* Implementation of all components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as 'good practice'.

*Satisfactory (S):* Implementation of most components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only few that are subject to remedial action.

*Moderately Satisfactory (MS):* Implementation of some components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with some components requiring remedial action.

*Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):* Implementation of some components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with most components requiring remedial action.

*Unsatisfactory (U):* Implementation of most components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

*Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):* Implementation of none of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.