

1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	503
IA/EA Project ID	1421
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Project Name	Initiative for the Protection of Wilderness Protected Areas of Paraguay.
Country/Countries	Paraguay
Geographic Scope	National
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNDP
Executing Agencies involved	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG) - SEAM
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Among the executing agencies
Involvement of Private Sector	Yes- Beneficiary
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	BD 3 Forest Ecosystems
TER Prepared by	Sandra Romboli
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	Ronny Ricardo Muñoz Calvo and Celeste Acevedo Gómez
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	25/05/1999
Project Implementation Start Date	23/06/2000
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	Year 2006 (unclear exact date from PMIS or ProDoc)
Actual Date of Project Completion	31/12/2010
TE Completion Date	01/07/2011
IA Review Date	
TE Submission Date	11/12/2012

2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	0.31	0.31
Co-financing for Project Preparation		
Total Project Prep Financing	0.31	0.31
GEF Financing	8.90	8.90
IA/EA own	0.25	0.25
Government	0.60	1.00
Other*	2.71	15.20
Total Project Financing	12.46	25.35
Total Financing including Prep	12.76	25.66

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	N/A	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	S	N/A	ML
Monitoring and Evaluation		S	N/A	S
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	S	N/A	MS
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS

4. Project Objectives

4.1. Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

Development Objective: That the rich deposit on Biodiversity of Paraguay be preserved. The GEO of the project was not changed as per TE page 6 and ProDoc page 29.

4.2. Development Objectives of the project:

Project purpose: The integrity of 4 globally important Protected Areas is ensured and the conservation capacity is improved. The project purpose of the project was not changed as per TE and ProDoc.

4.3. Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives	No	
Development Objectives	No	
Project Components	No	
Other activities	Yes	Any other (specify to the right)

5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

5.1. Relevance – **Satisfactory**

The project is relevant to the country priorities (and Paraguay ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1993). According to the TE the reported results of the project have been incorporated into the country environmental strategy, also in SINASIP Strategic Plan and SEAM Financial Strategy. Furthermore, several resolutions and laws have been passed as a results of the project. For the GEF this project is in line with the OP 3 Forest Ecosystems under BD (1999).

5.2. Effectiveness – **Moderately Satisfactory**

The Paraguayan Wildlands Protection project seeks to operationalize conservation management within four Protected Area sites. The project has contributed to the creation of new legal tools at different levels regarding protected areas and has enhanced the conservation capacity of PAs on different levels in the country. As such the project has contributed to the

development objective of conserving the rich biodiversity of the deposit in Paraguay. However, the counterparty administrative capacity deficit and the weakness in the political level support resulted in limiting aspects for the proper development of project activities and achievement of results (TE page 40). The TE reports that: The four APs currently exist and remain, having overcome the accelerated development process and environmental modification to which their surroundings underwent over the past ten years. If not by the project intervention these areas would have suffered "extreme damage", and the integrity and existence of these would have been compromised. Main results are indicated below:

1.1 AP Paso Bravo. Is consolidated. The results achieved for the AP were: 1) Support to SEAM in the transference process of legal property ownership in a surface of 93,000 hectares. 2) Judicial Measure, demarcation and delimitation on the ground, 3) Legal declaration; 4) Management Plan Approval, 5) Construction and equipment, 6) Community organizations consolidation; 7) Productive projects development 8) Monitoring, supervision and control in buffer zones, 9) environmental education and gender perspective training for officials and nearby communities, 10) control of land use and forest fires; 11) Management Committee, and 12) Basic studies.

1.2 AP San Rafael. AP achieved results were: 1) Previous measuring and marking, 2) Preventive registration, 3) Management Plan for discussion and approval, 4) Management Plan studies of indigenous territories, 5) Construction and equipment, 6) Monitoring, supervision and control in buffer zones, 10) training for officials and nearby communities, 11) Control of land use and forest fires; 12) Management Committee, and 13) Basic studies.

1.3 AP Médanos del Chaco. Is consolidated. AP achieved results were as follows: 2) judicial measure, demarcation and delimitation on the ground, 3) Legal declaration and property title transference to SEAM, 4) Management Plan Approval, 5) Construction and equipment, 6) Community organizations consolidation; 7) Development of food safety projects in indigenous populations, 8) Monitoring, supervision and control in buffer zones; 9) Environmental education and gender perspective training for officials and nearby communities, 10) Control of land use and forest fires; 11) Management Committee, and 12) Basic studies.

1.4 AP Rio Negro. Is in consolidation process. AP achieved results were: 1) Obtain transfer of 44,000 hectares from INDERT to SEAM, 2) Judicial Measure, demarcation and delimitation on the ground, 3) Legal declaration, 4) Management Plan under consultation process, 5) Provision of office equipment; 7) Productive projects development, 8) Monitoring , supervision and control in buffer zones; 9) Environmental education and gender perspective training for officials and nearby communities; 10) Control of land use and forest fires; 11) Management Committee, and 12) Basic studies. (TE page 39).

5.3. *Efficiency –Moderately Satisfactory*

Project efficiency was affected delays in implementation. The project was to be implemented over a period of 5 years (2000-2004), however due to problems during the first four years, the implementation period took 9 years (TE page 31). Efficiency in achieving results was affected by

issues such as the weak operational capacity of SEAM (executing agency under MAG) as well as level of discontinuous political support at a project directorate level. The extension of the duration of the project was also related to the low level of annual budget execution. The low execution level, besides influencing in the extension of the duration of the project, meant an increase in administrative costs at an amount close to 8% (5 vs 9 years) (TE page 31). The UNDP Country office in the last PIR (2010) rated Implementation Progress MS: "the marginally satisfactory rating resulted from all the delays in implementation that occurred at all levels and for most of the Project's final products. Decision making processes, both technical and administrative, continued to affect project implementation, resulting in setbacks in terms of efficiency, while an important effort (technically and time-wise) was required from the UNDP office to achieve progress".

5.4. Sustainability – **Medium/Significant Risks**

The TE reports that the risk of failure can be considered as negligible for the sustainability of three out of four APs, excluding San Rafael, expecting that key results continue in the future. In the case of San Rafael, the land tenure problem remains (beyond the scope of the project). Furthermore, the project also succeeded in developing the "SINASIP Strategic Plan" and "Financial Sustainability Strategy," instruments aimed to ensure the sustainability. The implementation and effectiveness of both strategies will depend on the future leadership of SEAM and of the support this may receive from the political levels in the country. The financial sustainability of the four APs depends on the budget allocation received from the central government. Although different NGOs and other international agencies provide resources to strengthen the conservation of these APs, permanent resource flows cannot be guaranteed over time. Lack of proper financial budgeting for the Department of Protected Areas, specifically the allocation of resources for the four APs, could mean that the project will lose the obtained results and the biodiversity conservation status currently protected would be seriously jeopardized (TE page 34). The TE further points out four weaknesses in institutional sustainability of the PAs as follows: 1) lack of visibility in national budget allocation to the biodiversity conservation issue in general and AP in particular, 2) the weak position of the Department of Protected Areas, to have a solid direction within the organizational structure, 3) the low number of park rangers, 4) the inconsistent and low institutional presence in the AP (TE page 35). Also, the commitment of the Paraguayan State through SEAM (that the responsible institution of the project) had to absorb the 25 park rangers and 4 administrators who worked during the project, but due to financial constraints this could not be achieved. The final result is that currently only 1 out of the 25 existing park rangers remains. The development of local management capacities at the APs was a permanent result, given by the formation and strengthening of local management committees and organized groups. This condition strengthens the sustainability of APs, through an increase in APs governance levels. However, after the project completion local committees were weakened. Currently, the sustainability of management committees is threatened due to lack of local leadership.

Among the major identified conservation risks of the 4 APs were identified: 1) SEAM low institutional capacity, 2) change in land use, 3) illegal logging and hunting, 4) invasion of settlers to APs, 5) low political interest.

6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

6.1. Co-financing

6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

Co-financing was essential to the achievement of the GEF objectives. The components were well integrated in the ProDoc. The TE does not elaborate on how which specific activities that were supporting the additional co-financing for the project. A first step was to secure the land so that the PAs could be established (which was outside of the GEF project per se but closely linked).

6.1.2. If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The TE compares the original project financing (12.76 million USD) with the project financing including the cost of the land that was bought to secure the PAs (by the Government) which in total amounts to 83 million USD. However the co-financing of 2.705 million USD expected at the beginning of the project rose to 15.196 (not counting land) which represents about 5 times more than anticipated. The TE does not elaborate what the reasons were for this increase. To what extent this affected project outcomes or sustainability specifically is difficult to attain from the TE.

6.2. Delays

6.2.1. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

This project suffered from severe delays. The project was to be implemented over a period of 5 years (2000-2004), however due to problems during the first four years, the implementation period took 9 years (TE page 31). Reasons for delays in achieving results was affected by issues such as the weak operational capacity of SEAM (executing agency under MAG) as well as level of discontinuous political support at a project directorate level. The extension of the duration of the project was also related to the low level of annual budget execution. The low execution level, besides influencing in the extension of the duration of the project, meant an increase in administrative costs at an amount close to 8% (5 vs 9 years) (TE page 31). The UNDP Country office in the last PIR (2010) rated Implementation Progress MS: "the marginally satisfactory rating resulted from all

the delays in implementation that occurred at all levels and for most of the Project's final products. Decision making processes, both technical and administrative, continued to affect project implementation, resulting in setbacks in terms of efficiency, while an important effort (technically and time-wise) was required from the UNDP office to achieve progress".

6.3. Country ownership

6.3.1. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

According to the TE: The reported results of the project have been addressed and incorporated into the country environmental strategy, as well as in SINASIP Strategic Plan and SEAM Financial Strategy.

SEAM has also capitalized the experiences gained with the project, in its process of internal restructuring, as well as in the implementation of new methodologies initially implemented through the project for the four APs, in the entire System of Protected Areas in Paraguay.

The key actors at national level are actively involved in the identification, planning and/or implementation of actions for the conservation of the 4 APs. The participation of NGOs, organized groups and local governments that supported the conservation of the four APs stands out, through the various activities undertaken by the project (TE page 10). Furthermore, "During the project implementation period, the central government promulgated various regulations that as a regulatory framework helped achieve the project objectives. Some examples of the rules promulgated are cited (TE page 11):

1. Law No. 1863/02 that approves the Agrarian Act. The National System of Wilderness Protected Areas is mentioned and its importance is recognized as a tool for preservation and protection of natural resources, inalienable and perpetuity in the Agrarian Act of Paraguay (Law, where a part is dedicated to the public and private nature conservation initiatives, considered not for expropriation and not subject to change, as long as they conform to the regulations issued in the Protected Areas Law and existing subsystems.
2. Law No. 3001/2006 "Appraisal and Compensation of Environmental Services"
3. Law No. 3003/2006 "which approves the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Paraguay, in the framework of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act (TFCA) for the establishment of a Tropical Forest Conservation Fund and a Tropical Forest Conservation Council... "

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

7.1. M&E design at entry –*Satisfactory*

The logframe as presented in the ProDoc has appropriate performance indicators at the outcome level. However some of the indicators are not phrased in a very precise manner and/or read more as targets. For example indicator "habitat conversion pressures within the four sites will have decreased". The logframe does include a detailed section on means of verification and responsibility for each of the activities in the project.

7.2. M&E implementation-

There is not enough information in the TE to understand how the M&E system was implemented. The section on M&E in the TE is brief, as follows; "The project execution was monitored by the UNDP local and regional office in a satisfactory manner. The instruments used were consistent and allow annual reviews, based on audits, financial control (CDR) and project implementation reports (PIR). Upon completion the project had five financial audits and 10 PIR, with an average rating of Satisfactory.

The monitoring of the effectiveness of applied management to the 4 APs was held through the implementation of the developed methodology by the World Wild Fund (WWF), entitled "Measuring of Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas" (TE page 15). The TE does not further elaborate on M&E arrangements, or the results of using the WWF methodology for PAs, budget or future arrangements for M&E of the PAs.

8. Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution

8.1. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution –**Moderately Satisfactory**

8.2. Overall Quality of Implementation- **Satisfactory**

This project was implemented over ten years instead of five and encountered many challenges. The TE reports that " the overall quality of project implementation and execution was satisfactory; since it was able to overcome difficulties, sustain the project in a complex political and institutional context, and manage the intervention facilitating synergies and institutional arrangements, and adaptive management, which strengthened conservation of the four APs" (TE page 41). The final UNDP PIR (2010) gave the implementation progress the rating MS stating, "As reported last year and in spite of the CO's efforts to improve project timely implementation, the marginally satisfactory rating results from all the delays in implementation that occurred at all levels and for most of the Project's final products. Decision making processes, both technical and administrative, continued to affect project implementation, resulting in setbacks in terms of efficiency, while an important effort (technically and time-wise) was required from the UNDP office to achieve progress. In fact, monitoring sessions were held weekly, in addition to several meetings with the Minister of SEAM and higher UNDP staff (RR and Programme Coordinator), to review AWP implementation and establish clear lines of work.

Thus, while SEAM's and project staff (currently 1 technical assistant and 1 administrative assistant) commitment is not questioned since this was evidenced throughout the above-mentioned meetings, the SEAM still needs to improve its institutional functioning in general

(for instance, the Directorship of Strategic Planning is still “provisional”, as are other functions) and to re-organize its human resources in order to improve efficiency. This issue has affected most of the SEAM project’s, including of course Paraguay Wildland.

As concerns the projects’ execution, this aspect also faced several challenges due to a variety of factors, both internal and external to the project, where changes were constant. The project went from NEX to DEX and back to NEX, while the project team also suffered changes and interaction with SEAM’s staff varied. Another factor affecting performance is that over the year 2009, project staff decreased down to an absolute minimum. On the other hand, SEAM’s repeated changes in authorities at different levels also impacted repeatedly on the execution rate" (UNDP PIR 2010).

8.3. *Overall Quality of Execution – Moderately Satisfactory*

Institutional weakness shown by the SEAM during the implementation phase was not properly detected in the formulation stage, so project design did not consider the issue of institutional strengthening sufficiently (TE page 8). Furthermore, an important limitation that the project had to face is related to the location of it within the institutional structure of SEAM. The beginning of the Project implementation coincided with the beginning of activities of the new environmental authority established in the year 2000: SEAM. The former Department of National Parks and Wildlife, in which the project would originally be hosted, was absorbed by SEAM becoming the Department of Protected Areas (DAP), which hierarchically depends on the General Directorate of Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (DGPCB). This meant that the project was hosted in a weak administrative position and with low institutional capacity to properly and consistently elevate the importance of protected areas in the country" (TE page 14). The deficit in the administrative capacity of the counterparty and the weakness in the support at a political level proved to be limiting factors for the proper development of the project activities and achievement of results. TE page 14).

9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Moderately Satisfactory	The TE does not provide any impact / outcomes assessment. The sections in the TE where impact is mentioned are unclear - for example (pg 39) "Both, the value of ecosystems of the four APs strengthened by the project, as actions for their conservation and results obtained by the project remain in effect; especially for the effects and impacts expected to be achieved in the future". The TE does not provide further details on what those are.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Moderately Satisfactory	The TE remains unclear in several areas and there is also a lack of information in some evaluation areas. For example a comprehensive M&E assessment is missing, baseline and methodologies are not mentioned, and the WWF PA methodology is not explained/assessed. Impact monitoring is not mentioned. There is a general lack of detail. The TE mentions biodiversity monitoring but without any reference as to what it would consist of, baselines or numbers that would indicate BD change. Detailed information on many of the components is lacking e.g. Awareness raising activities, public use plans of PAs institutional arrangements, NGO involvement and roles etc. There is a section on replicability - but the text in this section does not address this aspect sufficiently.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Moderately Satisfactory	In the sustainability section of the TE Sustainability is deemed as likely. However, the reasoning put forward in the TE to support this is not very convincing.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Satisfactory	Comprehensive
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Moderately Satisfactory	Project costs are included (including actual co-financing) but not per activity.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Moderately Satisfactory	The report does not sufficiently address the M&E system of the project. There is not enough information in the TE to understand how the M&E system was implemented. The section on M&E in the TE is brief, as follows; "The project execution was monitored by the UNDP local and regional office in a satisfactory manner. The instruments used were consistent and allow annual reviews, based on audits, financial control (CDR) and project implementation reports (PIR). Upon completion the project had five financial audits and 10 PIR, with an average rating of Satisfactory. The monitoring of the effectiveness of applied management to the 4 APs was held through the implementation of the developed methodology by the World Wild Fund (WWF), entitled "Measuring of Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas" (TE page 15). The TE does not further elaborate on M&E arrangements, or the results of using the WWF methodology for PAs, budget or future arrangements for M&E of the PAs.

10. Other issues to follow up on

11. Sources of information

Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved?

No

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance?

No

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

The TE reports that: "Availability of information about the environment has been made accessible to many; The availability of information for SEAM (Secretariat of the Environment) information system users, has improved significantly. This through: 1) The support of the project for the creation and installation of the "environmental library", 2) The strengthening of the tele-detection department, through the provision of equipment, software, hardware and training related to SIG management, and information generation; supported the construction of the Web design of SEAM and the correspondent site maintenance" (TE page 20). Furthermore the TE elaborates on printed and distributed materials as follows: Diverse forms, diverse materials were prepared: The Paraguayan Swamp; Environmental Indicators, SINASIP Financial Strategy, and SINASIP Master Plan Update, among more than 40 printed publications through the project or other institutions. Support was given to the creation of SEAM database, and the incorporation APs information on the web. A digital catalog was also prepared where the major milestones are presented, as well as specific publications on studies conducted in the four APs (TE page 22). Furthermore, Printed and distributed materials were produced as follows: Diverse forms and materials were prepared: The Paraguayan Swamp; Environmental Indicators, SINASIP Financial Strategy, and SINASIP Master Plan Update, more than 40 printed publications through the project or other institutions. Support was given to the creation of SEAM database, and the incorporation APs information on the web. A digital catalog was also prepared where the major milestones are presented, as well as specific publications on studies conducted in the four APs (TE page 22).

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?

Yes

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?

WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

The TE reports that attitudinal changes in stakeholder groups were identified. Positive changes in attitude are demonstrated toward conservation, in stakeholder groups. A survey conducted in November 2009, showed that at least 70% of the population recognizes -positive effects of APs on conservation. Values obtained were highly positive for Médanos del Chaco (97%), and San Rafael (98.3%). The results were Rio Negro (43.8%) and Paso Bravo (63.8%).
Furthermore, knowledge of the role of APs in the protection of environmental services was enhanced. Changes in the knowledge of stakeholder groups in the role of APs are shown in relation to the protection of environmental services provided by natural systems protected by the APs. The 2009 survey indicated that at least 90% of the target groups are aware of the main environmental services provided by APs (TE page 21).

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised?

Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

The TE reports that "appropriate awareness campaigns were developed which allowed improving the community perception about protected areas" (TE page 12). However more detailed information on the type of activities that were included in this campaign is not available in the TE. The TE further reports that the project: "consulted about the operation, methodology and progress of the project with the key actors involved. Specifically, on approval of management plans of the four APs - there was participation of local management committees, municipalities and governorates; NGOs and as well as other groups: indigenous people, women and farmers". (TE page 12). Training of local groups took place, including park rangers, technicians of the APs, the CLG, SEAM personnel, Local Governments personnel, and women groups, which also contributed to enhanced awareness and knowledge (TE page 20).

Was any *positive* change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?

Yes

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

The TE reports that attitudinal changes in stakeholder groups were identified: Positive changes in attitude are demonstrated toward conservation, in stakeholder groups. A survey conducted in November 2009, showed that at least 70% of the population recognizes -positive effects of APs on conservation. Values obtained were highly positive for Médanos del Chaco (97%), and San Rafael (98.3%). The results were Rio Negro (43.8%) and Paso Bravo (63.8%).
Furthermore, knowledge of the role of APs in the protection of environmental services was enhanced. Changes in the knowledge of stakeholder groups in the role of APs are shown in relation to the protection of environmental services provided by natural systems protected by the APs. The 2009 survey indicated that at least 90% of the target groups are aware of the main environmental services provided by APs (TE page 21). Other changes noted were (examples from Paso Bravo PA): 1. A change in the attitude of project participants towards the conservation of APs was noticed. Before the project, many residents had no knowledge of the concept of a park or an AP. 2. Experiences in the reproduction of forest species were generated. 3. Areas with forest loss through reforestation were recovered. The TE also reports that Data for the year 2008/09 report a reduction around 85% in the number of illegal activities within the boundaries of protected areas compared to previous years. For this period only two events reported illegal activity, one in San Rafael and one in Paso Bravo, which had coordinated intervention and detention of offenders (TE page 19).

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmental management skills?

Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO *TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS* BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

Training of local groups took place in the management of PAs, including park rangers, technicians of the APs, the CLG (local management committees), SEAM personnel, Local Governments personnel, and women groups (TE page 20).

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained?

Yes

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

The TE reports on a number of training activities, for example: "a number of management plans and committees were developed for the 4 PAs, 25 park rangers and 4 administrators were employed, monitoring, supervision and control took place in PAs and buffer zones, control of land use and forest fires were enhanced and number of studies were conducted in the four PAs".

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks?

Yes

Were these adopted?

Yes

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

The TE lists the resolutions as follows: For Paraguay Silvestre: Resolution No. 265/04 recognizes Management Committee, for San Rafael National Park SEAM Resolution No.32/2000 recognizes the Management Committee, for Médanos del Chaco National Park decree No.

2726/04 establishes the Médanos del Chaco National Park. Declaration of Departmental interest by Ordinance No. 04 of the Governorate of Boquerón. Recognition of the Management Committee, by SEAM Resolution No. 1214/1204 (TE page 23-25).

During the project implementation period, the central government promulgated various regulations that as regulatory framework helped achieve the project objectives. As an example, some examples of the rules promulgated are cited:

1. Law No. 1863/02 that approves the Agrarian Act. The National System of Wilderness Protected Areas⁸ is also stated and its importance is recognized as a tool for preservation and protection of natural resources, inalienable and perpetuity in the Agrarian Act of Paraguay (Law, where a part is dedicated to the public and private nature conservation initiatives, considered not for expropriation and not subject to change, as long as they conform to the regulations issued in the Protected Areas Law and existing subsystems.

2. Law No. 3001/2006 "Appraisal and Compensation of Environmental Services"

3. Law No. 3003/2006 "which approves the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Paraguay, in the framework of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act (TFCA) for the establishment of a Tropical Forest Conservation Fund and a Tropical Forest Conservation Council..." Furthermore, a number of relevant resolutions and regulatory decisions were taken during the years of the project and these are listed by the TE, however it is not clear which ones of these the project contributed to explicitly. The TE reports as follows (page 11-12): Regulatory decisions issued by the Secretariat of Environment for the protection, operation and management of Protected Areas for the period 2000-2010:

a. PARK RANGERS AND SUPERVISION OF PROTECTED AREAS. Definition of functions of Park Rangers and its Supervision in Wilderness Protected Areas under public domain that make up the National System of Protected Areas.
b. MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE. i) Recognition of the Management Committee of Médanos del Chaco National Park, as a coordination of actions within its boundaries and buffer zone; ii) Recognition to the Management Committee of the Paso Bravo National Park as an instance of coordination of actions within its boundaries and buffer zones; iii) Definition of Nature Objectives and Responsibilities of Management Committees of Wilderness Protected Areas in the public domain; iv) Recognition of the Management Committee of Defensores del Chaco National Park, v) Recognition of the Management Committee of the Reserve area for San Rafael National Park, Department of Itapúa vi) Recognition of the new Board of Directors of the Management Committee of Paso Bravo National Park; vii) Extension of the art. 2° resolution n° 581 dated April 20, 2005: "by which is recognized the Management Committee of the Chaco Biosphere Reserve, as coordinating body for environmental management and sustainable development; viii) For which it is recognized the Management Committee of the Chaco Biosphere Reserve, as a coordinating body for the management and sustainable development.

c. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT IN PROTECTED AREAS. Establishment that every document of EIA

related to Protected Areas, its Buffer Zones and wildlife pass through the Directorate of Biodiversity."

d. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES. i) Approval of Minutes of Intervention Model to be used by the Directorate of Protected Areas, dependent of the DGPCB; ii) Appointment of members of the Secretariat of the Environment in the framework of the new organizational structure project PAR98/Gg33 "Initiative for the Protection of Wilderness Areas of Paraguay; iii) Approval of the new organizational structure project PAR98/G33 "initiative for the Protection of Wilderness Areas of Paraguay; iv) Adoption of Signaling Manual of the National Wilderness Protected Areas of Paraguay and the Guide for signaling in the wilderness protected areas; v) Establishment of the Technical Committee of the Secretariat of Environment, to assess and report on the verification of environmental and administrative management in the protected wilderness area of Médanos del Chaco; vi) Approval of the sheet to be used for the National Registry of Wilderness Protected Areas of Paraguay.

e. MANAGEMENT PLAN. i) Directs the development of the Management Plan of the Médanos del Chaco Park and the beginning of measurement tasks of the same and are designated SEAM units responsible for carrying out such actions as necessary to that end; ii) Approval of Park Management Plan of the Defensores del Chaco National Park; iii) Approval of the Management Plan of Paso Bravo National Park; iv) By which it is approved the Management Plan of Médanos del Chaco National Park.

f. USAGE. i) Regulation of the Conservation and Rational Utilization and Sustainable of Wildlife in Paraguay; ii) Establishment of Regulations for Public Use of Wilderness Protected Areas in the public domain;

g. MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES. Allocation and Regulation of the Management Categories; the Zoning and Uses and Activities.

h. WILDLIFE. i) To rescind the resolutions of quota allocation for the Commercialization of wildlife and establishes requirements for the operation of storage facilities for live animals; ii) Approval of the list of protected species of endangered wildlife species; iii) Establishment of the basic structure of management projects of exotic native plant nurseries, iv) Partial Correction of the Art part 2 of Resolution No. 1944/06, dated October 2, 2006 "by which it is established the period of fishing Veda, v) Approval of the List of Threatened Flora and Fauna Species of Paraguay; vi) Approval of the List of Threatened Wildlife Species of Paraguay.

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures?

Yes

Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?

Yes

WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

The TE reports that "the project succeeded in developing the "SINASIP Strategic Plan" and "Financial Sustainability Strategy," instruments aimed to ensure the sustainability. The implementation and effectiveness of both strategies will depend on the future leadership of SEAM and of the support this may receive from the political levels in the country". Furthermore, according to the TE "the development of APs local management capacities was a permanent result, given by the formation and strengthening of local management committees and organized groups. This condition strengthens the sustainability of APs, through an increase in APs governance levels. However, after the project completion local committees were weakened. Currently, the sustainability of management committees is threatened due to lack of local leadership. Different NGOs and other international agencies provide resources to strengthen the conservation of these permanent resource flows can not be guaranteed over time. (TE page 34).

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

Yes

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

Yes

WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?

The project established four PAs that are currently functioning (according to the TE). Training of local groups took place in the management of PAs, including park rangers, technicians of the APs, the CLG (local management committees), SEAM personnel, Local Governments personnel, and women groups (TE page 20). Furthermore, knowledge of the role of APs in the protection of environmental services were enhanced. Changes in the knowledge of stakeholder groups in the role of APs are shown in relation to the protection of environmental services provided by natural systems protected by the APs. The 2009 survey indicated that at least 90% of the target groups are aware of the main environmental services provided by APs (TE page 21).

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

No

WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION?
WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?

Did the project contribute to any of the following:

Technologies & Approaches

No

Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies

No

Financial Mechanisms

No

Please specify what was contributed:

Did **replication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place?

No

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.

WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

No

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.

HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

UA

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

The TE reports on a number of relevant legal resolutions and regulations that were put in place during the course of the project. See section on laws/regulations adopted in this TER (TE page 11-12). However it is not clear to what extent these were results of the project. The TE reads: During the project implementation period, the central government promulgated various regulations that as regulatory framework helped achieve the project objectives. In Appendix 8 it is possible to observe an inventory of these regulations that collaborated with the project implementation. As an example, some examples of the rules promulgated are cited:

1. Law No. 1863/02 that approves the Agrarian Act. The National System of Wilderness Protected Areas is also stated and its importance is recognized as a tool for preservation and protection of natural resources, inalienable and perpetuity in the Agrarian Act of Paraguay (Law, where a part is dedicated to the public and private nature conservation initiatives, considered not for expropriation and not subject to change, as long as they conform to the regulations issued in the Protected Areas Law and existing subsystems.
2. Law No. 3001/2006 "Appraisal and Compensation of Environmental Services"
3. Law No. 3003/2006 "which approves the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Paraguay, in the framework of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act (TFCA) for the establishment of a Tropical Forest Conservation Fund and a Tropical Forest Conservation Council..."

Did **removal of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place? No

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

Institutional Capacity (governance) <--dropdown menu

If "combination", then of which types?

& <--dropdown menu

QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL STATUS HAS CHANGED AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.

Was stress reduction achieved? No

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (local)
<input type="checkbox"/> Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (systemic)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (systemic)
How was the information obtained?		
<input type="checkbox"/> Measured	<input type="checkbox"/> Anecdotal	

Was there a change in environmental status?

No

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local

Intended (local)

Unintended (local)

Systemic

Intended (systemic)

Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured

Anecdotal

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

Some local stress reduction was noted: The TE noted that Data for the year 2008/09 report a reduction around 85% in the number of illegal activities within the boundaries of protected areas compared to previous years. For this period only two events reported illegal activity, one in San Rafael and one in Paso Bravo, which had coordinated intervention and detention of offenders (TE page 19).

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental

UA

Socioeconomic

UA

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

The TE does not include the logframe of the project and does not assess the indicators or targets; however there is a descriptive section on project results (page 18-23). The logframe in the ProDoc does contain indicators such as "Improvement in number and distribution of threatened species within the PAs" with species monitoring in year 1 (baseline), 4,5 and 7 for example. Other impact monitoring in the original Logframe is e.g. "habitat conversion pressures within the four sites will have decreased" (ProDoc page 26). However the TE does report on the developments of each of the PAs per year (page 25-28) which includes "monitoring of biological diversity" and "monitoring of change in land use and forest fires". The TE does not provide any other information on these monitoring activities and this aspect can therefore not be assessed.

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

u/a

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

UA

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

The TE reports that all the PAs have management plans, operational plans, monitoring plans and management plans in place, and while the local communities are involved in the management of the PAs, it remains unclear as how these will operated after the project ends (as financial means are limited). See also section on sustainability.

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

The PA management committees have monitoring plans that include "monitoring of biological diversity" and "monitoring of change in land use and forest fires", however the extent to which this is taking place is unclear.

Has the monitoring data been used for management?

UA

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

UA

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

“SOCIOECONOMIC” REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE “BEFORE” AND “AFTER” NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS

COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts?

No

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local

Intended (local)

Unintended (local)

Systemic

Intended (systemic)

Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured

Anecdotal

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts?

No

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

The lessons provided by the TE related to design, institutional aspects in implementation and sustainability of results. A total of 27 lessons were provided (TE page 44-45).

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The recommendations provided by the TE aim to bring the project and its results forward. For example "the approved Strategic Plan of SINASIP" and "Financial Sustainability Strategy" - should now be implemented". A total of 22 recommendations are provided (TE page 42-43) around ensuring sustainability, PA model and institutional strengthening.