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# A. Basic Project and Finance Data

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Implementing Partner: | Ministerio de Ambiente  |
| GEF Focal Area: | Biodiversity |
| Country(ies) | (PAN) Panama |
| Project Start Date: | 31-Jan-2011 |
| Planned Project Closing Date: | 31-May-2014 |
| Revised Planned Closing Date: | 31-Dec-2016 |
| Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board meetings during reporting period: |  |
| Total GEF Grant (U$S) | $ 1,888,636 |
| GEF Grant Disbursed as of 30 June (U$S): | $ 962,066.50 |
| Total Co-financing (as planned in CEO endorsement request): | $ 2,675,000.00 |
| Overall Risk Rating | Moderate |
| Overall DO Rating | Moderately Unsatisfactory |
| Overall IP Rating | Moderately Unsatisfactory |

# B. Project Contacts and Links

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Partner | Contact Name | Email Address |
| Project Coordinator / Manager |  |  |
| UNDP Country Office Programme Officer | Jessica Young | jessica.young@undp.org |
| Project Implementing Partner | Zuleika PinzÃ²n  | zpinzon@miambiente.gob.pa |
| GEF Operational Focal Point | Elba Cortes  | ecortes@miambiente.gob.pa |
| Other Partners | IvÃ n Flores | iflores@arap.gob.pa |
| UNDP Technical Adviser |  Santiago Carrizosa | santiago.carrizosa@undp.org |
| UNDP Programme Associate |  Edwin Chipsen | edwin.chipsen@undp.org |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project website, etc. | http://www.pa.undp.org/content/panama/es/home/operations/projects/environment\_and\_energy/conservacion\_biodiversidad\_archipielagos.html |
| Links to media coverage | â¢ http://www.panamaamerica.com.pa/provincias/las-perlas-dejo-de-ser-paraiso-para-los-pescadores-del-area â¢ http://www.panamaagro.com/noticias/ultima-hora/860-islenos-en-panama-integran-la-conservacion-de-la-biodiversidad.html â¢ http://laestrella.com.pa/vida-de-hoy/planeta/islenos-integran-conservacion-biodiversidad-turismo/23779161 â¢ http://www.undp.org/content/undp/fr/home/ourwork/ourstories/panama--islanders-integrate-biodiversity-conservation.html |

# C. Project Summary

The main objective of a GEF intervention would respond to the needs identified in the Diagnosis document, and are aligned with national policies. GEF resources would be sought to cover the incremental costs of overcoming barriers that currently impede productive sectors (tourism, fisheries, local farming) in the ALP mainstreaming biodiversity conservation practices in their actions. The intervention will also include the creation of strictly protected areas in two of the most critical habitats of ALP.

The project will work with the Environment National Authority, Panamanian Institute of Tourism, the Panamanian Maritime Authority (Fisheries), the Ministry of Land & Cattle Development (Agriculture), and the Ministry of Commerce and Industry (Mining), and the local governments, to overcome barriers that currently impede the incorporation of biodiversity conservation in their practices. In light of the continued economic constraints in Panama and the pressures for fast conventional tourism development, and continued unsustainable fisheries practices, without the support of GEF it is unlikely that these barriers will be fully overcome, and an opportunity for encouraging biodiversity-friendly development in an area of outstanding global significance will be lost.

# 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 | Biodiversity (BD) conservation is integrated into the fisheries, tourism and property development sectors that operate in the archipelagos of Panama. | -Degree of compliance of regulations for number and size of boats in LPA and Kuna Yala. | Ã¢Â¢ Decree Law No. 17 of July 9, 1959 \\\"by which fishing is regulated and also approves the export of fishery products in the Republic of Panama, and regulates tonnage for small-scale fisheries. Ã¢Â¢ Executive Decree 124 of November 8, 1990 establishes the obligation of obtaining the permit of fishing. Ã¢Â¢ There are no regulations to set number of boats only to set the size. | At least 75% compliance. | Ã¢?Â¢ Based on the Executive Decree 124 the registry of boats within the LPA was updated, to help ARAP with this information. Ã¢?Â¢ Through this activity fishermen were allowed to update their fishing permits. Ã¢?Â¢ 35 fishing boats renew their permits. The rest of the boats have been carrying out their procedures in the ARAP offices in Panama City. Ã¢?Â¢ The PIU is working with ARAP in the implementation of the Monitoring Plan for Las Perlas Archipelago. Ã¢?Â¢ In the case of Guna Yala actually there is a regulation called: Ã¢??Rules governing tourism activities in Kuna Yala and create the Secretariat of tourism affairsÃ¢?Â. Through this rule tourism activities in the area are regulated for boats and touristic yachts. These rules where approved by the General Congress. Ã¢?Â¢ The PIU send to the Kuna General Congress through the official way (Instituto de InvestigaciÃ³n y Desarrollo de Kuna Yala Ã¢?? IIDIKY), a formal letter in order to present the actions of the project in Guna Yala Archipelago. However, no answer has been received up to date. | Ã¢?Â¢ The project established a strategic alliance with Conservation International (CI) for the preparation of the LPA fisheries plan. Ã¢?Â¢ The foregoing in order to set up a spatial database on landings data to define the number and size of vessels based on the current stock. Ã¢?Â¢ The plan began in October 2013. Results are expected by the end of 2014, because statistics will be obtained through CI partners up to August 2014 (approx) and the project has agreed to gather information for the remaining months to complete 12 months of analysis. Subsequently, ARAP will assume this process for sustainability and maintenance of the database and information analysis. Ã¢?Â¢ A response was received from the Guna Yala Congress in the Kuna Yala area.. Three meetings were held to organize and perform the actions in the fisheries and tourism components. Ã¢?Â¢ The project proposed starting the activities to determine the number and size of fishing vessels to the representatives designated by the Guna Yala Congress. Field observations indicate that few large cargo vessels are expected. | ? Conservation International has fiinished the technical document titled "Comprehensive Base Study for Managing Fishing Resources in the ALP." The study contains relevant information about the number of fishermen, fishing sites, the species caught and the sizes. ? The study reports that the community of San Miguel (ALP) has boats that are between 16 and 22 feet long. In Esmeralda they range from 16 to 24 feet in overall length. There are no regulations that set boat dimensions. The only thing considered for classifying boats is the tonnage. ? In GunaYala, they generally use sail boats or dugouts. There are no regulations defined for the dimensions. More than 10 years of information exists about boats related to lobster fishing. ? The mid-term evaluation considered removing this indicator because it disorients the PIU. |
|  |  | Percentage of boats using buoys to reduce coral damage in LPA and Kuna Yala. | No buoys in LPA and only a few in Kuna Yala with low % of use. Ã¢Â¢ Actually there are 18 buoys that were located in the LPA through a strategic alliance between STRI/IC and Ancon and they were placed in the year 2011. Ã¢Â¢ In the case de of Guna Yala there is no information | 80% or more compliance of boats using buoys. | Ã¢Â¢ A field trip to verify the existence of the buoys was done and it was found that from the 18 buoys initially installed 4 are lost probably due to the lack of surveillance and maintenance. Ã¢Â¢ The field trip was also used to verify the geographical reference of these buoys. Ã¢Â¢ There are 12 boats involved in the whale watching activity and other kind of touristic activities. It was proved during this field trip that all this boats use the buoys. Ã¢Â¢ There are also 6 ships that work in coasting trade and sometimes they use the buoys if there is bad weather. This is because they mainly stop at the main communities of the LPA. Ã¢Â¢ Actions will be taken to install the buoys that are missing. These will be bigger in size to allow bigger ships to use them. Ã¢Â¢ The definition of a maintenance plan will be included. | Ã¢Â¢ A plan to monitor the use of buoys by ARAP in Las Perlas Archipelago is being prepared and will be key in deterermining the level of compliance. Ã¢Â¢ Specific areas where the buoys can be placed are being analyzed in conjunction with the representatives designated by the Guna Yala Congress in the Kuna Yala area. Ã¢Â¢ The missing buoys were not installed and the maintenance plan was not prepared. This was considered in this way because ARAP states that it cannot finance long term maintenance. The assignment of new buoys by the programme will in turn increase the costs of the latter plan. Nevertheless, the project considered financing a study to be able to generate their own resources for subsistence of the new buoys. |  The PIU coordinated monitoring with the ARAP Division of Inspection, Oversight, and Control to verify the use of buoys. However, the reports sent do not show any results for boats and/or yachts anchored at the established buoys. GunaYala has buoys to protect biodiversity, located at Islas Tigre, NarganÃ¡, Agwanusadub, and Niadub. The mid-term evaluation considered eliminating this indicator because there is no buoy manager. No maintenance is given to them. The location was not assessed. |
|  |  | Number of turtle nesting beaches and their quality as habitat for turtles across 33,000 hectares in LAP and 218,000 ha in Kuna Yala | 37 beaches in LPA good habitat for turtles. To be determined for Kuna Yala. Ã¢Â¢ For Guna Yala Archipelago turtle nesting beaches were identified in the document called Action Plan for the Protection of the Caribbean Sea Turtle. | Ã¢Â¢ 37 beaches in LPA good habitat for turtles. | Ã¢Â¢ During the field trips made by the PIU in the coastal areas of the LPA (beaches) it was observed that there are no current real estate projects affecting the existing nesting beaches. Ã¢Â¢ As immediate actions workshops for the protection and conservation of marine turtles were carried out to create awareness in the communities and school children about the ecological role of this specie. Ã¢Â¢ Two workshops were given. One in the LPA and the other in the Bocas del Toro Archipelago. As a result of these workshops the group for the conservation and protection of marine turtles was created and it counts with the participation of La Esmeralda community members. | Ã¢Â¢ The project participates in conjunction with ARAP in raising awareness workshops for the protection of marine turtles at the Armila Community in Guna Yala. As a result, community awareness was raised with regard to the protection of marine turtles and georeferencing nesting beaches . Ã¢Â¢ ARAP is carrying out monitoring and surveillance activities in turtle-nesting beaches, No disruptiive actions are been reported. Nesting beaches are in good conditions. |  ARAP and international organizations carry out the process to mark sea turtles in the ALP. ARAP, with the support of its counterpart and of the Ministry of the Environment participates in the First Hawksbill Turtle Project Campaign to determine the presence and abundance of the Hawksbill Turtle (Eretmochelysimbricata) in the Coiba National Park. Inspection and oversight actions were carried out by ARAP to monitor the hectares of nesting beaches for sea turtles in the ALP. This year there were no changes in the established beach areas. The mid-term evaluation considered eliminating this indicator because it is part of the Las Perlas management plan. |
|  |  | Reduction in hectares of forest and mangrove deforested by residential projects in LPA. | 1400 ha of mangrove remaining and annual deforestation rate of 1% (70% forest cover in 2000). | Net deforestatrion rates zero due to residential projects. | Ã¢Â¢ Under the frame of the UN-REDD Project actually executed by ANAM a preliminary map of vegetation cover (including mangroves ecosystem in the LPA) has been elaborated. This map will be validated in field by that project and the results will be helpful to analyze and report the rate of deforestation in the ALP. | Ã¢Â¢ As pointed out by ARAP, no new environmental impact studies have been received for real estate and/or tourism development projects at Las Perlas Archipelago. Ã¢Â¢ ARAP carries out monitoring inspections to verify mangrove swamp cutting at ALP. No impact from mangrove swamp cutting is reported. Ã¢Â¢ The UNREDD programme prepared the forest cover map (including mangrove swamps) for the Republic of Panama for the year 2014. The project team participated in the workshops to validate the results of the forest (mangroves) cover maps. http://www.anam.gob.pa/index.php/article-categories/direccion-gestion-integradas-de-cuencas-hidrograficas/2014-06-24-14-09-32 |  ARAP does monitoring inspections to check the mangrove cutting in the ALP. ARAP is waiting for official information from UNN-REDD to establish whether the forest and mangrove coverage in the ALP has been deforested or not. The change in management by the new Minister of the Environment implied reviewing all the actions in the methodology and the results. Therefore, there are still no official figures. The project has held meetings with the project managers. |
|  |  | Lobster harvesting respects minimum catch size within the 136,000 ha of LPA marinescape. | All sizes caught. | All catch size above minimum size. | Ã¢Â¢ The PIU supports ARAP in the elaboration of a new Decree proposal Ã¢by which measures for the management, sustainable use and putting in order Lobster fisheries in the jurisdictional waters of the Republic of Panama are establishedÃ¢Â. Ã¢Â¢ This new proposal includes minimum size for the catches of lobsters in the Pacific Ocean were no regulations exist. Ã¢Â¢ This new proposal was based on scientific evidence obtained by ARAP through the monitoring of Pacific Lobster. Ã¢Â¢ This proposal will be presented to all the sectors involved in the activity to obtain their incomes. Once discussed and approved by all the parts it will be raised as a national legislation. Ã¢Â¢ A first workshop focused on the Caribbean Lobster was carried out in Bocas del Toro Archipelago. It was directed to fishermen and it aimed to raise awareness about the biology, capture, statistics, preservation, and studies about the current states of Caribbean lobsters. | Ã¢Â¢ A workshop was held at LPA addressing lobster fishermen and sales people to present and discuss the proposal that establishes the management and sustainable lobster catch. Ã¢Â¢ Findings at the Bocas del Toro and Las Perlas archipelago were incorporated into the proposal and it was presented to the Legal Advisory Department at ARAP and it is currently awaiting approval for forwarding to the Executive Branch. The new administration is expected to re-address this and it may be elevated to the executive branch. Ã¢Â¢ The proposed decree sets the minimum size for lobster catch for the Panulirus gracilis species (122 milimeters from head to tail). |  There is a draft of the decree on zoning, fishing, and marketing lobster in the jurisdictional areas in the Republic of Panama. ARAP spent 9 months without a General Manager, which stopped it from taking the budget to the Executive area. The project will provide continuity for the new recently designated authorities. (February 2014) for the proposal to be raised to the level of an Executive Decree and be sanctioned. |
|  |  | Increase in financial contributions from tourism, property development and fishing sectors in collaborative conservation management models in Bocas, Kuna Yala, LPA and Coiba archipelagos. | In 2009 property developers who are members of CRSIP spent $60,000 in the LPA on activities related to improving waste management, environmental education and other activities desgned to reduce negative impacts on biodiversity. A further $60,000 was generated in 2008 from tourism for Kuna Yala government, but this was not invested in conservation management. Tourism in Coiba (ANAM lodge) and in Bocas (to e.g. BSTA memebership) generated an undetermined though likely low amount from tourism, some of which has been invested in conservation management. The amounts generated are well below the estimated costs of managing the sector Â´s activities sustainably (Threshold of Sustainability). There are currently no other flows of finance from these sectors to conservation. | Financial contributions cover 50% of threshold of sustainability (covered by annual license fees, taxes, etc). | Ã¢Â¢ Currently the contributions to Environmental issued have been done by the commitments of the developers under what has been declared in the EIA. Ã¢Â¢ There are no institutional mechanisms to obtain revenues from tax receipts, licenses and other rates that may revert to the protection of biodiversity and environment. Ã¢Â¢ The PIU will manage a study to establish the mechanism that can help the way that this earns can revert to conservation issues. If approved by the institutions involved it will be raised as a national legislation. As an example of the actual reality, the PEARL ISLAND project pledged USD $300,000 for execution in the LPA, for 2013. However this income has been used mainly for communitarian actions and in general terms for conservation awareness. | Ã¢Â¢ The consultancy for channeling municipal taxes to promote and increment the financial contributions made for the conservation of biodiversity at LPA is been designed and will be carried out in the second half of 2014. |  The project set up a strategic alliance with CI as support to establish the mechanisms to collect taxes or municipal fees that may be applied to promote and increase the financial contributions to conserve the ALP's biodiversity. A specialist (Environmental Economist) was hired. The specialist held a workshop to raise awareness for the project's partners about financial mechanisms that may be implemented to protect the biodiversity in the ALP. Some 20 partners participated in the event As a result of this workshop, some financial mechanisms identified in the PRODOC were not considered as being a priority for execution in the initial phase, such as the Habitat Banking case. It should be emphasized that short-term fees and rates were established. There is a strategic alliance to establish the mechanisms to collect taxes or municipal fees that may be applied to promote and increase the financial contributions to conserve the ALP's biodiversity. |
|  |  |  |  | At least 75% compliance |  |  |  |
| Outcome 1 | Cost- effective market-based instruments and improved investment opportunities for biodiversity Ã¢ friendly tourism and fisheries developed and promoted in the Archipelago of Las Perlas (LPA) | Ã¢Â¢There are currently products of ecotourism in the LPA directed to whale-watching, beach tourism and snorkel offered by a company (Coral Dreams) | None | 10 products. | Two new product were identified: Ã¢?Â¢ Town tourism Ã¢?Â¢ Touristic experience in the accompaniment of small scale fishing. These new products will impact in a positive way in the following communities: Ã¢?Â¢ La Ensenada, Ã¢?Â¢ La Guinea, Ã¢?Â¢ San Miguel, Ã¢?Â¢ La Esmeralda Ã¢?Â¢ Casaya. In this way the touristic activities will not only be concentrated in Contadora Island and will impact on the development of the communities mentioned above and its people. Ã¢?Â¢ A document that describes the three touristic products identified with the hotels last year plus two new touristic products that includes the rest of the LPA island has been elaborated by the PIU. Ã¢?Â¢ This document was used as a reference by the expert in charge of the Chain of Value Consultancy | A consultant was hired to increase capacities of stakeholders in value chain for tourism development at Las Perlas archipelago obtaining the following results: Ã¢?Â¢ Trained key LPA stakeholders and project partners on the concept and strategies for implementation of the value chain and experiences in the region. Ã¢?Â¢ Identified community- based initiatives (ventures) and stakeholders with potential for integration into the value chain. Ã¢?Â¢ Strategic Plan and methodology for integrating of LPA community initiatives into the value chain developed. Ã¢?Â¢ Began the process of structuring and integrating the value chain focusing on LPA tourism. | In the ALP, three tourism products are operating. 1. Cetaceans were sighted, which is carried out by the Whale Watching company in conjunction with the Hotel The Point. They are working to raise awareness and also educate the boat people on good practices for whale watching. The packages they offer includes a 3-hour tour from Contadura: They work with a local boat owner, normally from Saboga, and with a Panamanian guide, foreigners, and biologists who guide the tour. They have prepared an educational guide that they use on the tours to educate and raise the awareness of tourists about the importance of conserving whales. The price is $50. A full one-day tour from Contadora: The tour departs from Contadora on a catamaran sailboat and lasts a full day. It also includes food. There is a biologist and they also work with a guide. The price is $150. Tour from Panama City. The tour departs in a yacht from Panama City and does not include food. The price is $200. The tour stops for lunch at one of the restaurants in Contadora. 2. The Beach Tourism project is associated with hotels and tour operators. This project has consolidated with the two ferry lines (the "Las Perlas Sea" ferry) that visit most of the islands in the ALP and OFFER BEACH TOURS TO THE TOURISTS. 3. Snorkeling: Associated with various tour operators, where the Coral Dreams stands out, snorkeling packages are offered to tourists that visit Contadora Island. 4. The project will develop actions to strengthen these tourism products and other products that are currently being consolidated that currently occur sporadically in the ALP. The actions are focused on supporting organized entrepreneurs with the support of the ALP to train staff and provide technical guidance for the products. |
|  |  | Number of buyers of certified ecotourism and sustainable tourism products. | None | 10 certified business (with others in process) having made 1,000 sales in total to Panama based tour operators as well as international companies. | Ã¢Â¢ Panama Tourism Authority (ATP) has considered as an initial phase the implementation of trainings aimed to the tourism certification in order to improve the service quality offered by tourist companies in the country. Ã¢Â¢ This consideration adopted by ATP motivated the adjustments to the TORS prepared by the PIU, to perform training in best practices of sustainable tourism excluding international certifications (ie, the ones emitted by Rainforest Alliance). Ã¢Â¢ With the support of ATP, Empresa Integra and the PIU, the first training about the image and quality of touristic services was carried out. The same was directed to hotel and restaurant owners as an introduction on subjects of sustainable tourism\'s best practices. A total of 50% of the touristic enterprises of the LPA were trained (Hotels, Restaurants, Tour guides). Ã¢Â¢ It was necessary for the PIU to know more prior to the implementation of training in best practices of sustainable tourism, about the perception of this sector and for this purpose two workshops were held. One in the LPA and the other in Bocas del Toro archipelago, resulting in the acceptance of the implementation of the trainings in best practices of sustainable tourism in both Archipelagos. | UNDP did some consultations with UNDP Costa Rica and the World Tourism Organization on experiences related to environmental certifications issued by Rainforest Alliance or similar groups, their applicability and their cost-effectiveness. After these consultations, the project actions will be oriented towards accreditation of good practices in tourism and not to the international certification. Accreditations are carried out with the support of organizations with experience, and is more cost efficient. The project will promote the incorporation of best practices by tourism operators and local communities, and provide the technical support so they can then obtain the accreditation. |  The project hired a specialist in Good Sustainable Tourism Practices to train the company and tour operators in the ALP and the Bocas del Toro Archipelago (Isla ColÃ³n and Isla Carenero). Training was provided to 11 companies in the Las Perlas Archipelago; and to 18 companies in the Bocas del Toro Archipelago (Isla ColÃ³n, Carenero, Bastimentos) on Good Sustainable Tourism Practices. The training session included the following contents: Sustainable design, the use of potable water, use of electricity, environmental interpretation, handling the impact by visitors, and establishing financial mechanisms to protect biodiversity. There is a strategic plan to implement the environmental credits in the La Perlas and Bocas del Toro (Isla Carenero, Bastimentos, and Isla ColÃ³n) archipelagos. Formal work was done with the ALP through the tourism quality and culture department to coordinate the development of outstanding tasks pertaining to future certifications for good practices. |
|  |  | Voluntary standards adopted by cruise ship operators and residential developers in LPA. | None | - All cruise ships operating in LPA have adopted the standards. - 50% of residential developments have adopted voluntary standards. | The PIU elaborates the terms of reference for the recruitment of the consulting firm that will train, implement and certify the ships under a sustainable management structure. | Performed consulting work referred to as Ã¢Rules for the Protection of Biodiversity linked to Tourism and Real Estate Development in the Las Perlas Archipelago, Balboa District, Panama ProvinceÃ¢Â and obtained the following drafts: Ã¢Â¢ Rules on Waste Handling and Disposal at LPA in order to ensure complete and efficient collection of all types of waste. Ã¢Â¢ General prohibitions for the protection of LPA biodiversity in order to guaranty conservation of the Las Perlas Archipelago Biodiversity. Ã¢Â¢ Proposed rules for establishing building architectural height and design, in order to regulate building heights, as well as architectural design for conservation of biodiversity at Las Perlas Archipelago, its surrounding areas and the natural resources associated with the landscape. Ã¢Â¢ The PIU will undertake actions to divulge to the ARAP, ATP and ANAM, key LPA stakeholders and the Municipality regarding the rules prepared. | The PIU sent the project partners (ARAP, ATP, ANAM) the proposed regulations to protect biodiversity linked to real estate development to disclose the regulations and to later provide a joint analysis to have them approved. Coordination was set up with MIVIOT around the land zoning regulations on the coasts and the insular territory that was advanced by the territorial research division. |
|  |  | % of local community enterprises that have received certification in best practices for sustainable tourism in LPA | 0 | 50% of local communities businesses (handicraft, boat tours, hostelsm guides, etc) | Ã¢Â¢ More or less 14 boat owners involved in whale-watching activities were identified and they have the potential to be organized in the near future. Ã¢Â¢ Coordination with institutions as ATP, ANAM, and ARAP have been done in order to carry out the planning of whale watching which involves training and obtaining the relevant permits. Ã¢Â¢ With these processes it is expected to make the arrangements for relevant certifications. Ã¢Â¢ There are also private initiatives that are carried out in the activity of snorkeling that will also receive training. | Ã¢Â¢ Held a training workshop on successful ecotourism experiences in island areas of the LPA, it targeted community-based stakeholders to orient them on the development of small tourism enterprises. Ã¢Â¢ A product of the workshop was the identification of several ecotourism initiatives that may be developed at LPA. Ã¢Â¢ UNDP did some consultations with UNDP Costa Rica and the World Tourism Organization on experiences related to environmental certifications issued by Rainforest Alliance or similar groups, their applicability and their cost-effectiveness. After these consultations, the project actions will be oriented towards accreditation of good practices in tourism and not to the international certification. Accreditations are carried out with the support of organizations with experience, and is more cost efficient. Ã¢Â¢ The project will promote the incorporation of best practices by tourism operators and local communities, and provide the technical support so they can then obtain the accreditation. Ã¢Â¢ In this regard the project is preparing the TOR to define the scope of the consulting work because of its high cost and the project does not have sufficient resources for international accreditation on sustainable tourism best practices at all archipelagos in all tourist areas. With this the implementation draft that had already been prepared is now complete. However it became necessary to know what was happening in the region or how it was implemented and the costs. |  The value chain integration study identified the tourism businesses or companies with a community base that may be developed in Las Perlas Archipelago. These tourism businesses are: Cultural Show, Environmental Education through Children's Puppetry, Fruit Processing and Tourist Circuits to Las Perlas Archipelago. For each community tourism business identified in the ALP, its chain of value is structured and the tourism business is described. Students in the tourism career program were trained in San Miguel Cabecera and Pedro Gonzales so they would learn the theoretic bases for tourism planning, view practical examples of resources, attractions, and tourism products from other tourist destinations in the world whose characteristics are similar to the ALP's characteristics. The different types of jobs in tourism and community tourism companies that may be created to satisfy the domestic and international demand for tourism were also shown. There is a strategic plan to promote and market the tourist products. |
|  |  | % of fishing vessels working under a sustainable management scheme in LPA. | 0 | 0.5 | The first workshop on Ecosystem Approach to Fisheries (EAF) was carried out in the community of La Esmeralda (Isla del Rey) in the Archipelago of Las Perlas. It was directed to small scale fishermen of the cooperative COOPERLAS, and its main subject was the conservation of marine ecosystems, as the foundation to ensure a future to their fisheries. There are 30% of fishermen\'s boats that work under a sustainable management structure. Almost 90% of small scale fishermen use methods considered environmentally friendly (long line). | Ã¢Â¢ The project has a strategic alliance with Conservation International (CI) participating in the preparation of the LPA fisheries plan. Ã¢Â¢ The foregoing in order to set up a spatial database on landings data to define the number and size of vessels based on the current stock. Ã¢Â¢ The plan began in October 2013. Results are expected by the end of 2014, because statistics will be obtained through CI partners up to August 2014 approximately and the project has agreed to develop the information gathering activities for the remaining months to complete 12 months of analysis. Subsequently, ARAP will assume this process for sustainability and maintenance of the database and information analysis. Ã¢Â¢ PIU participated in the workshop on Ã¢Alternatives for the improvement of aquicultural production through genetic management, pearl farming, use of prebiotics and bio active agentsÃ¢Â under the framework of the Mexico-Panama international technical and scientific cooperation programme, for future development of a Co-Management programme at LPA. Ã¢Â¢ ARAP, PIU and the Mexico-Panama Cooperation Programme endorsed an agreement for a feasibility study on re-populating the Conchuela at LPA. Ã¢Â¢ The TOR are in place for hiring a fisheries extensionist to support the application in the field of sustainable pilot fishing regimes. |  The Project hired a fishing extension worker to implement co-management systems in Las Perlas Archipelago. Studies are underway to identify the potential areas to implement the co-management projects in the ALP. The result is that the Casaya community will be the initial implementation site. The study results were presented to the key stakeholders (fishermen) and project partners. Two co-management projects were defined: oysters and shrimp. The shrimp fattening project in floating cages has been installed in the community of Casaya. A total of 14,000 post-larva have been seeded. Fifteen artisanal fishermen in the ALP participated. The idea is to support fishermen to improve their economic and social life. |
|  |  | Annual amount of credits placed in small and medium community enterprises to develop BD-friendly businesses. | None | $200,000 in small grants and $500,000 in bank credits. | Ã¢Â¢ AMPYME identified 11 small community business initiatives in San Miguel (Isla del Rey). Ã¢Â¢ These initiatives are: o Refreshment shops o Kiosks o Beauty parlors o Restaurants. Ã¢Â¢ These initiatives aimed at strengthening community-based tourism activities that would help the integration of the community. Ã¢Â¢ Initiatives like this will be moved to other communities of LPA. Ã¢Â¢ An estimated seed capital of $800.00/project is estimated by AMPYME. | Ã¢Â¢ PIU prepared the TOR for the business and development plan for the labor force in the sustainable fishing and tourism sectors to strengthen local Las Perlas Archipelago communities in order to establish community projects. Ã¢Â¢ The only fishing organization at LPA is COOPERLAS and has obtained support thought the SGP (USD25,000) to build the refrigerated storage faciltiy. The project is monitoring this initiative and supporting the grantee in strengthening its leadership capcity. |  The Project has already identified the tourism and fishing businesses in the ALP. However, no credits have been given yet since they must be structured to be submitted for consideration for the PPD program. The mid-term evaluation considered removing this indicator. |
| Outcome 2 | Improved sectoral policies and regulations that enable mainstreaming BD conservation into the tourism, fisheries and property development operations in the Archipelagos of Panama. | Enactment of specific legislation for tourism and property development in islands to reduce impacts on biodiversity. | None. There is the law N Âº 2 of January 7, 2006, that regulates concessions for tourism investment and the alienation of island territory for purposes of its tourist exploitation and teaches other provisions. Decreto Ejecutivo No. 85 de 19 de Julio de 2006 Ã¢Que reglamenta la ley n Âº 2 de 7 de enero de 2006, que regula las concesiones para la inversiÃÂ³n turÃÂ­stica y la enajenaciÃÂ³n del territorio insular para fines de su aprovechamiento turÃÂ­stico y dicta otras disposiciones. LEY 80 de 8 de noviembre de 2012, G.O. 27159-A Ã¢Que dicta normas de incentivos para el fomento de la actividad turÃÂ­stica en PanamÃÂ¡Ã¢Â | Norm implemented. | The project has elaborated the terms of reference for the recruitment of a specialist that will define the rules for the protection and conservation of biodiversity in the Archipelagos of Panama, considering touristic and real state activities. In Guna Yala\'s case, a regulation for touristic activities is already in place. | Performed consulting work referred to as Ã¢??Rules for the Protection of Biodiversity linked to Tourism and Real Estate Development in the Las Perlas Archipelago, Balboa District, Panama ProvinceÃ¢?Â and obtained the following drafts: Ã¢?Â¢ Rules on Waste Handling and Disposal at LPA in order to ensure complete and efficient collection of all types of waste. Ã¢?Â¢ General prohibitions for the protection of LPA biodiversity in order to assure conservation of the Las Perlas Archipelago Biodiversity. Ã¢?Â¢ Regulations for architectural design (including building height) to promote biodiversity conservation at Las Perlas Archipelago, its surrounding areas and management guidelines for the natural resources associated with the landscape. Ã¢?Â¢ The PIU will share the drafts prepared among ARAP, ATP and ANAM, key LPA stakeholders and the Municipality representatives to promote their improvement and adoption. | The project partners (ARAP, ATP, ANAM) were sent the Regulations for Protecting Biodiversity Linked to Tourism and Real Estate Development in Las Perlas Archipelago, the District of Balboa, the Province of Panama. Coordination was set up with MIVIOT around the land zoning regulations on the coasts and the insular territory that was advanced by the territorial research division. |
|  |  | Enactment of new regulations for fisheries to regulate impacts on biodiversity | - None for sport fishing - Current regulation for spiny lobster leaves gaps for adequate management. - Se cuenta con el Plan de Manejo para la langosta del Caribe. -There is the resolution No.2 of February 16, 2012 \\\\\\\\\\\\\\\"which prohibits the sale and marketing of species obtained from sport fishingÃ¢Â. | Both regulations implemented. | 1. The project management unit and ARAP carried out a workshop in Coronado from the 20 to the 24 of May, 2013. It resulted on the Proposal of the Decree \"By which there has been established the measures for ordering, management and sustainable use of the Lobster in the jurisdictional waters of the Republic of Panama\". 2. The first workshop focused on Lobster in the Archipelago of Bocas del Toro was carried out. It was directed to fishermen, and it aimed to raise awareness about the biology, capture, statistics, preservation and studies about the current state of the Lobster. 3. In addition ARAP has a legislation proposal for the licensing of sport fishing which will allow the management of sport fishing vessels. | Ã¢Â¢ A workshop was held at LPA addressing lobster fishermen and sales people to present and discuss the proposal that establishes the management and sustainable lobster catch. Ã¢Â¢ Findings at the Bocas del Toro and Las Perlas archipelago were incorporated into the proposal and it was presented to the Legal Advisory Department at ARAP and it is currently awaiting approval for forwarding to the Executive Branch. The new administration is expected to re-address this and it may be elevated to the executive branch. Ã¢Â¢ The proposed decree sets the minimum size for lobster catch for the Panulirus gracilis species (122 milimeters from head to tail). |  The PIU and ARAP worked jointly on the proposal that establishes the measures for zoning, management, and sustainable use of lobster in the Republic of Panama's jurisdictional waters. It was agreed to by the fishermen and reviewed by the ARAP's legal advisor. It was not promulgated since the ARAP had no manager for a period of 9 months. This is the key person for the proposed regulation to be upheld by the Executive Branch and sanctioned. As for sport fishing, the past administration was not interested in zoning it. The project will continue to make an effort for this new administration to allow the regulations to be prepared |
|  |  | Enactment of specific regulations on marinas, boating, anchoring and access to islands. | The Republic of Panama has the Law N Â° 56 of August 6, 2008 Ã¢General Law of Panama PortsÃ¢Â | Norm implemented. | The country counts with the Law 56 of August 6, 2008 Ã¢General Law of PortsÃ¢Â. Currently, the project team is gathering secondary information about the current state of the marinas and the regulations relating the size of the ships. | The proposals contained in the LPA Management Plan are been analyzed and in conjunction with key partners, tors will be prepared to propose the regulations for anchoring and access to the islands. |  |
|  |  | -EIA guidelines include more stringent standards to measure impacts on biodiversity. | Existing EIA guidelines. | New guidelines enforced. | There was a meeting in the Direction of Environmental Evaluation and Ordering, of the National Environment Authority (ANAM), with the purpose to obtain information about the strategic environmental evaluation and implementation of more strict regulations to measure the impacts to biodiversity and have secondary information of this environmental tool. The ANAM has already made studies on the subject through consultants. We count with a Regulation Proposal for the implementation of the environmental strategic evaluation and a handbook of procedures. As a result of the meeting it has been considered necessary to organize an inter-institutional workshop to discuss the applicability of the new concept and afterwards hire a consultant for the implementation of the EEA that has the ANAM in the LPA. Currently, the terms of reference for the recruitment of a specialist are being done. | Ã¢Â¢ A consultant was hired to conduct an introductory workshop on strategic environmental assessment. Ã¢Â¢ TORS have been prepared to identify what are the requirements to implement the strategic environmental assessment in the area. |  The last ANAM administration was not interested in adopting guidelines that contained stricter standards for the projects in the coastal marine areas. They thought that they contained standards that were too difficult to meet. ARAP continues using them to do the evaluations for the environmental impact studies for the marine coastal areas. The project will make an effort with the new Minister of the Environment to make the pertinent adjustments and figure out whether these standards will be adopted or not. |
|  |  | -Habitat banking system established as a way to improve the protection of forests and other ecosystems. | None. | 50% of compliance with zoning regulations involves habitat banking or similar scheme. | There\'s little knowledge about the Habitat Banking concept and its implementation, from the level of the environment\'s executing unit just as other matters. Because of this reason, as part of the strategy, the project made contact with the specialist in Habitat Banking with the purpose of making an inter institutional workshop in Panama, to get to know the strategy for the Habitat Banking\'s implementation. The terms of reference for the recruitment of the specialist are being proceeded. | Ã¢Â¢ PIU and UNDP CO prepared tors to hire a specialist to provide advisory services in Habitat Banking. The public announcement was launched but hte procurement process was not succesfull because insufficient participation of offerors. Ã¢Â¢ Because of the difficulty in finding a specialist, we have entered into an alliance with CI (Conservation International) to host a workshop that will allow participants to understand the concepts, and mechanisms for applying Habitat Banking at LPA. |  As a result of the strategic alliance with Conservation International (CI). A specialist (Environmental Economist) was able to be hired to do an analysis of the ALP's current situation and the possibility of implementing financial mechanisms to protect biodiversity. There was a workshop held to let the project partners (ARAP, ATP, ANAM, CI and the UNDP representatives) hear about the different types of financial mechanisms in existence to protect biodiversity. The workshop was attended by 20 partners. Seventeen (17) financial mechanisms were analyzed that may be implemented in the ALP. Short-term financial mechanisms were prioritized in an expert workshop that are applicable to the ALP such as fees charged to ferries, hotels, restaurants, and tour operators. There is a long-term financial mechanism strategic plan (for five years). The mid-term evaluation report considered removing this indicator and coordinating with ANAM about the contents of the strategic plan for financial mechanisms to protect biodiversity. |
| Outcome 3 | Local governance for planning, capacity building and policy enforcement strengthened in LPA pilot area. | -ARAP and ANAM have decentralized operation, presence and expertise in the archipelagos. | No local offices of ARAP or ANAM in LPA. | ANAM and ARAP have fisheries and tourism experts as permanent staff in LPA offices. | The ARAP with its financial resources hired two persons a secretary and a sea inspector. In the case of the secretary, she is currently working in the temporary offices of the ARAP located in San Miguel, Archipelago of Las Perlas. The sea inspector participates in marine actions of surveillance and inspection, and is located in headquarters. | Ã¢?Â¢ PIU has a permanent office at LPA. Ã¢?Â¢ The staff contracts issued by ARAP to strenghten the institutional presence in Las Perlas Archipelago were not renewed this year (Environmental inspectors and technicians, adminsitrative assistant, among others). Ã¢?Â¢ Established the structure and proposed decree to set up the Local Commission as a tool for integrated coastal management for LPA conflict resolution. Ã¢?Â¢ Prepared the manual for the Local Commission to provide quick operating guidelines to identify their relation with the rest of the environmental stakeholders present in its area of influence. | ? The PIU has provided the resumes again to ARAP to hire a secretary and inspector for the ALP. Appointments are waiting to be announced. |
|  |  | -Budget expenditure by municipality and planning and supervising tourism, fishing and property development activities. | US$0.00 The contribution of the municipality to the fishing sector during the years 2012 and 2013 tilt around B/.7, 972 in concept of boat, motor outboard and fuel. La ATP elaborÃÂ³ el plan maestro de turismo 2007-2020 como una herramienta de planificaciÃÂ³n turÃÂ­stica que incluye el ALP como zona de desarrollo turistico | 100% of those project needs which are the responsibility of municipality. | There was a meeting with the Mayor from the Balboa District. The decentralization of the municipalities hasn\'t been implemented regardless of the existence of a regulation that establishes it. The municipality of Balboa is subsidized and there\'s no assigned budget for fishing, tourism and Real State Development activities. Assigned funds are used to support both fishermen and the National Police in the activities of sea surveillance. This year, trips were made through the sea in San Miguel, Saboga, Mogo Mogo, and Bayoneta. Tax charges are applied in restaurants, drinks, supermarkets, construction permits, and land movements. This year the contribution from the Municipality to the fishing sector was around B/. 7972.00 mainly in the form of boats, motors and gasoline. The project will support the definition of a strategy so the responsibility of these projects could be assumed gradually through the Municipality. The project will produce a document containing information of the administrative and budgetary management of the Municipality of Balboa, where costs and investments related to the issues of fishing and tourism can be identified in order to strengthen the capacity of the municipality to future investments in terms of projects that are implemented. | Ã¢Â¢ ARAP has established a budget of USD13,795 for monitoring fishing activities. | ARAP carried out oversight and control actions for the 2014 period; however, they were few due to the lack of an ARAP manager. The overall amount spent on inspections has not been made compatible. |
|  |  | -Frequency of interactions between ARAP, ANAM, municipality and fishermen (inspections in open sea and landing sites, information and consultation meetings). | No interactions. | At least once every week. | Five interactions between ARAP/ANAM/ATP have been made in the following activities: 1. A whale watching workshop: 70 people (one interaction). 2. Inter institutional workshop in Bocas del Toro (one interaction). 3. Workshop in Bocas del Toro about sustainable tourism practices, lobster biology, Marine Turtles and Lion Fish biology (three interactions). Actions of the Unit of Conservation and Surveillance in the ALP have begun, having as a result a first practical report. Two specialists have been hired to establish and organize the Zonal Committee structure and its operational guideline and functions. | There were 10 interactions between ANAM, ARAP and ATP with regard to the following activities: Ã¢Â¢ Workshop on marine turtles at the Esmeralda community. Ã¢Â¢ Verification of Contadora buoys. Ã¢Â¢ Workshop on Value Chains held in Panama. Ã¢Â¢ Establish, organize and write Regulations for the Local Commission. Ã¢Â¢ Workshop on the transfer of information on successful ecotourism experiences in island areas of Latin America and the Caribbean. Ã¢Â¢ Meeting on the implementation of the Decree on cetaceous sightings. Ã¢Â¢ Presentation of the new lobster catch proposal held at Bocasdel Toro and LPA. Ã¢Â¢ Workshop on the Strategic Environmental Assessment. Ã¢Â¢ An specialist was hired by the project to gather all of the information on biodiversity, fishing, tourism and real estate development considered in the LPA management plan. Secondary information is also been considered int the spatial database that will be installed in a server bought by the project. Ã¢Â¢ ARAP has continued with the inspection and monitoring within LPA marine areas and there is an operating plan in place. During this period 10 inspections visits were made to the LPA. | There were 13 instances of interaction between ANAM, ARAP and ATP related to the following activities: Workshop on financial mechanisms to protect biodiversity in the ALP. Twenty (20) partners (ARAP, ATP, ANAM, and CI) participated in the project. Workshop on Isla Contadora to present the results of the tourist survey and also to present possible tourism businesses that may be added to the ALP value chain. Fourteen (14) tourism operators from the ALP participated. A workshop was held in San Miguel targeting the career program in tourism and a group of artisans about identifying resources, activities, and tourism jobs in the ALP. Eighteen (18) people participated. A workshop was held in Pedro GonzÃ¡lez targeting the career program in tourism about identifying resources, activitites, and tourism jobs in the ALP. Thirteen (13) people participated. A workshop was held in San Miguel to show the students in the career program the results of the market study carried out on Isla Contadora, approve the value chain, and make certain pledges related to upcoming training sessions and future projects. Thirteen (13) people participated. Meeting with ARAP in the community of San Miguel to coordinate actions about fishing zoning, research, and inspection and oversight. Five (5) ARAP employees participated. The project partners (ARAP, ATP, ANAM) and key stakeholders in the ALP were presented the studies carried out to establish the co-management projects. A total of fourteen (14) people participated. Meeting with artisanal fishermen in San Miguel to present the co-management projects. Training sessions were held in Casaya to install and organize the co-management projects in the ALP. A total of 15 fishermen participated. The results of the consulting work on the Value Chain Integration done in San Miguel were presented to the ALP'S partners and key stakeholders. A total of thirty-five (35) people participated. A training session was held on Isla Contadora about good sustainable tourism practices. Ten (10) key stakeholders in the ALP tied to tourism participated. Training was held on Isla ColÃ³n, the Bocas del Toro Archipelago, on good sustainable tourism practices. Fifteen (15) key stakeholders tied to tourism participated. Training was held in GunaYala on tourism business administration, customer service, tour guides, and marketing tourism services. Twenty-five (25) key stakeholders tied to tourism participated. A workshop was held in the area of the marine reserve in Las Perlas Archipelago to present the zoning proposals and alternate regulations. A total of fifteen (15) project partners participated. |
|  |  | -Implementation of a monitoring and evaluation system to monitor indicators of key threats (overfishing, turtle nesting, visitation, etc.) in LPA. | No monitoring system in place. | Monitoring system in implementation. | UNDP is processing the terms of reference elaborated by the Project team for the recruitment of a consultant for strengthening the local institutional capabilities reinforced for the monitoring and supervision of the compliance of the Management Plan for the special zone of Las Perlas Archipelago. This same zone is considered the base of the LPA\'s biodiversity, allowing the users to access information on issues of fishing, tourism and real estate development in the LPA. | Ã¢Â¢ An specialist was hired by the project to gather all of the information on biodiversity, fishing, tourism and real estate development considered in the LPA management plan. Secondary information is also been considered int the spatial database that will be installed in a server bought by the project. Ã¢Â¢ ARAP has continued with the inspection and monitoring within LPA marine areas and there is an operating plan in place. During this period 10 inspections visits were made to the LPA. |  There is a data platform available containing all the information on fishing, tourism and real estate development in the ALP. An ARAP employee was trained to manage the spatial data infrastructure platform and the procedures manual was relinquished. The project has considered doing a study to figure out which system would make it possible to monitor threats to biodiversity. |
|  |  | -Annual amount of funds mobilized by Payment for Environmental Services (PES) system and green taxes for the protection of forests and marine ecosystems in LPA. | - No PES system is in place - Symbolic Water fee is being charged by Isla del Rey. | - PES system operating and secured for long term. - 50% of financial needs of existing conservation areas in LPA year are covered with funds generated by PES schemes. | The TORs elaborated by the Project Management Unit for the recruitment of a specialist to provide advice to the key stakeholders (LPA, ANAM, ARAP and the Municipality) in payments for environmental services and environmental taxes, is still pending. | Ã¢Â¢ PIU submitted the TOR to UNDP for hiring a specialist to establish the financial mechanism for biodiversity protection. Ã¢Â¢ The project establishes joint work with CI (Conservation International) to host a workshop to describe the PES application concepts and mechanisms at LPA. | As a result of the strategic alliance with Conservation International (CI). A specialist (Environmental Economist) was able to be hired to do an analysis of the ALP's current situation and the possibility of implementing financial mechanisms to protect biodiversity, including the PSA. There was a workshop held to let the project partners (ARAP, ATP, ANAM, CI) hear about the different types of financial mechanisms in existence to protect biodiversity. The workshop was attended by 20 partners. Seventeen (17) financial mechanisms were analyzed that may be implemented in the ALP. Short-term financial mechanisms were prioritized in an expert workshop that are applicable to the ALP. For short-term implementation, fees charged to ferries, hotels, restaurants, and tour operators were feasible. The PSA was rated to be viable for implementation in the medium term. There is a long-term financial mechanism strategic plan (for five years). The PIU will coordinate with the Ministry of the Environment about whether it is possible to have the financial mechanism strategic plan applied to the ALP. |
|  |  | -% of property development areas that comply with zoning regulations in LPA | 0% because there are no zoning regulations in place. Ley 6 de 1 de febrero de 2006, G.O. 25,478 Ã¢Que reglamenta el ordenamiento territorial para el desarrollo urbano y dicta otras disposicionesÃ¢Â. Decreto ejecutivo No. 23 de 16 de mayo de 2007, G.O. 25794 Ã¢Por el cual se reglamenta la Ley 6 de 1 de febrero de 2006 Que reglamenta el ordenamiento territorial para el desarrollo urbano y dicta otras disposicionesÃ¢Â ResoluciÃÂ³n N Âº 4-2009 de 20 de enero de 2009, G.O. 26221Ã¢Por la cual se establece el procedimiento y los requisitos para la tramitaciÃÂ³n de solicitudes relacionadas con el ordenamiento territorial para el desarrollo urbanoÃ¢Â | 100% comply with zoning regulations. | The project has elaborated the terms of reference for the recruitment of a specialist that will create a regulation for the allowed activities within the special areas of conservation (marine and terrestrial) already established in the Management Plan of the LPA and to guide ARAP for the adoption of this regulation. | Ã¢Â¢ Held a preliminary meeting with the territorial research department of the MIVIOT Vice Ministry for Territorial Management to establish strategies for field verification of the percentage of real estate development areas compliant with current zoning laws. | Since the ARAP did not have a manager formally appointed for 9 months, the paperwork with the MIVIOT could not be done to verify the development areas and whether they met the existing zoning regulations. |
| Outcome 4 | BD Ã¢ friendly tourism, fisheries and property development practices replicated in PanamaÃÂ´s remaining three archipelagos. | -Revenues collected by Kuna Yala from visitation that are allocated to BD conservation activities. | Around US$60K generated but zero allocated to BD. | Optimum needs identified and revenue generation mechanisms identified. | The project has made the initial efforts with the Guna General Congress in order to obtain preliminary information about the statistics of tourism in this archipelago. We\'re still waiting for answers. | Ã¢?Â¢ Were able to meet with technical representatives and the Secretary General for Tourism at the Guna Yala Archipelago. The project coordinates mechanisms for compiling information on income derived from tourism. Income from tourist activities is not channelled into funds for the protection of biodiversity, according to the information provided by the technical commission. | Conversations were held with the Secretary of Tourism in the General Guna Congress and so far the information has not been able to be provided. So far, this information is not available. The ATP was checked for the tourism planning address but there is no information. |
|  |  | -Voluntary standards adopted by cruise ships operators in Panama archipelagos. | None | All cruise ships operating in Panama have adopted the standards. | The terms of reference for the recruitment of a consultant firm that will be in charge of training the owners of the yachts, boats and cruises in subjectsÃ¢ related to sustainable tourism\'s best practices, has been prepared. | Ã¢Â¢ The project conducted research on current standards regarding cruise ships and yachts that generally travel through jurisdictional waters of the Republic of Panama identifying the following standards which Panama has signed, whose goal is to protect the marine environment and therefore the biodiversity. Ã¢Â¢ MARPOL 73/78 Convention establishes standards to prevent trash, toxic substances and hydrocarbon pollution. Ã¢Â¢ Law No. 121 of July 9, 1980 establishes rules for preventing pollution in the sea and navigable waters in the Republic of Panama. Ã¢Â¢ General Ports Law establishes environmental standards that regulate the operation of service ports and the development of port activities to achieve the objectives of the environmental conservation, protection and improvement policy. Ã¢Â¢ The project coordinates meetings with the Maritime Authority to jointly analyze the possibility of establishing new initiatives. | The project has a coordination meeting outstanding with the new authorities of the PANAMA Maritime Authority to jointly analyze the possibility of setting up new initiatives |
|  |  | -% of tourism developments in Bocas, Kuna Yala, Coiba and LPA that comply with international standards for sustainable tourism. | 0% certified enterprises at the moment. | 20% | The terms of reference for the recruitment of a consultancy firm that will be in charge of the training of tour guides, restaurant and hotel owners in subjects related to sustainable tourism and best practices in Panama\'s archipelagos have been prepared. Terms of reference were developed for the recruitment of a specialist to share experiences of eco-tourism in the Islands. | Ã¢Â¢ UNDP did some consultations with UNDP Costa Rica and the World Tourism Organization on experiences related to environmental certifications issued by Rainforest Alliance or similar groups, their applicability and their cost-effectiveness. After these consultations, the project actions will be oriented towards accreditation of good practices in tourism and not to the international certification. Accreditations are carried out with the support of organizations with experience, and is more cost efficient. Ã¢Â¢ The project will promote the incorporation of best practices by tourism operators and local communities, and provide the technical support so they can then obtain the accreditation. Ã¢Â¢ In this regard the project is preparing the TOR to define the scope of the consulting work because of its high cost and the project does not have sufficient resources for international accreditation on sustainable tourism best practices at all archipelagos in all tourist areas. With this the implementation draft that had already been prepared is now complete. However it became necessary to know what was happening in the region or how it was implemented and the costs. Ã¢Â¢ UNDP has launched the procurement process for hiring the training in sustainable tourism best practices for the Bocas del Toro (Colon Island, Carnero and Bastimientos Islands) and Las Perlas Archipelagos. | The project hired a specialist in Sustainable Tourism Best Practices to train the company and tour operators in the ALP and the Bocas del Toro Archipelago (Isla ColÃ³n and Isla Carenero). Training was provided to 11 companies in the Las Perlas Archipelago and to 18 companies in the Bocas del Toro Archipelago (Isla ColÃ³n, Carenero, Bastimentos) on Sustainable Tourism Best Practices. The training session included the following contents: Sustainable design, the use of potable water, use of electricity, environmental interpretation, handling the impact by visitors, establishing financial mechanisms to protect biodiversity. There is a strategic plan to implement environmental credits in the La Perlas and Bocas del Toro (Isla Carenero, Bastimentos, and Isla ColÃ³n) archipelagos. The same thing is true for the TDR to hire the specialist to implement the strategic plan. In Guna Yala, 25 stakeholders linked to tourism were trained on managing tourism businesses, customer service, tour guides and marketing tourism services. In the training session, community tourism development projects were identified that, with the joint direction of the 6 towns, are expected to be able to be developed. |
|  |  | -% of tourist expenditure that is allocated to conservation | Less than 2% in LPA, Bocas and Kuna Yala (to verify). | 5% | In Guna Yala\'s case, there\'s a regulation for the organization of the touristic activity, for both tour guides as well as for the owners of yachts, boats and cruises. | Ã¢Â¢ Pending for the project is a meeting with ATP to define the strategies and mechanisms for establishing the manner in which income from tourism can be incorporated and used for biodiversity conservation. | The project did a study in the ALP to draw a profile of tourists coming to the ALP, to find out what tourism activities they are engaged in, and to identify their lodging preferences. Some 70% of the tourists surveyed spent two days on Isla Contadora. On a daily basis, the tourists spent, in different ranges: 23% spent between US $51 and $100; 20% spent between $100 and $150; and 20% spent between $200 and $300. |

# E. Progress in Implementation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Project Outcomes | Description | Outputs Reported as of 30 June 2015 |
| Outcome 1 | Cost- effective market-based instruments and improved investment opportunities for biodiversity Ã¢â¬â friendly tourism and fisheries developed and promoted in the Archipelago of Las Perlas (LPA) | The project trained 25 key stakeholders in the ALP (owners of restaurants, hotels, and tour operators) in the Bocas del Toro Archipelago on Good Sustainable Tourism Practices. Valuable information was obtained about the services they provide and their strengths and weaknesses, as well as a strategic plan for environmental credits. 1.2 The base community projects were identified in the ALP. The following stood out: handcraft business development, fruit processing, cultural shows, environmental education through children's puppetry, and the establishment of tourism circuits for Las Perlas Archipelago. 1.3 For each community tourism business identified in the ALP, its value chain is structured and the tourism business is described. The key stakeholders in the ALP were strengthened through training to transmit the theoretic bases of tourism planning. There is a strategic plan to promote and market the tourist products. 1.4 A study was prepared to identify sites within the ALP that may be used to implement co-management pilot projects; the community of Casaya was found to have potential. The artisanal fishermen in the ALP were trained in co-management systems and the first co-management project was set up for Las Perlas Archipelago. |
| Outcome 2 | Improved sectoral policies and regulations that enable mainstreaming BD conservation into the tourism, fisheries and property development operations in the Archipelagos of Panama. | The Project sent the partners proposed regulations to protect biodiversity tied to real estate development so they may be analyzed by the Project's partners. The regulations were not finalized because the ARAP did not have a manager. 2.2 Along with the ARAP, the Project has been able to establish the proposed zoning laws for the sustainable use of lobster in the jurisdictional waters belonging to the Republic of Panama. The ARAP has incorporated the fishermen's contributions, but the laws have not been finalized so far because there was no manager. |
| Outcome 3 | Local governance for planning, capacity building and policy enforcement strengthened in LPA pilot area. | The project was able to set up an ARAP office in the ALP but the local government is weak and ARAP will not renew the contract of the Secretary who had been hired initially. ARAP implemented an inspection and monitoring program for the ALP fishing activities and interacts with innumerable activities and events in the ALP along with artisanal fishermen. 3.2 The Project established the geo-space data information platform that contains information related to the territorial features and data on fishing, tourism, and real estate development in the ALP. Likewise, an ARAP employee was designated and trained to keep the database current and the procedures manual was relinquished. 3.3. A study was assigned to validate the marine reserve and marine coastal areas established in the Las Perlas Archipelago management plan and the allowable and non-allowable activities in each of the zones were established. Likewise, proposed regulations to define how to establish the zones were prepared. |
| Outcome 4 | BD Ã¢â¬â friendly tourism, fisheries and property development practices replicated in PanamaÃÂ´s remaining three archipelagos. | The Project trained 25 key stakeholders in the ALP (owners of restaurants and hotels and tour operators) in the Bocas del Toro Archipelago on good sustainable tourism practices. Valuable information was obtained about the services they offer, their strengths and weaknesses, and a strategic plan for environmental credits. In Guna Yala, 25 stakeholders linked to tourism were trained on managing tourism businesses, customer service, tour guides and marketing tourism services. Small community-based business initiatives were generated. |

# F. Ratings and Comments on Project Progress

**Project Progress toward Development Objective**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Role | 2015 Rating | 2015 Comments |
| Project Manager/Coordinator | Moderately Unsatisfactory | The Project was able to make progress over this year on major subjects related to tourism, such as training for stakeholders (hotels, restaurants, and tour operators) tied to tourism on matters related to good sustainable tourism practices in both Las Perlas and Bocas del Toro Archipelagos. The studies have shown that more effort is needed to be able to receive environmental credits in both archipelagos. However, due to the weakness by the agency involved, these actions could not be monitored or given continuity. There are still some pieces missing to improve the subjects of sustainable development, the use of water and electricity, environmental interpretation and the certifications have still not been given out. There is a possibility that the ATP may afterward incorporate these companies in a pilot plan for tourism certification for the archipelagos in Panama. The community-based businesses related to tourism have been identified, along with their value chain, but the ALP stakeholders still need to be trained and strengthened in tourism business administration. The Project was able to transfer fishing technologies to aquiculture by implementing the first project to fatten shrimp in the community of Casaya on the Las Perlas Archipelago. In relation to policies and regulations, last year the Project has been preparing the proposed regulations related to real estate development to protect biodiversity, but they were not promulgated due to lack of government support. The proposed decree on catching, fishing, and marketing lobster in the jurisdictional waters of the Republic of Panama was not promulgated, however. ARAP spent 8 months without a general manager. This caused huge delays because it did not have an authorized signature. No progress was made on matters related to policies and regulations. The Project accepted key stakeholders from the Las Perlas Archipelago, which brought about an opportunity to implement the actions included in the project document and strengthen local governance. The Project was also able to report on and communicate the progress made to the new government authorities (project partners). One of the structures created by the Project last year in the ALP, however was the area committee to support communities in solving and planning conflicts. The ARAP did not follow up on it so it faltered. Likewise, the Oversight Coordination Unit that was supported by the project to run an operating test was not activated by ARAP and did not join the zone committee. They are both important for the integral coastal management processes. The Project was able to install the ARAP office where the ALP operates. This helped increase the number of interactions between ARAP, the fishermen and the Project. However, one of the huge weaknesses is not being able to hire the staff to be able to provide continuity and follow-up to the institution's and the Project's functions. The Project implemented the geo-space data platform in ARAP with information on biodiversity, fishing, and tourism. It was placed on the institution's web page, but an official launch should have been done with the key stakeholders on Las Perlas Archipelago so it can be used but there is no staff to follow up on it. The marine zones contained in the management plan were validated. The productive activities that may be developed in each of them are established and the proposed regulations to create them are officially established. However, they were not promulgated because the ARAP went 8 months with a manager. No work could be done by the Project on replicating the fishing activities in other archipelagos; however, training sessions were held on good tourism practices targeting the Bocas del Toro tour operators. Likewise, no environmental certifications were achieved because it takes time and direct follow-up by the Panama Tourism Authority. At the request of six towns, training was given in Guna Yala for people related to the tourism business but the project profiles and economic support need to be processed and prepared to support the new and existing businesses. In general, major progress has been made by the Project but obviously awareness needs to be raised about various issues related to tourism and fishing. Likewise, ARAP's institutional weakness and project support were low, making it difficult to carry it out. |
| UNDP Country Office Programme Officer | Unsatisfactory | The unsatisfactory performance respond to the following factors: lower than expected implementation capacity by executing agency (ARAP) as well as lack of government commitment to project activities. Also, the project encountered lack of leadership of project coordinator. These scenarios had changed recently, Minister of Environment was created and ARAP subrogated competences regarding integrated marine and coastal management, including the Archipelagos. Minister of Environment is already leading the project to complete activities. This institution, with support of ARAP, ATP, and UNDP, made a substantive revision of the project, including the budget available. Therefore an extension is required. |
| Project Implementing Partner |  |  |
| GEF Operational Focal point |  |  |
| Other Partners |  |  |
| UNDP Technical Advisor | Moderately Unsatisfactory | This is the fourth PIR and the project is granted a rating of Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU) it is expected to achieve only some of its major global environmental objectives. This is a project that has been struggling from the beginning. The level of progress presented in the 2015 PIR suggests that some progress has been made but it still needs additional time to consolidate the delivery of key global environmental benefits. The current progress shown below under each of the outcomes explains why the Regional Technical Advisor (RTA), the project manager, and the UNDP Country Programme Officer granted the project an MU: Outcome 1. Cost- effective market-based instruments and improved investment opportunities for biodiversity â friendly tourism and fisheries developed and promoted in the Archipelago of Las Perlas (LPA). This year the project invested in concrete efforts to strengthen the value chain or improve the business plans of specific tourism businesses in Las Perlas. The project identified several tourism businesses to test recommendations on value chain and business plan development. The project is strongly encouraged to strengthen these and other tourism products. The project hired a specialist on Sustainable Tourism Practices to train the companies and tour operators in the ALP and the Bocas del Toro Archipelago (Isla ColÃ³n and Isla Carenero). Training was provided to 11 companies in the Las Perlas Archipelago; and to 18 companies in the Bocas del Toro Archipelago (Isla ColÃ³n, Carenero, Bastimentos). Project efforts to support small enterprises have been marginal. The only fishing cooperative in Las Perlas (COOPERLAS) received US$25,000 from the Small Grants Programme of the GEF. The project facilitated this donation and is supporting the grantee with technical assistance. This year the project hired a fishing extension worker to implement co-management systems in Las Perlas Archipelago. Studies are underway to identify the potential areas to implement the co-management projects in the ALP. Outcome 2. Improved sectoral policies and regulations that enable mainstreaming BD conservation into the tourism, fisheries and property development operations in the Archipelagos of Panama. Policy development is usually a long-term undertaking and the project should have drafted policy proposals long time ago but this was not the case. Nevertheless, as reported under Outcome 1 (see above) and also under Outcome 2 the project drafted several policy proposals that were shared with relevant government stakeholders. The project is encouraged to invest resources to ensure that these regulations come into force in Panama before project conclusion. Unfortunately, despite efforts to ensure that Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) include standards to measure impacts on biodiversity, the project team is still struggling on this front. The project tried to obtain information from ANAM on the application of Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA) in Las Perlas. But it is not clear if the SEA, which is a non-EIA based process applied particularly to policies, plans and programmes, is being proposed by ANAM to replace EIAs or simply to complement EIAs. A SEA is usually conducted before a corresponding EIA is undertaken. This means that information on the environmental impact of a plan can cascade down through the tiers of decision making and can be used in an EIA at a later stage. In any case, the project hired a consultant to conduct an introductory workshop on SEA and to outline the requirements to implement the strategic environmental assessment in Las Perlas. Last year, ANAM became the Environment Ministry and the project will make an effort with the new Minister for the Environment to make the pertinent adjustments and figure out whether these standards will be adopted or not. In this context, the project should establish a work plan with the Ministry for the Environment that to initiate discussions regarding strategies to improve current Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations and their relationship with SEA in Las Perlas. The project held a workshop with the project partners (ARAP, ATP, ANAM, CI and the UNDP representatives) to examine financial mechanisms for the protection of biodiversity. Seventeen potential financial mechanisms were identified including fees charged to ferries, hotels, restaurants, and tour operators. Outcome 3. Local governance for planning, capacity building and policy enforcement strengthened in Las Perlas Archipelago pilot area. The Aquatic Resources Authority of Panama (ARAP), the agency in charge of executing the project is in a unique position to strengthen local governance in Las Perlas. ARAP already has an office in the Archipelago and is strengthening relations with local stakeholders. Unfortunately, ARAP did not renew the contracts of its staff based in Las Perlas this year. The lack of presence of ARAP in the region should be considered a critical risk for current activities of the project and for the future management of resources in Las Perlas. The project together with UNDP must bring this issue to the attention of relevant political authorities in Panama. On the positive side, the project initiated the design of the monitoring and evaluation system and this effort should be complemented with training of local stakeholders to facilitate its implementation. Today, there is a data platform available containing all the information on fishing, tourism and real estate development in the ALP. An ARAP employee was trained to manage the spatial data infrastructure platform and the procedures manual was relinquished. Outcome third includes one of the most challenging indicators which is âannual amount of funds mobilized by Payment for Environmental Services (PES) system and green taxes for the protection of forests and marine ecosystems in LPAâ. The project should develop a plan to facilitate implementation of activities to deliver these indicators. Outcome 4. BD â friendly tourism, fisheries and property development practices replicated in PanamaÂ´s remaining three archipelagos. At this stage project activities should obviously focus on delivering results for the other three outcomes. Progress under this last outcome is likely to be registered during the last six months of project implementation. In addition to the above recommendations/suggestions stated under each of the three outcomes, the project should consider the following action plan in order to ensure that the project reaches its proposed objectives: 1) continue strengthening project implementation through partnerships and memoranda of understanding (MOU) with the Ministry for the Environment and Sustainable Development, the Tourism Authority of Panama (ATP), the Ministry of Housing (MIVI) and NGOs. The project will need the Ministry to improve the Environmental Impact guidelines and asses the viability of a habitat banking system (indicators 2.4 and 2.5); 2) Continue articulating the GEF/UNDP small grants program to the projectâs activities through concrete proposals. |

**Project Progress in Project Implementation**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Role | 2014 Rating | 2015 Rating | 2015 Comments |
| Project Manager/Coordinator | Moderately Satisfactory | Moderately Satisfactory | â¢ In this period, the PIR Project made an effort to obtain the products and results established by the PRODOC. Progress was represented by providing guidance toward identifying and structuring the fishing and tourism businesses. Therefore, the local skills had to be strengthened by transferring knowledge and technologies. These components are new for the key stakeholders in the ALP. To develop these businesses and for the stakeholders to be accepting takes time. For the first time, a major study was done to be able to diversify the fishing activities. It was based on implementing the first co-management pilot project about fattening shrimp at sea. This currently benefits a small community in the ALP. This community showed strengths and opportunities that are ideal for implementing this pilot project. It will take time to be able to replicate this work in the other archipelagos. In relation to marine zoning, the marine and coastal reserve zones established in the ALP management plan were able to be validated. The activities that may be implemented in them were also defined. The database information related to an information platform on biodiversity, fishing, tourism, and real estate development was strengthened. This will make it possible for the ALP residents to have more information about their resources. It will enable competent authorities to make decisions related to land planning, tourism, fishing, and real estate development. â¢ In this PIR report, the Project has shown progress in executing the budget. The budget was for B/. 400,942.15. This represents 70% execution with GEF funds. Result 1 was outstanding with the highest execution level. This year the budget was not fully expended mostly because ARAP spent 8 months without a General Manager. Consequently, it was difficult to execute the activities contained in the operating plan and it decreased participation by ARAP in those activities. In relation to execution by the counterpart. The ARAP co-financing expenses were B/.175,000. The ARAP co-financing expenses were B/.50,000 representing 29%. â¢ During this PIR period, the Project underwent a mid-term evaluation. The result was a plan with recommendations for the Aquatic Resource Authority since it is the agency implementing the Project and adjusts the design. The recommendations include extending the project for 18 more months. A Board of Directors' Meeting is being waited for to approve the mid-term evaluation report. â¢ There was a favorable change when the Ministry of the Environment was created. The Project may have great opportunities and strengths related to transferring ARA's competencies to the new Ministry so a time extension may be requested to be able to execute actions to protect the biodiversity in the archipelagos in Panama. â¢ One of the big risks that the Project had in this PIR was the lack of a General Manager for ARAP and the lack of an upper-management team to provide continuity to the Project's actions. This risk was handled by the country office. As an alternative, to provide continuity to all the actions by the specialists who were hired, the National Project Coordinator and the UNDP had to take on the responsibility of managing the disbursement payments until the new Administration is set up in the ARAP. â¢ The Project's Board of Directors may only meet once in the second half of 2014 to establish the annual operating plan for 2015. The Project's Board of Directors did not provide any follow-up. We hope that, in the remaining execution time, we will be able to hold two meetings as established in the PRODOC |
| UNDP Country Office Programme Officer | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory | In general, project could not involve stakeholders in the implementation stage; weak government commitment (past period 2009-2014), not sufficient interest and politic will from ARAP. It appears project in the past government, did not response national or local interest. Therefore, most of the indicators and the objectives set for the project were not accomplished. With the Environment Ministry being created and the new competences on integrated marine coastal management, there is a new institutional scenario, with strong commitment for reach project goals, and in general, improve and strengthen coastal spatial planning and regulate access to marine coastal resources. The new institutional priorities include the design and implementation of a national policy for coastal areas and principles for effective management of Marine Coastal Management Special Zones (Las Perlas Archipelago for example is a MCMSZ). |
| Project Implementing Partner |  |  |  |
| GEF Operational Focal point |  |  |  |
| Other Partners |  |  |  |
| UNDP Technical Advisor | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | This is the fourth year of implementation and the project is granted a rating of Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) as it was managed in a less than effective manner due to internal or external factors and some components were not in accordance with the work plan, schedule and budget. This rating is supported by a delivery rate of about 40% (i.e., during the 2014-2015 reporting period) and an accumulative delivery rate of about 56%. Such a low accumulative rate means that the project will need a no-cost extension in order to disburse the remaining US$761,560 as it was scheduled to close on 31 May 2014. Key outputs that did not present significant progress during this period include: 1) Improved tourism competitiveness through the adoption of certification systems that endorse best practices for sustainability: no certification system was identified or assessed in the context of local tourism initiatives; 2) pilot Strategic Environmental Assessment implemented in LPA for tourism and property development plans; and 3) local institutional capacities strengthened to monitor and oversee compliance with the Management Plan of the Special Management Zone in LPA. Project implementation may have also been affected by the electoral period, the reform of the National Authority for the Environment which became the Minister of the Environment and the failure to appoint the General Manager of the Authority on Aquatic Resources of Panama (ARAP) whose designation and approval occurred in mid-February 2015. These issues are compounded by Law 8 of 2015 which removed jurisdiction over the management of coastal areas and marine resources from ARAP and transferred these functions to the new Ministry of Environment. Today ARAP has exclusive competence on fisheries and aquaculture. The Project Board approved the change of the executing agency and the new project execution responsibility rests with the Ministry of Environment. Nevertheless ARAP will continue as cooperation partner. These events contributed to the removal of the project coordinator and the project has been paralyzed between May and November 2015. UNDP is currently engaged in the selection of the new coordinator which should be in place in November 2015. The mid-term evaluation was completed and the project received a less than satisfactory rating. The projectâs management response includes several recommendations such as the need to review several indicators which may no longer be relevant given changes in government policy or insufficient time and resources left to deliver outcomes. As soon as the new project coordinator is hired the RTA proposes to have a meeting with the project management unit to analyze the Management Response, including the review of the logical framework, technical and procedural bottlenecks and limitations that may be preventing the project from achieving significant progress. In addition, the RTA proposes the following action plan in order to expedite implementation: 1) Increase the political profile of the project within the Ministry of Environment through a workshop to review project progress and bottlenecks; 2) assign a person from the project management unit to be in charge of the following tasks: i) monitoring and evaluation of projectâs activities, ii) progress and compliance with indicators of the logical framework, iii) monitoring of the projectâs delivery rate, and iv) monitoring of the disbursement rate of co-financing and contribution of co-financing sources to the projectâs outcomes; 3) review the effectiveness of the operations manual for the project vis a vis the mid-term evaluation recommendations; and 4) submit a project extension request taking into account the projectâs revised framework and amount of resources left to be disbursed (i.e., US$761,560). |

# G. Project Planning

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Key project milestone** | **Status** | **Original Planned Date (Month/Year)** | **Actual or Expected Date (Month/Year)** | **Comments** |
| **Inception Workshop** |  |  **-**  |  **-**  |  |
| Mid-term Review |  |  -  |  -  |  |
| Terminal Evaluation | delayed/pending | October - 2014 | October - 2016 | El proyecto ha pasado por una serie de retrasos desde su inicio lo que ha generado en cascada dilataciones que no fueron superadas en la implementaciÃ³n, mucho por situaciones de apropiaciÃ³n del Gobierno -ARAP socio implementador, asi como por cambios polÃ­ticos en la instituciÃ³n en el 2014. A partir de julio de 2014 la nueva administraciÃ³n (Gobierno) hay mayor interÃ©s asÃ­ como los cambios de competencia de la ARAP hacia ahora MIABIENTE generan espacios propicios para una nueva gestiÃ³n mÃ¡s enfocada y de interÃ©s con su plan de gestiÃ³n 2014 -2019. Lo que implica cambio en el socio implementador al nuevo ministerio MIAMBIENTE y sobre el cual ya se han dado los pasos para apoyar a la institucionalidad en estos cambios y aprobado por Junta de Proyecto en el 2015. |

# H. Critical Risk Management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Critical Risks Type(s) | Critical Risk Management Measures Undertaken in 2015 |

# 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. |
| â¢ The Project was designed to integrate conservation into the fishing and tourism activities in the archipelagos in Panama. At the Central American regional level, this is an innovative project even though it was designed with high standards in mind for the Las Perlas Archipelago. This has not been developed to the maximum due to the economic recession that affected the real estate and tourism project developers. The Project has introduced the bases to implement good tourism practices to the tour operators in the ALP and Bocas del Torso. This will make it possible to conserve biodiversity. These will guide them when implementing standards related to using water and electricity, environmental interpretation, and sustainable design to later opt for an environmental tourism credit. However, it will take time for the tour operators to be able to rely on a tourism credit that includes biodiversity protection. With the ATP, coordination is already underway with the tourism culture and quality department, which supports the process. The ALP residents who currently have developed skills and abilities have actively participated in the value chain mapping processes. They have mentioned some examples of the possible tourism businesses that may be developed. The Project has guided and transferred major types of knowledge and technologies to be able to diversify fishing activities. A business was set up to fatten shrimp at sea and it is being managed directly by the local fishing community. This is an example whose results are valuable so they may be replicated. There is some concern about the tourism businesses because experience tells us that, when the stakeholders that do not have seed capital begin businesses as pilots, if the wages or material incentives are not provided, they do not generally crystallize. The Project also shared experiences garnered from tourism in Guna Yala, strengthening the key stakeholders in relation to administrative management, marketing, tour guides, and customer service. In this part of the district, proposed tourism projects that are community based were identified that will have the support of the six towns' leaders. This is an important issue that strengthened the friendship ties and participation with the GUNA YALA region related to governance. The project resubmitted the paperwork with ARAP for hiring the required staff. The key stakeholders in the three archipelagos have participated a great deal and shown their support. The Project ratings keep climbing in relation to credibility and participation by the people. The project has their support. There are huge expectations by the community and the new local authorities (the mayor and government representatives) for finalizing the outstanding tasks. The office that installed the Project has made it possible to maintain effective communication with the fishermen and the ARAP. The Project has gained credibility and the trust of the people. The local authorities (the mayor, government representatives) have already visited the Project and have also supported it. |
| What is the most significant change that has resulted from the project this reporting period? |
|  |
| Describe how the project supported South-South Cooperation and Triangular Cooperation efforts in the reporting year. |
|  |

# K. Partnerships

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Partners | Innovation and Work with Partners |
| Civil Society Organisations/NGOs |  |
| Indigenous Peoples |  |
| Private Sector |  |
| GEF Small Grants Programme |  |
| Other Partners |  |

# L. Progress toward Gender Equality

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Has a gender or social assessment been carried out this reporting period? | No |
| If a gender or social assessment has been carried out what where the findings? | No |
| Does this project specifically target woman or girls as direct beneficiaries? | No |
| Please specify results achieved this reporting period that focus on increasing gender equality and improving the empowerment of women. |  |

# 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.