



Fondo para el Medio
Ambiente Mundial



FINAL PROJECT EVALUATION MISSION REPORT

“CONSOLIDATION OF THE BAÑADOS DEL ESTE BIOSPHERE RESERVE”

E. Fuentes (Team Leader)
M. C. Varela (Consultant)
November 4th, 2003.

ACRONYMS USED IN THE TEXT AND ANNEXES.

- ADEATUR** – Asociación de Eco y Agroturismo (Association of Eco- and Agri-Tourism)
- AECI** - Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional (Spanish International Cooperation Agency)
- AMGRU** – Asociación de Mujeres Rurales (Association of Rural Women)
- APROMIEL** – Asociación de Productores de Miel (Association of Honey Producers)
- ANEP** – Administración Nacional de Enseñanza Pública (National Administration of Public Schooling)
- AUCRIÑA** – Asociación Uruguaya de Criadores de Ñandúes (Uruguayan Association of Ñandú Breeders)
- BR** – Reserva de Biosfera Bañados del Este (Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve)
- CCU** – Centro Cooperativista Uruguayo (Uruguayan Cooperatives Centre)
- CERP** – Centros Regionales de Formación de Profesores (Regional Teacher Training Centres)
- CLAEH** – Centro Latinoamericano de Economía Humana (Latin American Human Economics Centre)
- CND** – Corporación Nacional para el Desarrollo (National Development Agency)
- COTUNA** – Cooperativa de Turismo Náutico (Nautical Tourism Cooperative)
- CRR** – Consejo Regulador Regional (Regional Regulating Council)
- CRT** – Corporación Rochense de Turismo (Rocha Tourism Agency)
- DINAMA** – Dirección Nacional de Medio Ambiente (National Directorate for the Environment)
- DINAMIGE** – Dirección Nacional de Minería y Geología (National Directorate for Mining and Geology)
- DINARA** – Dirección Nacional de Recursos Acuáticos (National Directorate for Water Resources)
- DINOT** – Dirección Nacional de Ordenamiento Territorial (National Directorate for Land Use)
- DNH** – Dirección Nacional de Hidrografía (National Directorate for Hydrography)
- GEF** – Global Environmental Facility
- GIS** –Geographical Information System
- GRADE** – Grupo de Apicultores del Este (Group of Beekeepers of the East)
- GUPECA** – Grupo Uruguayo para el Estudio y Conservación de las Aves (Uruguayan Group for the Study and Conservation of Birds)
- IFD** – Instituto de Formación Docente (Teacher Training Institute)
- IMR** – Intendencia Municipal de Rocha (Government of the Department of Rocha)
- INIA** – Instituto Nacional de Investigación Agropecuaria (National Agricultural and Cattle-Raising Research Institute)
- IUCN** –International Union for Conservation of Nature
- JUNAGRA** – Junta Nacional de la Granja (National Small-Holding Board)
- MAB** – Man and Biosphere
- MGAP** – Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca (Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries)
- MIEM** – Ministerio de Industria, Energía y Minería (Ministry of Industry, Energy and Mining)

MTOP – Ministerio de Transporte y Obras Públicas (Ministry of Transportation and Public Works)

MVOTMA – Ministerio de Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Medio Ambiente (Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment)

NGO – Non-Governmental Organization

OSE – Obras Sanitarias del Estado (State Water Works)

PA –Protected Areas

PIA – Producción Integrada Apícola (Comprehensive Bee-Keeping Production)

PROBIDES – Programa de Conservación de la Biodiversidad y Desarrollo Sustentable en los Humedales del Este (Program for the Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Eastern Wetlands)

RAMSAR - Convention on Wetlands

SAR – Sociedad Agropecuaria de Rocha (Farmers Association of Rocha)

SEPAE – Servicio de Parques del Ejército (Army Park Services)

ToR- Terms of Reference

TSC – Train Sea Coast

IUCN –International Union for Conservation of Nature

UNDP –United Nations Development program

UNEP - United Nations Environmental program

UNESCO – United Nations Education, Science and Culture Organization

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The core objective of the Project under evaluation for the Consolidation of Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve (BR) (Uruguay) was to supplement the activities of the first stage of a two-phased intervention. These concerned mainly training and research, with activities involving on-site support and the creation of political frameworks to ensure the protection and sustainability of the reserve's biodiversity of global interest. The Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve_ is an area covering about 350,000 hectares consisting of lagoons and wetlands, which had been qualified as such by MAB/UNESCO in the mid-70s. Prior to the GEF project, there had not been systematic action undertaken to implement the Biosphere Reserve and ensure its protection by eliminating threats to its biodiversity.

Between 1992 and 1995, a first phase of the GEF intervention was executed that focused on studies and training, and between 1997 and 2002 a second phase was undertaken – the consolidation phase. This evaluation regards only the last consolidation phase.

The Project Document, to which Uruguay, UNDP and GEF were committed, proposed six objectives over two stages:

The objectives of the first phase included the following:

Objective 1: A set of legal provisions governing the use and regulation of the territory, including mainland lands and waters, and coastal areas, to ensure the long-term ecological integrity of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve.

Objective 2: Political frameworks and incentives mechanisms, as well as regulations, to allow for the successful implementation of the set of legal provisions.

The second-phase objectives covered the following:

Objective 3: An effective system of public and private protected areas at the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve.

Objective 4: Land use practices compatible with biodiversity conservation and activities consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, adopted by farmers, tourist industry entrepreneurs and other users of the resources.

Objective 5: Capacities of the Government, NGOs and the private sector strengthened the effective implementation of agricultural and tourist-industry policies within the conceptual frameworks of the Biosphere Reserve and the uses and conservation plan.

Objective 6: Greater awareness, at both national and local level, concerning the benefits of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve.

UNDP commissioned the consultants Mr Eduardo Fuentes (head of the mission) and Mrs Carmen Varela to carry out the final evaluation of the Project for the Consolidation of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve (Uruguay), to prepare an independent expert opinion concerning the significance, history and degree of success of the Project execution. This purpose of the evaluation included specific interest for an assessment of the project impacts and sustainability of its achievements and results, including capacity-building through training and the conservation of biodiversity of global interest. It also included interest in

identifying the lessons learnt and any recommendations that might contribute to the design of other initiatives and to fulfil the final consolidation of the Project achievements.

Between October 6th and 18th, 2003, the consultants studied the basic project documents and carried out field visits to determine actions undertaken and meet with some of the main stakeholders in Uruguay and in the wetlands area. Subsequently, they prepared their evaluation report.

The main findings and conclusions of the evaluation mission are:

- The Project was successful in achieving all six objectives. Most of the stakeholders mentioned as well as the consultants agreed that the most significant achievements of the project were the preparation and adoption of the Rocha Coastal Land Use Regulation, the Bañados Master Plan, the Regional approach as opposed to the more traditional uni-Department approach, the demonstrations concerning the uses of native biodiversity and the training, awareness and education of the stakeholders.
- Although the protected areas act was one of the Project objectives, and the Project played a very large role in the process leading to its achievement, there are certain stakeholders who prefer not to acknowledge this as a Project achievement but rather as an initiative which had the support of the Project but which was the result of a broader social dynamics.
- The consultants were able to link impact indicators to each one of the six objectives and saw proof that, in all of them, the Project had achieved training, impact in the field and awareness building in stakeholders and of the civil society. The project has contributed to the protection of public and private areas, in the legal and regulatory frameworks achieved, and in generating sustainable uses of the local biodiversity. In other words, the Project was successful in attaining its goals for protecting the biodiversity of the wetlands in the Biosphere Reserve, in the 350,000 hectares that were approved as the Bañados BR, in 1976 by MAB and UNESCO. In the opinion of the consultants, the Project has set firm bases for future stages, when the protected areas will be able to continue gaining strength and increasing sustainable local biodiversity uses. (*See results Section page 25-32*)
- Although the Project did not comply in strict sequential order with the two stages indicated in the Project Document, these were completed in an overlapping manner. Because of the long time it takes for laws and rules to be officially approved, if the Project had not worked concurrently on both stages, it would probably not have been possible to fulfil them on time and the Project would not have been as successful as it was.
- According to the Project Brief, the Project would have had \$ 4 million at its disposal for implementation purposes. In the Project Document, however, the financing only appears to have been \$ 3.5 million. This reduction occurred because the Government of Uruguay cut back its contribution in kind. Additionally, during the execution, Government contributions were further reduced, but other donations were obtained which made up for it and, as a result, the Project was implemented with little more than \$ 3.8 million.
- The funds were distributed in a relatively equitable manner between the six objectives. The basic focus, which was consistent with GEF standards, was to invest in removing

barriers to the conservation and sustainable uses of the biodiversity and strengthening the protected areas.

- Although the Project is qualified as a success and the funds were used following an incremental criterion, the consultants believe that certain expenditure decisions could have been taken so as to make investments more cost-effective from the viewpoint of ensuring the conservation of a biodiversity of global importance. For instance, if instead of enlarging the working areas in order to prepare a Master Plan covering 3.85 million hectares, the efforts had been focused on the area originally set (less than 10% of the surface it finally operated in), part of those funds could have been used for activities more closely connected with conservation. The State-owned protected areas could have been strengthened to a larger extent and endowed with more infrastructure works (access roads, more and better trails, more signalling, etc.), more educational activities could have been undertaken, or more work could have been done with producers interested in the uses of biodiversity, such as fishermen.
- The Project did not implement a systematic biological monitoring plan, as mentioned in the Project Document; however, some pilot experiences were developed on a small scale aimed at training local groups. The Project was submitted to regular tripartite evaluations and a mid-term review, which were useful to guide the execution.
- Several and varied stakeholders were involved in the Project implementation. The Governing Board of PROBIDES (MVOTMA, the Government of the Department of Rocha – and later the addition of the four other Governments of the Departments which form part of the enlarged Biosphere Reserve– and the Universidad de la República), the Program Director and his technical team. Social stakeholders from the public and private spheres were also incorporated at different levels of the Project. Among the latter, the following can be highlighted: NGOs, groups of small producers and entrepreneurs, some already existing and others established as a result of the Project (“ñandú” *rhea Americana*– breeders and ecotourism), and representatives from Councils and other Government bodies of the Departments.
- Nevertheless, the participation of the stakeholders was not always as satisfactory as it could have been. For instance, the broad and representative Operations Advisory Committee, which was to enable the participation of NGOs, the private sector and key Ministries such as MGAP and the Ministry of Tourism, was never established and never met, and this prevented important stakeholders from being formally involved.
- The Advisory Committee, which should have been composed of international NGOs, technical institutions, UNDP and universities, was never established either, and this was another lost opportunity concerning the more formal attachment of important stakeholders.
- Despite all of this and although the two committees mentioned above were never formed – thus preventing the formal participation of the other stakeholders–, there was an effective dialogue with and involvement of the private sector (businessmen, farmers), NGOs, teachers belonging to the educational system, and the rural police, which set the bases and provide the roots to continue the Biosphere Reserve conservation work and to provide it with leverage.

- The dissemination of information concerning the objectives and achievements of the Project through publications, meetings, workshops and the media was excellent.
- The Project was implemented by UNDP and executed by PROBIDES (Programa de Conservación de la Biodiversidad y Desarrollo Sustentable en los Humedales del Este – program for the Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Development in the Eastern Wetlands). PROBIDES is composed of the Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment, the Government of the Department of Rocha and the Universidad de la República but does not have the status of a legal entity. During the execution of the Project, and to the extent that it decided to enlarge the coverage area from 350,000 hectares to 3,850,000 hectares, the Governments of the four additional Departments that are within the same watershed were incorporated.
- In general terms, the sustainability of the Project goals is based on the durability of the public and private protected areas, on the association with the producers who incorporate sustainable biodiversity use practices, and on the new awareness concerning the value of the RB biodiversity. Several pillars that are more or less independent from each other in turn support these networking nodes. The Government, the private sector and the income coming from the sustainable uses of biodiversity ensure that the efforts are sustainable. The protected areas will be funded from private efforts, the NGOs and the Government. The sustainable uses practices of biodiversity will be self -supporting based on the markets and in the future will increase as ecotourism grows and the MERCOSUR integration is greater. The training and education provided to the NGO social stakeholders, teacher training centres (secondary and primary school teachers), the rural police, farmers, the young and the technical experts from the Governments of the Departments, has created leaders who actively participate in maintaining and extrapolating the actions which enable the continuity of the works actions undertaken in favour of the conservation of the Biosphere Reserve.
- PROBIDES is preparing a sustainability strategy that ensures the continuity and expansion of the work carried out during the completed Project stage. Work is likewise being carried out on a Regional Development Plan between the five Governments of the Departments covered by the enlarged Biosphere Reserve. The area shall hence be conceived as a region, and as such it shall extend beyond the political and administrative boundaries of the Departments and operate under a regional criterion. This fact in itself sets a milestone in the rural management of the country. It is to be hoped, however, that the Regional Development Plan adopts the Master Plan for the 3,850,000 hectares as drafted by the Project and its recommendations concerning the conservation and sustainable use of the regional biosphere.
- In addition to sustainability, the Project also shows signs of replicability in exporting lessons and knowledge to other similar projects in the region. Indeed, the enlargement of the Project area already constitutes a form of replication.

The following section presents the main recommendations for strengthening the protection of biodiversity during the regional development:

- It seems important that PROBIDES management formally incorporate more local stakeholders and more stakeholders linked to the productive sector. It is possible to think about having an enlarged steering committee which also includes a representative from the MAB Committee of Uruguay (in charge of RB management), key ministries, the private sector, NGOs and representatives from the communities. For instance, the ministries of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries, of Tourism and of Public Works could become members of PROBIDES since they are agencies which already have a share in the responsibility of managing the area.
- If PROBIDES were to have the status of a legal entity, it could be the direct recipient of projects and operate in a more agile manner. Additionally, PROBIDES could have a greater presence and insertion in Montevideo and thus speed-up any formalities whenever this is necessary.
- It seems that PROBIDES has completed a stage of its development, and instead of thinking about an institutional project that would cover all its interests, it might be more interesting for PROBIDES to become a type of umbrella providing support and management to several projects on the subject of conservation and development. This might be the right time to prepare action plans and seek financing for sub-programs such as public protected areas and private protected areas, rather than having them wait until PROBIDES has a new action plan. PROBIDES staff could focus on managing and obtaining resources for specific sub-programs.
- The University could develop a more organic linkage with PROBIDES, so that it is institutionally committed. In order to achieve this, its involvement must go beyond having a representative in the Governing Board.
- Similarly, the Governments of the Departments and MVOTMA could also develop closer and more effective ties with PROBIDES.
- It seems important that, when the regulatory provisions of the Protected Areas Act are adopted, PROBIDES and the Ministry give top priority to the areas included in the Bañados del Este BIOSPHERE RESERVE in its restricted definition, i.e. 350,000 hectares. In this manner, there would be several examples available for the national program and an early protection of the wetlands area would be ensured. For the same reasons, it would be extremely important to start a protected areas sub-program within the framework of PROBIDES. A sub-program could be useful as an example of how strategic agreements should be developed, funding found and actions in the field implemented.
- When the regional planning discussions start, it would be important to also consider giving priority to the protected areas in the broader Biosphere Reserve, i.e. 3,850,000 hectares, and that the lessons learnt from the Project be put to good use concerning the convenience of having buffer zones around them.

Moreover, there are several lessons that can be gleaned from this Project, and which can be useful for future initiatives with similar purposes.

- It seems important that in projects that address Biosphere Reserves that have a land use matrix consists of core areas and sustainable use areas, the private sector and the key ministries regarding territorial management participate from the very beginning. In general, it does not seem sufficient to have the ministries of the environment involved.
- Basic or semi-basic studies may seem to be necessary, but they should not be the core of the Project and should be focused on fulfilling knowledge needs for management purposes. On occasion, scientists or experts in specific techniques manage to attract too much attention to knowledge gaps and thus distract from the core biodiversity management objectives of the projects. The steering committees play a significant role in securing the proper balance between the activities and, in this regard, it might be important for UNDP not to be just an observer, but to have a more active involvement.
- The publications that are most useful for biodiversity conservation sustainable uses projects are field guides, management plans, dissemination and information brochures, guides as to how things should be done, rather than scientific or technical publications. Occasionally, scientific or technical papers may become a core project objective to the detriment of field actions.
- Projects with multiple components that target preservation, sustainable uses and awareness may form a network that is easier to sustain than individual initiatives. In these cases, feedback among the components contributes to establish a conservation culture which provides greater political strength and sustainability to the initiative. The social capital of stakeholders interested in conservation/preservation may be the best guarantee of sustainability. On occasion the attraction of funds for and investment in the establishment of social networks of stakeholders for conservation are underestimated.
- Projects needing changes in the laws and legal provisions concerning land use may require eight or more years before their objectives are attained. These projects may require building high levels of awareness among the local population and at Government level. Frequently, there is a sense of urgency and pressure to have projects that only take 4-5 years.
- Biodiversity conservation/management projects have different needs during their execution stage. Sometimes staff is hired with the expectation that it will be there for the entire duration of the project, and this introduces flexibility and may incur cumbersome management that is more closely tied to the staff than to the achievement of certain goals agreed upon before project execution commences.

2. INTRODUCTION.

The purpose of the final evaluation of the Project Consolidation of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve (Uruguay) was to have an independent expert opinion regarding the significance, history and degree of success of the project during its execution. In addition there was an interest in assessing the impacts and sustainability of its achievements and results, including capacity building and the conservation of a biodiversity of global interest. A third area of interest was to identify the lessons learnt and recommendations which could contribute to the design of other projects and achieve the final consolidation of this project's achievements. The ToRs showing details of all these issues can be found in ANNEX 1.

The Project Document proposed six objectives and a series of outcomes to consolidate the achievements of the first stage of GEF intervention (1992-1995). This second phase was to conserve the biodiversity of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve through the elimination of barriers to the consolidation of the Biosphere Reserve. According to the Project Document, this would be achieved through the following:

“Completion of the plans concerning the use of water and land, and coastal management of the Reserve; assistance for the enactment of the National Act on Protected Areas, analyzed by the Uruguayan Senate; identification of land use technologies which are biodiversity-friendly so that they can be used by producers in the buffer and transition zones; design of funding mechanisms to catalyze the adoption of these technologies; development of a framework of incentives/regulations to encourage the adoption of these technologies; the establishment of a network throughout the Reserve of public and private protected areas; capacity-building among the private sector, Government agencies and NGOs to help those interested in adopting new technologies or managing protected areas; help local interested parties to identify and overcome barriers to the development of economic activities which add value to natural habitats; and raising the awareness concerning a broad range of local and national stakeholders through activities targeting the formal and non formal educational sectors and the media.

The Project Document goes on to indicate that the Project was to be executed in two phases: during the 1st phase, PROBIDES would execute the activities under Objectives 1 and 2 with regard to the completion and approval of the Protected Areas Act and the Master Plan. Once these have been approved and the legal frameworks and policies are operational, PROBIDES would proceed to Phase 2, which involves the fulfilment of the other four objectives. In order to progress to Phase 2 with a minimum delay, the preparation of the activities corresponding to Objectives 3-6 would be executed during Phase 1.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY.

The evaluation was performed by Dr. Eduardo Fuentes (independent consultant and Team Leader) and Sociologist Ms Carmen Varela (independent consultant and Professor at the Universidad de la República in Montevideo).

Before going to the field, the evaluators had at their disposal and examined a vast selection of documents prepared by UNDP and PROBIDES (ANNEX 5 and ToRs). Between October 8 and 17, the evaluators went on a field trip to meet with and talk to a selected sample of stakeholders and visit some of the working areas (ANNEX 3 and 4).

During the first day of fieldwork, October 8, the consultants met with UNDP in Montevideo and agreed on the details of the visits and the expectations, defining a final schedule both for the visits and the people to interview. (ANNEX 2).

The consultants agreed upon the purpose and modality of the interviews before they started. Both consultants were present at all the interviews. In addition to the formal interviews, the consultants had a chance to individually meet some of the stakeholders. The results of these meetings also were discussed between the consultants before including them in this report.

The Project Document does not contain a logical framework matrix enabling an easy evaluation of the Project achievements and impacts. Therefore, for this part of the evaluation, the consultants have prepared a matrix that could be used for such a purpose. The matrix contains the objectives and results proposed in the Project Document, as well as indicators of the impacts expected or times of impacts expected under each of the headings. The indicators were proposed and approved by the Project Team (ANNEX 6).

For the rest of the interviews, as relevant, a questionnaire was prepared to cover all the items described in the ToR. In preparing the questionnaire, the annexes to the ToR were used (see ANNEX 1).

The scores for the achievements and the conclusions of the evaluation were reached by agreement between the two consultants.

Both consultants wish to thank UNDP and PROBIDES staff for their hospitality and help throughout the duration of the mission. The consultants also wish to thank all the interviewees for their patience in answering the innumerable questions asked during the interviews.

The Consolidation Project is a complex project and the time for the mission was short. Due to the brief time available, the consultants may not have fully understood the whole range of nuances which a project with so many components of such a broad range as this one presents, but they hope to have managed to grasp their essence and so contribute to the success of similar experiences.

EVALUATION STRUCTURE

The evaluation structure follows the list of desired contents according to the ToR. In other words, after presenting the project and its context, an explanation is given of the findings and conclusions concerning the concept and its formulation, implementation and outcome. In the last two sections, recommendations are made and mention is made of the lessons learned from the analyses and interviews carried out. At the end, annexes are attached illustrating or explaining methodological issues and providing data which were deemed to be significant as a supplement to the bulk of the text.

3. THE PROJECT AND ITS CONTEXT

The Consolidation of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve (BR) Project has as its core objective to supplement the preparatory training and research activities of the first state, in order to ensure the protection of globally significant biodiversity of the Reserve. The Bañados del Este BIOSPHERE RESERVE was awarded this distinction by UNESCO in the mid-70s, but no systematic actions were undertaken to implement the Reserve and ensure its protection by eliminating threats to its biodiversity.

The project's development objective was to attain improved generalized and permanent conditions in the quality of life of the population, in a healthy and productive environment of environmental excellence. This development objective is focused on two fundamental elements of the Project: environmental excellence and the quality of life of the population.

In order to consolidate biodiversity protection and improve the quality of life of the population, a six-component Project was formulated:

1. To prepare and achieve official approval for a regulation governing the use and planning of the territory, including lands and mainland waters and coastal zones, and ensuring the long-term ecological integrity of the BR.
2. To create political frameworks and incentives, as well as regulations to enable the successful execution of the afore-mentioned regulation.
3. To create an effective system of public and private protected areas within the BR.
4. To succeed in having farmers, businessmen in the tourist industry and other BR resources users adopt land use practices compatible with biodiversity conservation.
5. To succeed in having public and private protected areas managers trained in managing the wildlife and the habitats in order to preserve biodiversity.
6. To achieve a greater national and local awareness of the BR benefits.

The Project was formulated in two phases. Upon completion of the first phase, the following would be available:

- A set of rules governing the use of lands and waters, including the coastal area, and ensuring the long-term integrity of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve.
- A National Protected Areas Act covering the establishment of a National Protected Areas System.
- A proposal to design and institutionalize a National Trust Fund for the Sustainable Use of Land with the purpose of providing seed financing to promote biodiversity-friendly use practices.

Once the first stage is completed, an independent mid-term review would be performed and then the second stage would be executed.

Upon completion of the second stage, the following would be available:

- An effective public and private protected system supported on a geo-referenced data base with information including the distribution and number of species, together with zoning and land use data.
- A technical support system, based at PROBIDES, for the managers of protected areas.
- A set of technologies or production methods that mitigate the adverse effects of current land use practices on biodiversity.
- The identification of financial, information, institutional, technical, managerial and other barriers for the execution of sustainable technologies or production methods.
- A diagnosis on the potential demand of nature tourism in the Biosphere Reserve and the implementation of measures to for its development.
- A system for the production, quality control and marketing of natural products managed by the producers of the zone.
- A strengthened technical capacity of the NGOs, local governments and private sector stakeholders concerning protected areas management.
- Strengthened institutional capacities of the agencies charged with the execution of government policies in areas connected with the biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in the Biosphere Reserve.
- Developed educational modules liable to be integrated into existing formal and non formal education syllabuses (primary, secondary and tertiary and by NGOs).
- A general dissemination system on the Biosphere Reserve integrating the different existing media (Internet, TV, radio, press, publications).

Of the eight items, the first two refer to the implementation of the protected areas, the next four items concern sustainable development practices and the last four cover training, education and dissemination on protected area management and biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in the Biosphere Reserve.

The Consolidation project has objectives regarding biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in an area with multiple uses and consequently it has a vast and broad range of stakeholders who make it possible. The leading actors in this project are PROBIDES (formed by the Universidad de la Republica, the Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment, and the Government of the Department of Rocha), cattle raisers, rice growers and businessmen in the tourist industry which operate in the BR, NGOs and the rest of the civil society present in the area.

As mentioned earlier, the Project under evaluation is the second and last phase of GEF Pilot Phase project called Bañados del Este Biodiversity Conservation (1992-1995). According to the Project Document, the Consolidation of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve project would have duration of 48 months. In practice, the Project was executed between November 1st, 1997 and October 31st, 2002, i.e. over a period of 61 months. The evaluation was carried out almost one year after project's main activities were completed and this has made it possible to witness a few developments that took place after its completion.

4. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

PROJECT CONCEPT AND FORMULATION.

Implementation Approach. The Project seems to have been logically stated and the team that executed it, have indicated they had no problems with the proposal. There were a few comments to the effect that the project involved too many studies but these probably referred to the first phase intervention. Apparently, during this first stage (1992-1995) and early into the Consolidation Project, there were a few concerns with regard to the applicability of the project products. In the opinion of the consultants (evaluators), although the first phase did include many studies, this changed in the project for the consolidation stage. Despite this, and as will be seen, it is possible that more studies than those initially planned were carried out during the implementation of the second phase.

A few comments were also made with regard to the fact that some objectives, such as the protected areas act or the set of regulations governing land use, were too broad as objectives of a project. In other words, the enactment of laws and land use regulations are responsibilities for a broader sector of society and should not form part of projects of this nature. On the other hand, projects on the sustainable conservation/use of biodiversity must frequently seek to change regulations on the use of the resources for them to be viable, and part of the challenge is to promote such changes. From this perspective, a key element may be to have critical actors involved from the very beginning.

During the first phase of the Project, mistakes were made and attempts to remedy them were made in the Consolidation stage. For instance, amongst others these include:- goals that were too ambitious; insufficient execution time; lack of clarity in the objectives and expected outcomes; and lack of NGO participation. Likewise, and in response to the first phase project evaluation, attempts were made to overcome the lack of stakeholder involvement, the lack of efforts by PROBIDES to identify alternatives concerning biodiversity-friendly uses, shortage of educational activities, integration of PROBIDES with other development agencies, and monitoring of biological and sociological variables. To a certain extent, project formulation took into account these recommendations based on shortcomings of first phase.

No mention was made in the Project Document regarding other integrated management initiatives in the region. Possibly, this was due, in part, to the fact that it was a project whose origins were in the GEF Pilot phase, and that by the second phase there was a degree of certainty on what seemed to be necessary. Nevertheless, during their visit, the evaluators heard that since 1985 several fruitless attempts had been made at developing management plans for the wetlands region, but they had not prospered due to the complexity of the stakeholders. It would have been interesting to learn more about those early plans and see the real causes why they failed so as to draw lessons from them. There seems to be some dispute among the institutions as to which one would be best qualified to lead a task as highly complex as the drafting of a plan acceptable.

The Project lacked a logical framework matrix, probably because when it was approved this was not required. Although a list of objectives, outcomes and activities did exist, there were no indices to enable a quick comparison of achievements and impacts. Because of this

absence, the evaluators prepared a list of indicators making it possible to evaluate the Project achievements and impacts (ANNEX 6).

Based on the information received and the considerations made, the consultants estimate that *the implementation approach during Project Concept and Formulation qualifies as satisfactory*.

Country Drivenness and Ownership. The Project is rooted on the need to develop the Bañados del Este region, by preserving environments of global significance. In the mid-70s, Uruguay was acknowledged as having a Biosphere Reserve covering an area of approximately 350,000 hectares of wetlands in the eastern part of the country. It is an area where rice is grown and cattle are raised, and which has a great tourist appeal.

In 1990, the Department of Rocha, where the largest portion of the Bañados del Este lies, manifested its environmentally-based development policy. Interested in implementing conservation and development objectives in the area, Uruguay created PROBIDES (Program for the Conservation and Sustainable Development of the Eastern Wetlands) in 1992, as basis from which to monitor and achieve the desired balance between conservation and production in the wetlands region. PROBIDES managed to obtain bilateral cooperation aid to fulfil its mission.

Subsequently, when GEF was established as a support mechanism for conservation and development projects, the Government of Uruguay decided to propose a Bañados del Este Biodiversity Conservation project, which was executed over the 1992-1995 period. The Project currently under evaluation is second, “consolidation”, phase of the Project, which was executed from 1997 to 2002.

The Project also enables Uruguay to comply with its obligations as a member of the Biodiversity Convention, i.e. RAMSAR Convention on Wetlands (Bañados del Este are RAMSAR sites).

Stakeholder Participation. PROBIDES and NGOs were involved in the preparation of the Consolidation Project.

The Project Document contemplated several participation levels, such as a Governing Board, a program management group, an Operations Committee and an Advisory Committee. The PROBIDES Governing Board (composed of MVOTMA, Government of the Department of Rocha, and later by four additional Department Governments– and Universidad de la Republica) was conceived as a significant level for involvement of national and local project stakeholders (UNDP was just an observer). The Board was devised as the Steering Committee of the Project.

The Project Document included two important stakeholder participation mechanisms. The Operations Committee, which would be chaired by PROBIDES, have an advisory role and bring together the NGOs, public and private productive sectors and Government agencies (Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries and Ministry of Tourism). With hindsight, it would seem that stakeholders as significant as the private sector (which holds 90% of the property) and the ministries mentioned above should have been part of the Steering Committee and should not have been left at a second level, merely charged with being part of

an advisory committee. It is surprising to see that the Ministry of Transportation and Public Works, responsible for water management, was not present. These absences are linked to the major threats to biodiversity in the region, such as those resulting from private sector actions connected with rice growing, cattle raising, tourism and infrastructure construction. It is also striking that the Ministry of Defence has not participated in the Project, given that it owns land in the area.

The second committee, the Advisory Committee, should have brought together international NGOs, technical institutions, UNDP and universities. Once again, it was to be a mechanism fostering the involvement of stakeholders in the development of the Project.

The Project Document also envisaged forums, workshops and other similar participation occasions for the civil society.

Based on the information received and considerations made, the consultants estimate that *Stakeholder participation at the Project Formulation stage Conceptual design qualifies as satisfactory*.

Replication. Neither the Project Brief nor the Project Document specifically mention spheres in which the Project should be replicated, probably because when it was approved this was not a requirement. However in practice this occurred see page 36.

UNDP's Comparative Advantage. UNDP was chosen as the Implementation Agency because of its ties with the country's development and its capacity to bring together actors. This is a Project seeking to achieve social and economic development with biodiversity and therefore an agency such as UNDP was thought to have comparative advantages as the implementation agency. In the design of the Project, however, UNDP appears just as an observer at key management levels. The opposite occurred during the execution stage, when, as in other GEF projects, UNDP played a multiple role.

Firstly UNDP is a neutral stakeholder, capable of convening others and interconnecting different initiatives. For instance, early on in the Project, UNDP contributed as catalyser for agreements to be reached between MVOTMA and the Government of the Department of Rocha, and PROBIDES and other actors. UNDP provided a neutral meeting ground.

Secondly, UNDP had a role to play in the Governing Board of the Project, in its capacity as observer monitoring the substantive interests of the project and especially those related with global benefits and project development.

Thirdly, UNDP performed a monthly follow-up and oversight of the Project execution, emphasising activities, products and the achievement of objectives.

Fourthly, UNPD managed the funds and monitored the use they were put to, within the context of the commitment with GEF. This role is significant, because PROBIDES does not status as a legal entity and could not have managed the funds.

Lastly, UNDP had a role in promoting and capitalizing the Project sustainability strategy. UNDP also contributed funds (\$30,000), which together with those from AECI (\$ 30.000) and from the Government of Uruguay (\$85,000), brought stakeholders together and helped

them agree on a sustainability strategy which includes: conservation, improving local integrated management capacities, and social and economic development.

Linkage with other Projects. The Project was expected to interact with, feed from and be useful for other projects, such as the National Biodiversity Strategy. In practice, and since this was the first experience of its kind in the country, the Project contributed concrete experiences to help set the priority for the goals and activities within the Strategy.

UNDP was also expected to link the Project with other initiatives such as ECOPLATA, and IDRC (Canada) project for the integrated coastal management of the Río de la Plata, and with TRAIN/SEACOAST. This would contribute to strengthen PROBIDES efforts in coastal management.

Project Management. The Project was designed as a project implemented by UNDP with national execution entrusted to PROBIDES, which is a consortium without status as a legal entity, that, at the time, involved the Government of the Department of Rocha, Universidad de la Republica, and the Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment. UNDP participation in the Project was as an observer. Likewise, there would be two advisory committees enabling the capitalization of the interests and experiences of other Government Agencies and Non-Governmental Organizations, both national and international.

IMPLEMENTATION

Financial Planning. According to the Project Brief, the Project would receive \$ 4 million for its implementation. The Project Document shows funding at only \$ 3.5 million. This reduced amount result from a Government cut back in its contribution in kind. In addition to these changes, during the execution phase, the Government contributions dropped but other donor support was levered so that in the end the entire Project was implemented with little slightly US\$ 3.8 million.

The financial contributions promised, pursuant to the Project Document, and the actual contributions were as follows:

SOURCE	PROJECT DOCUMENT (Planned amount)	REAL INCOME	DIFFERENCE (expressed as planned minus real)
GEF	2,500,000	2,500,000	0
AECI (European Agency)	360,000	69,125	-290,875
GOVERNMENT OF CANADA	20,000	0	20,000
GOVERNMENT OF URUGUAY	620,000	337,343	-282,657
RURAL PRODUCERS	0	106,000	106,000
REVENUE FROM PROJECT PUBLICATIONS	0	42,760	42,760
EUROPEAN UNION	0	726,274	726,274
TRAIN SEA COAST	0	3,601	3,601
FUNDACIÓN AVINA	0	2,549	2,549
OTHER PRIVATE SOURCES	0	17,560	17,560
TOTAL	3,500,000	3,805,212	+305,212

During the execution phase, the Project managed to obtain new funds from Train Sea Coast, the farmers, the European Union, AVINA Foundation and several private donors. Hence, the total amount contributed was greater than that which appears in the Project Document, and somewhat smaller (by approximately 5%) than that which is mentioned in the Project Brief.

The differences between the amounts promised pursuant to the Project Document and the payments received are due to accounting reasons and to actual contribution reductions.

- (i) The differences shown in the funding from AECI and the Government of Canada arise because, in the Project Document, figures were including which, as a result of delays in the approval of the Project, ended up by being used in the Pilot phase project (URU/92/G31), that preceded the commencement of the Project under evaluation (URU 97/G 31).
- (ii) The difference that appears in the Project Document for the Government of Uruguay arises from a figure involving 4 annual payments of \$ 155,000. Subsequently, the Uruguayan Government approved yearly disbursements of only \$ 85,000. The disbursements were received in Uruguayan pesos, between 1998 and 2002, for a total amount of \$ 337,343.
- (iii) As a contribution towards the fulfilment of the proposed objectives of the Biosphere Reserve consolidation, payments were received from other funding sources. All of which increased the local component by \$ 169,921. These sources were:
 - Train Sea Coast,
 - AVINA
 - Farmers of the Reserve zone
 - Publishing houses of Montevideo
 - Sale of publications,
- (iv) There was also an amount donated by the European Union to be used in supplementary activities in the Biosphere Reserve that amounted to \$ 726,274. This contribution had not been recorded in the Project Document.

It is interesting to see that the private sector, as proof of its interest and commitment to the Project, made specific contributions. The following matrix presents a breakdown of these contributions.

Private Financial Contributions

Prizes for photography competitions (accommodation and photographic equipment) – 4 competitions 1999 to 2002	\$ 6,500
Printing of posters from the photography contest 2002 –Contribution by Diario El País, a daily newspaper with nationwide circulation – December 2001	\$ 200
Procurement of Bañados del Este videos to donate to the schools of the Department of Rocha – Contribution by COMERO (Cooperativa Médica de Rocha) – September 2001	\$ 360
Sponsors for the printing of ADEATUR brochures and the Guía de Establecimientos de Agro y Ecoturismo de Rocha (Guide of Agri- and Eco-Tourism Establishments of Rocha) – 1999	\$ 1,000
Agreement with Editorial Santillana for the joint publication of the “Guía Ecoturística de la Reserva de Biosfera Bañados del Este” (Eco-Tourism Guide of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve) – Contribution by Santillana covering half the cost of printing the Guide – August 1999	\$ 5,000
Agreement with Fundación de Cultura Universitaria for the joint publication of the book “Legislación sobre Medio Ambiente en el Uruguay” (Environmental Legislation in Uruguay) – Contribution by Fundación covering half the cost of printing the Guide – September 2000	\$ 4,500

Contributions made by Farmers

Installation of Granja Ñandu-Guazú. Contribution by farmer José Pienica to undertake an experience in breeding ñandú (<i>rhea americana</i>)	\$ 100,000
Different contributions for conservation activities (estimated amount involving transportation, exclusion of cattle grazing in palm tree zone for research to be carried out, lanes, etc.)	\$ 5,000
Fuel for surveillance against poaching by the Rural Guard – Contribution from farmers in the Negra lagoon area.	\$ 1,000

As shown in the following chart, the contributions that had not been planned in the Project Document were made for specific objectives and not for the Project as a whole.

Objective	Train Sea Coast	Fundación AVINA	European Union	Rural Producers	Publications	Other private sources	AECI Agency	TOTAL
1			186,274		7,126			193,400
2					7,126			7,126
3					7,126			7,126
4		2,549	180,000	106,000	7,126		41,500	337,175
5	3,601		180,000		7,126			190,727
6			180,000		7,130	17,560	27,625	232,315
TOTAL	3,601	2,549	726,274	106,000	42,760	17,560	69,125	967,869

Objectives No. 4 (practices consistent with conservation), 5 (training) and 6 (sensitization) were those that attracted the most funding. Unfortunately, protected areas (Objective No. 3) did not obtain any additional funds. This observation may come in useful when structuring future project joint funding.

Implementation costs may be broken down under two large headings. An Amount A includes only the contributions duly entered in the accounting of the Project URU97/G31 for six objectives, and an Amount B which likewise includes all other donations benefiting the same objectives. The implementation expenses charged to the different objectives and by Amounts (A and B) are itemized as follows:

Objective	Amount A (\$)	% of Amount A	Amount B (\$)	% of Amount B
1	541,855	18	728,129	19
2	364,184	12	364,184	10
3	615,014	21	615,014	16
4	548,386	19	834,386	22
5	416,621	14	596,621	16
6	469,318	16	666,828	17
TOTAL	2,955,378	100	3,805,212	100

The table shows that in Amount A the distribution is quite equal, between 12% and 21%, of the disbursement among the different objectives. Objectives Nos. 1 and 2, considered essential for the success of the Project, concentrate almost 30% of the budget. The protected areas (Objective No. 3) received 21% of the funds.

When the other sources of funding are added (Amount B), implementation costs by objective change slightly. Objectives Nos. 4, 5 and 6 turned out to have higher implementation costs and percentages. Protected areas, as was to be expected, in the end had a smaller percentage.

As is usual in UNDP-GEF projects, Project URU/97/G31 “Consolidation of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve” was audited every year by an independent private firm, external to both UNDP and the Project. Several audits were performed in the years 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001 and 2002. In all cases, the auditors found that the financial management of the Project was **satisfactory**.

In all cases, the auditors stated:

“In our opinion, based on the results of the examination performed and considering what is mentioned below, in general terms PROBIDES Management is managing the resources of the Project complying in a satisfactory manner with the provisions governing the execution of the Project. As part of our work, performed as foreseen in paragraph 3, we carried out different kinds of investigations to confirm the basic elements of the Project management, covering the following: distribution of the functions and responsibilities, fund management, personnel recruitment, procurement of goods and services and use of non perishable equipment. Even though it is not in our purview to evaluate the quality of the management developed in administrating the Project, in our opinion, the matters in that regard which were subject to our confirming investigation were found to be the usual practices in our milieu.”

Cost-Effectiveness. Although the Project may be described as being a success and the funds have been used following an incremental criterion, the consultants consider that certain expenditure adjustments could have been made for the investments to be more cost-effective in assuring the conservation of a globally significant biodiversity. For example, if instead of enlarging the work areas and prepare a Master Plan including 3,800,000 hectares, efforts had been focused on the area originally committed (less than 10% of the final coverage), part of those funds could have been spent in activities more closely linked to conservation. The State owned protected areas could have been strengthened by providing them with more facilities (means of access, more and better lanes, more signalling, etc.), more work could have been done on education, or else it would have been possible to work with producers interested in the different uses of biodiversity, such as the fishermen.

The consultants were able to see that, by financing sustainable uses of biodiversity, barriers have been broken down and this has enabled other users to show an interest in these uses. The most striking example is eco-tourism and the breeding of ñandú (*rhea americana*), where other producers are already imitating what others have already done.

Monitoring and Evaluation. The project management was evaluated by Tripartite meetings and by an independent mid-term review by Dr Enrique Bucher. Additionally, UNDP played a major role in monitoring the activities and achievements, as well as regulating the disbursements. Dr Bucher’s evaluation was used as a guide to imprint greater emphasis on the conservation and sustainable uses objectives during the second stage.

The Project Team took very much into account the objectives that were to be accomplished and the times available for that, e.g. concerning stages one and two of the Project Document. In fact, it was in a Tripartite evaluation meeting that the decision was made to overlap the stages so as to finish on time with all the objectives, instead of having to wait until the first objectives

were achieved in full. All these evaluations made it possible for the Project to come to an end having completed all the tasks.

Based on the information received and the considerations made, the consultants estimate that monitoring and evaluation during implementation qualifies as satisfactory.

Implementation Approach. The Project did not have a logical framework matrix, but the Project Document provided a list of objectives and set sufficient priority to the activities to enable the Team to have a roadmap for the execution. For instance, the Document mentions two execution stages that played a highly significant role in setting the priorities of Objectives 1 and 2 over the first two years of the execution. Subsequently, a collective decision was taken to meet all the objectives within the time frame, as promised, and this was beneficial for the Project as a whole. This change was the largest adjustment that the Project underwent. The annual work plans reflected the adjustments that should be done to the work of the Team so as to complete the goals in time.

As mentioned earlier, in order to fulfil the goals, the staff hired for the Project established joint work plans with the private sector producers, NGOs, educators and Government agencies. As a result of these partnerships, it was possible to attain the results, for example, in the approval of the Land-Use Regulation by the local Council and in the fruitful collaborations with tourist businessmen and ñandú (*rhea americana*) farms.

Based on the information received and the considerations made, the consultants estimate that the implementation approach during project execution qualifies as satisfactory.

Stakeholder Participation. A variety of actors were involved in the Project implementation. The Governing Board of PROBIDES (MVOTMA, the Government of the Department of Rocha –and later the addition of the four other Governments of the Departments which form part of the enlarged Biosphere Reserve– and the Universidad de la Republica), the program Director and his technical team, and at different Project levels, social stakeholders from the public and private spheres were also incorporated. Among the latter, the following can be highlighted: NGOs, groups of small producers and entrepreneurs, some already existing and others established as a result of the Project (“ñandú”– *rhea Americana* – farmers and ecotourism), and representatives from Councils of the Departments.

The Board was charged with overseeing compliance of the goals and it operated the Project’s Steering Committee. Nevertheless, several interviewees stated that the member institutions did not fulfil the role expected from them. In general, it would have been expected that the institutions participating in the Board had shown a greater appropriation and institutional commitment.

In the case of the Universidad de la República (UDELAR), participation appears not to be representative of the institution but rather involved the participation of some units or members individually. It had membership at the Governing Board throughout the life of the Project, but it did not commit itself beyond that sphere.

A few examples of this are as follows: a unit in tourism studies which never used the region as focus for its operation, the Limnology Station which operates in the region had no close ties with the Project, the master’s program on environmental sciences of the School of Sciences does not use PROBIDES and the Reserve as a training laboratory. The academicians

seem to have sought rather a source of funds for their research and missed the chance of using the area as a unique opportunity, in the country, for integration around developmental and environmental goals.

Some PROBIDES technical experts said that the linkage with the university was a difficult one, since on several occasions its help was unsuccessfully sought to carry out specific research activities. However, a few fruitful experiences were recorded. An example of this is the research on the palm trees (*Butia capitata*), carried out in close relationship with the School of Agricultural Sciences.

The evaluators were informed that UDELAR had engaged in a self-evaluation exercise and is currently preparing a proposal to change its interaction modalities in the context of PROBIDES.

Although MVOTMA is one of the institutions with direct competency over the management of the areas to be protected, in the opinion of many interviewees, it could have been more active. No institutional commitment was perceived in the Ministry as such, but rather at the individual action level. MVOTMA's share in the generation and approval of the Coastal Land Use Regulation was, however, highly commended by many interviewees and future expectations are encouraging in this regard.

The Government of the Department of Rocha seems to have undergone several problems concerning its involvement. Some interviewees would have wished to have a leadership that was stronger and more deeply committed to conservation and development. Nevertheless, the last period, during which the Coastal Land-use Regulation was approved, also leads to encouraging prospects concerning the joint management of the BR.

The formal participation of other actors did not meet expectations. For instance, the broad and representative advisory Operations Committee, which would have enabled the more formal involvement of NGOs, the private sector and key Ministries such as MGAP and Tourism, in fact never met. It was never established and thus the formal involvement of major stakeholders was hindered.

MGAP does not seem to have a clear idea of the objectives and development of the PROBIDES project, and officials stated that they were not aware that they were members of any committee related to the Project. Despite recognizing that they had participated in meetings organized by PROBIDES, they had done so in a personal capacity and did not feel committed with the institution.

This is one of the shortcomings of the Project, because MGAP is in charge of overseeing the RAMSAR site in the BIOSPHERE RESERVE, it holds significant property in areas liable to become protected areas, and has the mission of regulating land and water uses in the agricultural and cattle raising parts of the region. The region covered by Master Plan comprises approximately 25% of the total surface of the country. Indeed, they stated they did not feel committed to the Master Plan prepared by the Project.

MTOP was not an active member of the Project either, although it is the Ministry responsible for water management, nor was the Ministry of Tourism that is a key entity in the design of tourist-attracting plans that are environmentally friend with regard to conservation.

The Advisory Committee, which should have been composed of representatives from international NGOs, technical institutions, UNDP and universities, was never set up either, and thus an opportunity to involve major stakeholders more actively was lost.

It is worth explaining that despite the non establishment of the two committees mentioned above, a dialogue was maintained with and actual involvement existed of the private sector (businessmen, farmers), NGOs, teachers belonging to the educational system and the rural police, and this set the foundations and the roots to continue and multiply the BR conservation work.

As recorded in other parts of this evaluation, the dissemination of information concerning the objectives and achievements of the Project through publications, meetings, and workshops and in the media was excellent (ANNEXES 7, 8 and 9).

*Based on the information received and the considerations made, the consultants estimate that Stakeholder participation in implementation qualifies as **satisfactory**.*

Execution and Implementation Modality. The Project was implemented by UNDP and executed by PROBIDES (Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Development Program for the Eastern Wetlands). PROBIDES is composed by the Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment, the Government of the Department of Rocha and Universidad de la Republica, but it does not have the status of a legal entity. During the execution of the Project, and since it was decided to extend the coverage area from 350,000 hectares to 3,800,000 hectares, the Government of the other four Departments in the same watershed were informally added.

PROBIDES was established before the GEF project existed, with the purpose of driving development and biodiversity management in the region, and it is likely that it shall continue to fulfil this function once the Project has been completed. Indeed, conversations are under way, as mentioned elsewhere in this report, to fine-tune the terms of reference of PROBIDES for the next phase of its work.

Since PROBIDES lacks the status of a legal entity, its funds were managed by UNDP. The Project Team has stated that the supply of funds and the management by UNDP presented no difficulties. Among its duties, UNDP played a significant role in ensuring that the staff was recruited following a public and open competition.

Engineer Álvaro Díaz headed the Project Executive Unit. In the opinion of the Executive Unit and of the other participants, there were no great problems with the flow of funds for execution purposes, even though the total funds contributed were not as much as expected. What did undergo changes was the total execution time of the Project, which increased from four to little over five years. This extension was justified because 48 months after the Project had started, certain activities had not yet been completed and funds were still available from the project financed by the EU, which covered part of the operational expenses. Nevertheless, in 2002, a skeleton staff was kept and operational expenses, travel expenses, etc. were cut back. Seen from a longer term perspective, as the evaluation mission was able to do, this extension to five years was beneficial because it enabled the Project to follow up and contribute to the approval of the Coastal Land Use Regulation, which otherwise might not have been adopted, or the approval process may have taken longer.

The Project was implemented under the modality of consultation, work and participation by PROBIDES technical experts with different local public and private stakeholders, rather than through the subcontracting modality.

The Project organized forums, workshops and meetings with different local and national stakeholders. A significant medium for participation is the Foro de la Costa, which was organized to discuss the Coastal Land Use Regulation with different community stakeholders (both public and private). This forum made it possible for the interests of the different stakeholders involved being collected and incorporated, thus facilitating the consensus building required for the approval.

RESULTS

Achievement of Objectives and Results. Most of the actors consulted mentioned that the leading achievements of the Project were following: the drafting and approval of the Coastal Land Use Regulation for the Department of Rocha; the Master Plan for the Wetlands; the project's regional focus (instead of the traditional approach by individual Departments); and the trainings, awareness and education of the stakeholders. Concerning the Protected Areas Act, although it was one of the Project objectives and the Project actually participated very actively to ensure its enactment, some stakeholders prefer not to acknowledge this as a Project achievement, but rather as an initiative which received the support of the Project but in fact was the result of a broader social process.

Even though the Project did not strictly comply with the two-stage sequence mentioned in the Project Document, they were actually fulfilled in an overlapping manner. Given the time required for laws and sets of regulations to be official approved, if the Project had not overlapped both stages, it would probably not have been able to complete its activities on time and would not have been as successful as it was.

The Project complied with all the most substantial elements of the proposals set forth in the Project Document, and shows significant achievements and results. A description of these can be read in the Project reports and in the numerous and very good publications it has released (ANNEX 9). Instead of making an exhaustive review of all the activities, the evaluators preferred to focus on the achievements and impacts that were most important for the conservation of a globally significant biodiversity and the sustainability of a GEF funded effort.

The Project Document proposed two initial objectives considered essential and which would set the basis for the other four objectives. The first was to prepare and approve a Master Plan for Land Use and Planning, comprising mainland estates and waters and coastal areas, which would ensure the development with biodiversity of the BR. The second includes the political frameworks and incentives mechanisms, as well as the regulations enabling the successful implementation of the Master Plan.

The Project Document used the name Master Plan to refer to the document that has enough regulatory features to *ensure* the development with biodiversity of the BR. However, the document that effectively ensures this objective is a Land Use Regulation of the Department of Rocha and not the Master Plan.

The Master Plan is rather an informative document, which also contains proposals, which can be used to draft an Land Use Regulation, and that is precisely what happened within the framework of the Project. The Project drafted a Master Plan for a very large region and then generated, and succeeded in achieving, the approval of a land use regulation for the area which is the most critical from the point of view of globally significant biodiversity and its threats. The Project managed to have the Government of the Department of Rocha adopt the General Plan for the Regulation and Sustainable Development of the Atlantic Coast of the Department of Rocha, in December 2002, a few days after Project completion. This document sets the rules governing coastal use, including the islands that are within the 12 nautical miles of territorial waters and the area that lies between the tidal line and Highway 9. In this area, covering about 370,000 hectares of land, 100% of the Bañados del Este BR is located, i.e. the area which was submitted to the consideration of UNESCO in 1976. The Land Use Regulation also embraces 100% of the RAMSAR site in Rocha, and roughly 50% of the total RAMSAR areas in Uruguay. The Land Use Regulation specifically defines the protected areas and the possibility of establishing new areas, the possible infrastructure works, the types of real-estate development and the activities permitted within that band. In this manner, the Land Use Regulation ensures that the globally significant biodiversity can be preserved in the future development of Rocha. The threats posed by an unregulated tourist development and the construction of roads are thus restricted by this standard.

Additionally, and before the Land Use Regulation was drafted, the Project prepared and published in December 1999 a very complete Master Plan. This Master Plan contains descriptions of the land and proposals on the uses of an area covering 3,850,000 hectares which embraces the entire watershed on which the BR is found. In other words, an area which is more than 10 times that of the BR itself, and accounts for approximately 25% of the Uruguayan territory. This Master Plan proposes, among other things, potential protected area sites. This Master Plan, which is far more ambitious than Objective 1 as proposed in the Project Document, is as yet a proposal and has not acquired the status of a legal provision. During informal conversations with Councillors of the Department of Rocha, they stated that they were not yet acquainted with the Master Plan, but they showed a great interest in doing so. This part of Objective 1 was fulfilled *in toto*, and it could even be said that excessively so, since proposals are made for an area which is far greater than that originally committed to the Project.

For the above reasons, in the Matrix summarizing Objective 1 achievements, mention is now made of the Land Use Regulation and not the Master Plan, as used to be the case in the Project Document.

Objective 1 likewise proposed the drafting and approval of a Hydrology Plan. However, this objective was not achieved as successfully as the one described above. Proposals have been put forth, but they are still being studied. The consultants heard several opinions that favoured the idea that it would soon be approved, in view of the Government's commitment to the promotion of tourism. Nevertheless, it deals with an area located in the north eastern part of the BR, where the wetlands were drained to grow rice and which the Project planned to restore to its original state. Since the area is relatively small and did not originally form part of the BR proposal approved by UNESCO, and that it does not affect the rest of the BR, the consultants believe that failure to fully achieve this objective does not compromise the substantive achievements of the Project. If, in the future, it is possible to revert the situation and recover these inland wetlands, this will be beneficial for biodiversity, but this is not considered of the essence.

The second fundamental Project objective consists of the approval of political frameworks and incentives mechanisms, as well as regulations to enable the successful implementation of the Master Plan. In practice, this objective refers to the establishment of the legal framework for a system of protected areas within the BR, a framework consisting of policies and incentives in order to be in a position to implement the set of regulations governing the uses of the BR, and a proposal for the establishment of a Trust Fund for sustainable development within the BR. This objective (Objective 2 of the Project Document) has been achieved in part. In February 2000, the Government of Uruguay passed the Protected Areas Act which is in force for the entire country, but the regulatory provisions that enable it to be implemented have still to be approved. The consultants were informed that all that is missing is the signature of one or two Ministries for the regulation to be adopted. Until this regulation is adopted, the protected areas system mentioned cannot be set up, nor can individual protected areas be formalized.

On the other hand, there is a proposal on policies and incentives that has been published but has not yet been approved (see publications in ANNEX 9).

This third issue regarding the objective, i.e. the Trust Fund, has been informally established. In Uruguay no law exists for the time being that allows the operation of trust funds with authority to receive donations. The Project has set up a local committee that manages a revolving fund, initially formed by \$ 100,000, set up with monies from the GEF project and the EU project, 50% each. On two occasions, the Fund has made an open competition and financed more than 20 community projects for sustainable development based on local biodiversity. The experience to date indicates that it is possible to recover a significant portion of the funds lent (more than 50%).

The Project has not been able to capitalize the fund, but the management team explained to the evaluators that they consider this to be their next challenge, once legislation has been enacted which allows this, and once its credibility as a fund has been established. The consultants believe that the experience of UNDP with trust funds with the means to make donations available to these funds could be extremely useful in this next phase as identified by the managers.

The Project has also been highly successful in promoting eco-tourism as a development option in the region, as well as other alternatives to the traditional ones that are beneficial to the environment and biodiversity. In this context, the Project has strengthened certain public protected areas which had been created by decree of the Executive, promoted eco-tourism businesses, helped to establish and administrate an association of eco-tourism businessmen (Agri- and Eco-Tourism Association of Rocha, ADEATUR), and provided assistance to a regional process aimed at reaching an agreement on an eco-tourism plan. The “Guía Ecoturística de la Reserva de la Biosfera Bañados del Este”, prepared and published by PROBIDES, deserves special mention here. It is a very well written and laid out book of international class, with maps and photographs which will enable the tourists to get to know what the Reserve has to offer. It is an example that could be replicated with regard to one of the types of things that can be undertaken to promote eco-tourism.

The Project has also provided technical support to dairy farmers, rice growers and cattle raisers so that they could set aside part of their estates to be private protected areas devoted to eco-tourism. The consultants had the chance to visit a few estates and talk with their owners.

The knowledge and degree of commitment that PROBIDES has achieved with the farmers caused a very favourable impression. There did seem to be a commitment to biodiversity and eco-tourism that is rarely found among private sector farmers.

Among the supplementary productive and environmentally friendly activities, the following have been realized: ñandú breeding farms (at present there are more than 140 farmers engaged in this activity), shrimp farms bred by local small-scale fishermen, fish processing to achieve an added value, better fishing practices by establishing sheltered areas (where no fishing takes place); organic farming and honey production. Once again, the consultants were able to talk with the fishermen, the ñandú breeders and it was possible to see the high degree of commitment to conservation and to the last objectives of the Project.

There are numerous publications in the field of environmentally friendly production options and they describe the Project achievements and present financial considerations. This in itself is an achievement, but in the opinion of the consultants, the most valuable thing is that PROBIDES has gone far beyond the publications *per se* and managed to arouse the interest of the producers and have them show in real life how these activities are carried out. This objective has been very well achieved.

The Project has also been very successful in introducing the subject of Biosphere Reserves in general and the Bañados del Este BR in particular, at primary school level in the Department of Rocha. Moreover, it has done a commendable job improving the general level of awareness concerning the BR among the general public and local and national lawmakers. The conversations between the consultants and primary school teachers and the rural police who were trained by the Project showed the interest and enthusiasm these professionals have for the nature and how to care for it. These professionals had only words of praise for the Project and the efforts of PROBIDES staff. The lawmakers (councillors) of the Department of Rocha who were interviewed also praised the help of the Project staff during the debates concerning the Land Use Regulation.

The awareness building process was gradual and was also expressed through the press items on the Project and the Biosphere Reserve and in the demand for information that have been received. For example, in the local written press, more than 100 articles and items about the BR have been printed, more than 60 interviews with PROBIDES technical experts have been requested and whole journalistic and informative TV shows have focused on the BR. This included 30 appearances by PROBIDES technical experts on TV stations and 10 participations of PROBIDES technical experts in forums. Experts from the Project said that PROBIDES was also a regular source of information for regional and national public entities on the subjects of biodiversity and protected areas. This is yet another indicator of the Project's impact on Uruguayan society.

Many of the Project's experiences were published in the different PROBIDES series. The consultants have examined and read in part this material and are able to attest that it is of a very high quality and also has a very good presentation (ANNEX 9). The consultants heard that there are institutions in the formal Uruguayan schooling system which are asking to take over the material if PROBIDES does not continue its work. This material could set an example for other, similar, projects.

Unfortunately, the Project did not implement any systematic monitoring plan such as the one promised in the Project Document, although it did carry out certain small scale pilot

experiences in training local groups. The monitoring work was focused on monitoring training, mainly concerning water quality, and it targeted local stakeholders: NGOs, secondary and primary school teachers and students.

The major Project achievements are summarized below in a matrix summarizing results and impacts. This achievements matrix is consistent with the objectives and results laid out in the Project Document. The indicators were proposed by the evaluator and then discussed with people belonging to the Project.

ACHIEVEMENT MATRIX FOR THE PROJECT: CONSOLIDATION OF THE BAÑADOS DEL ESTE BIOSPHERE RESERVE.

<u>OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>INDICATOR OR TYPE OF COMPLIANCE INDICATOR</u>	<u>LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE ACHIEVED</u>
<p><u>DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE</u> To achieve generalized and permanent conditions in the population's quality of life, in a healthy and productive ambient of environmental excellence</p>		
<p><u>OBJECTIVE 1.</u> An Land Use Regulation regulating the use and planning of the territory, including continental lands and waters and coastal zones, which will ensure the long-term ecological integrity of the BR.</p> <p>OUTCOME 1. Document finalized and ready for Government approval.</p>	<p>- Land Use Regulation with all three components finalized and approved at all Government and private sector levels, ensuring future compliance and hence the integrity of the BR.</p> <p>- Biological and chemical indicators show that the BR conditions were enhanced during project execution.</p> <p>Finalized document available.</p>	<p>Objective fully achieved regarding the territory of the BR. Moreover, proposals have been put forth to cover far larger area than that originally committed.</p> <p>The Project did not establish a regular biological monitoring program, as foreseen in paragraph 78 of the Project Document.</p> <p>At this point in time, the Land Use Regulation and the publication contained in the Plan are available, as well as the proposal for water management.</p>
<p><u>OBJECTIVE 2</u> Political framework and mechanisms of incentives and regulations to enable the successful implementation of the Master Plan.</p> <p>OUTCOME 2.1.</p>	<p>Incentive and regulation system for conservation and sustainable uses of BR biodiversity approved at all corresponding Government levels and currently being implemented.</p> <p>Official evidence of approval.</p>	<p>Objective achieved in part (see text)</p> <p>The Law was officially enacted in February 2002.</p>

<u>OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>INDICATOR OR TYPE OF COMPLIANCE INDICATOR</u>	<u>LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE ACHIEVED</u>
<p>National Law for Protected Areas approved.</p> <p>OUTCOME 2.2. Recommendations on policies regarding the BR, with the relevant incentives and regulations.</p> <p>OUTCOME 2.3. <i>Proposal to establish a Trust Fund</i> for Sustainable Land Planning, including identification and development of economic instruments for its capitalization.</p>	<p>Document of recommendations of regulations and incentives.</p> <p>Formal proposal to the Government.</p>	<p>The adoption of the regulatory provisions is still outstanding.</p> <p>There is a proposal by PROBIDES that is still to be approved.</p> <p>The Fund is currently operating under a different modality to that foreseen. See text.</p>
<p>OBJECTIVE 3 An effective system of protected areas, public and private, in the BR.</p> <p>OUTCOME 3.1. Public protected areas established.</p> <p>OUTCOME 3.2. Private protected areas established.</p> <p>OUTCOME 3.3 Management and Supervision System for the BR protected area network.</p>	<p>- The National Bureau for Protected Areas has established management standards for the PAs and monitors compliance.</p> <p>- Public and private protected areas with management plans and personnel implementing them.</p> <p>Participative management plans are available.</p> <p>Participative management plans are available.</p> <p>The National Bureau for Protected Areas has maps of existing and potential PA in the BR, it provides support to the managers by publishing</p>	<p>Since the regulation of the Act has not been approved yet, no national protected areas system currently exists.</p> <p>By means of Decrees of the Executive, several PAs in the BR have been established: Potrerillos, San Miguel, Quebrada los Cuervos, Bañados de los Indios, Rocha Lagoon, India Muerta, Isla del Padre. The Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries also has another PA prior to the Monte Ombúes project. They are at different degrees of implementation. Only Potrerillos and San Miguel have management plans. In general, they are waiting for the adoption of the regulation to be fully established.</p> <p>Provisionally, 10 private PAs have been established, which are used by their owners for eco-tourism purposes and otherwise. They are currently operating and waiting for the adoption of the regulation.</p> <p>It has not been possible to implement this result because of the absence of a regulation.</p>

<u>OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>INDICATOR OR TYPE OF COMPLIANCE INDICATOR</u>	<u>LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE ACHIEVED</u>
	the PA bulletin, and monitors ecotourism and habitats in the BR.	
<p>OBJECTIVE 4. Practices of territorial use compatible with biodiversity conservation and activities consistent with the Master Plan, adopted by the farmers, tourist entrepreneurs and other resource users.</p> <p>OUTCOME 4.1. Portfolio of alternative production practices, including required resources for their implementation and broad dissemination, to be presented before relevant private and State institutions and subsequently demonstrated/experimented in agricultural establishments.</p> <p>OUTCOME 4.2. <i>Ecotourism development plan</i>, driven by the interested parties.</p>	<p>- Documents showing official adoption of the practices by agricultural producers, tourism entrepreneurs and other users.</p> <p>- Evidence of changes in the traditional practices of producers and entrepreneurs as a result of the project.</p> <p>- Document(s) of portfolio of options with execution requirements.</p> <p>- Evidence of experiments with new options by entrepreneurs and producers.</p> <p>Ecotourism plan with public and private sector participation.</p>	<p>ADEATUR, formed by private businessmen and grouping tourist entrepreneurs of the region, has acknowledged that eco-tourism is a preferential option for the region.</p> <p>Fishermen, ñandú (<i>rhea americana</i>) breeders, tourist entrepreneurs and farmers who have been recipients of aid from the trust fund have changed some of their practices. Project reports provide abundant evidence in this regard and the evaluators themselves have witnessed some cases.</p> <p>The Project has prepared and published a study on the sustainability of alternative production activities.</p> <p>The Project has successfully promoted alternative activities in the field, such as ñandú (<i>rhea americana</i>) breeding, organic farming, sustainable small-scale fishing, local arts and crafts based on the biodiversity of the area.</p> <p>For the time being no formally approved eco-tourism plan exists. However, the Project provided its support to a broad meeting in 200, and also to the 1st National Eco-Tourism Congress in 2002, as well as other meetings which are expected to soon lead to the drafting and adoption of the plan.</p>
<p>OBJECTIVE 5. The capacities of the State, NGOs and private sector</p>	Evidence that the State sector, NGOs and private sector have proposed or implemented	ADEATUR has submitted a proposal to the Ministry of Tourism for the incorporation of new areas to the traditional tourist routes, as well as means to

<u>OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>INDICATOR OR TYPE OF COMPLIANCE INDICATOR</u>	<u>LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE ACHIEVED</u>
<p>are strengthened for the effective implementation of agricultural and tourism policies, within the BR and Master Plan conceptual framework.</p> <p>OUTCOME 5.1. Public and private managers of protected areas are capable of managing wildlife and habitats for the conservation of biodiversity.</p> <p>OUTCOME 5.2. Private sector, NGOs and Government stakeholders are capable of responding to new policies, laws and State plans for the implementation of biodiversity-friendly land use technologies.</p> <p>OUTCOME 5.3. Private sector, NGOs and Government stakeholders are in a position to start to develop and market ecotourism products and services.</p>	<p>policy changes that are consistent with the Master Plan.</p> <p>Evidence that public and private managers are now capable of managing for conservation.</p> <p>Evidence that public and private managers are now capable of responding to new policies, laws and plans when applying technologies.</p> <p>Evidence that NGOs, private and Government sectors are capable of starting to develop and sell ecotourism products and services.</p>	<p>increase eco-tourism in the region. NGOs trained by the Project manage the PAs: Rocha, Potrerillos, San Miguel. The police, after having received training, have increased the number of offences recorded concerning the PAs.</p> <p>Personnel trained by the Project work as park rangers in PAs. MVOTMA, through DINOT and DINAMA, coastal management with biodiversity considerations among its activities.</p> <p>The Governments of the Departments of Rocha and Treinta y Tres have hired personnel trained by the Project. The Army has incorporated conservation in its Santa Teresa PA.</p> <p>There are 10 eco-tourism initiatives in private areas. The businessmen involved in eco-tourism are organized under ADEATUR. Grupo Candela (Maldonado) organizes an arts and crafts and gourmet trade based on local biodiversity. Private entrepreneurs have started to breed ñandú and shrimp, as well as arts and crafts based on the local biodiversity. The Ministry of Tourism Turismo has organized the first National Eco-Tourism Congress, based on local biodiversity.</p>
<p><u>OBJECTIVE 6.</u> Greater awareness at national and local levels regarding BR benefits.</p> <p>OUTCOME 6.1. Educational institutions and NGOs capable of performing formal and informal educational</p>	<p>Evidence that there is now more national and local awareness of the BR benefits</p> <p>Evidence that educational institutions and NGOs are now capable of performing formal and informal activities regarding the benefits of</p>	<p>All the school libraries in the country now have PROBIDES material on the BR and receive environmental education. PROBIDES material on the BR has officially been declared of interest to the teachers.</p> <p>The Police of the Departments of Rocha and Cerro Largo have applied to PROBIDES for more training to be provided on the BR.</p> <p>From being practically ignored, the BR is now frequently mentioned in the media (see text).</p> <p>The subject of BRs and Wetlands has been formally incorporated in secondary school teacher training. The teacher-training centre has requested training on the BR to be provided.</p> <p>Students from 10 schools in the Department of</p>

<u>OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>INDICATOR OR TYPE OF COMPLIANCE INDICATOR</u>	<u>LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE ACHIEVED</u>
activities regarding the benefits of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.	conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.	Rocha prepare presentations with drawings on the subject of the BR. Requests for information concerning the BR to the PROBIDES information centre have trebled over the last 4 years.
OUTCOME 6.2. Plan for the awareness building in public opinion.	Sensitization plan and evidence of its implementation.	An in-house document was prepared. Evidence of its implementation can be found in the other indicators under this heading.
OUTCOME 6.3. An information program addressed to Parliamentarians and Government agencies.	Program and evidence of its implementation.	No plan was drafted, but a lot of work was carried out to sensitize and educate national and regional lawmakers to achieve the approval of the Protected Areas Act and the Coastal Land Use Regulation. Likewise, the Master Plan was circulated among them and they were given PROBIDES newsletters. During informal conversations with the evaluators, regional lawmakers (councillors) commended the BR and PROBIDES praiseworthy terms.

From this brief analysis of the achievements and results, it is evident that the Project shows indicators of great impact in all six objectives and that it has been successful in its achievements regarding biodiversity protection in the wetlands of the Biosphere Reserve. A contribution has been made to the protection of public and private areas, legal and regulatory frameworks have been achieved, and a contribution has been made to the generation of sustainable uses of the local biodiversity. In other words, the Project has helped to protect core and buffer zones.

However, in addition to this support to the core and buffer areas from a geographical viewpoint, the Project has helped place the areas in a cultural medium that favour conservation. Even more important, and the consultants were able to attest to this during their visits), a network has been created which is formed by protected areas, by producers who engage in biodiversity friendly practices and by a greater awareness regarding the BR and its significance. The consultants heard producers and owners of private protected areas, as well as the managers of an Army reserve talk enthusiastically about PROBIDES, and the help received from it. Many stated that without PROBIDES and the Project the things the consultants were able to perceive would not have done. The network of producers, public and private protected areas, coupled with awareness, have brought about a true awakening among the local population concerning biodiversity, they have acquired knowledge about it and ways in which it is possible to live with it. Furthermore, the nodes of the network are already engaging in feedback exercises. The producers send people to the protected areas and vice-versa. To the extent that the protected areas and the establishments are incorporated in the regular tourist circuits of Uruguay –something that is already starting to be true— this feedback shall become stronger and steadier. In the opinion of the consultants, a key factor has been that the Project was conceived with different nodes capable of feeding from each other and that there was enough time for this to be implemented, almost 9 years.

*Based on the information received and the considerations made, the consultants estimate that **Achievement of Objectives and Results qualifies as very satisfactory.***

Sustainability. In general terms, the sustainability of the Project relies on the durability of the public and private protected areas network, in the partnership with the producers who incorporate biodiversity sustainable uses and in the new awareness regarding the value of the BR biodiversity. These network nodes are in turn founded on several pillars:

On one hand, the Government is contributing \$ 85,000 from its regular budget to maintain the basic operation of PROBIDES. UNDP has contributed \$30,000 in 2003 to supplement this maintenance is helping in seeking new funding sources.

The public reserves shall be financed by the State and by the admission tickets they charge. The private reserves shall be maintained by their owners. The care and control of the protected areas is performed by park rangers trained by PROBIDES and is funded by different agencies. In the case of Rocha Lagoon, by the Government of the Department of Rocha and by a farmer, in the case of Potrerillo from PROBIDES funds through an agreement with an NGO, in the case of Castillos Lagoon by the Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries

For the private operators, the reserves are a new and additional source of revenue, which supplements their traditional income that they still receive. Therefore, it is to be expected that, once the reserves are formally recognized and when the regulatory provisions to the Protected Areas Act has been adopted, they shall remain and maybe even increase in number.

Biodiversity sustainable uses practices are self-maintaining and can only grow in the future to the extent that eco-tourism grows and the integration process in MERCOSUR becomes better. The training and formation of social stakeholders belonging to the NGOs, educational centres (primary and secondary school teachers), rural police, farmers, the young and technical experts of the Governments of the Departments has produced leaders who participate actively in the maintenance of and provide leverage to any actions enabling the continuity of the works carried out on the BR conservation.

The field visits and the interviews have shown that the management of some public and private areas is effective and that the capacity to maintain them exists, especially from the private sector, which seems to leverage its own actions and build a circuit that travels from the private areas to the public areas. For instance, it is possible to quote the ñandú farm in Maldonado, which includes the management of a small swamp, and is promoted for the development of eco-tourism, and from there it boosts the development of a public area such as Potrerillo.

PROBIDES is now preparing a sustainability strategy that assures the continuity and expansion of the work carried out during the completed project stage. In this strategy, there is a proposal for a Regional Development Plan to be tackled jointly by the five Governments of the Departments of the enlarged BR. The area shall then be conceived as a region that knows no Departmental political and administrative boundaries, and can consequently operate with a regional criterion. This fact sets a historical milestone in the rural management of the country.

Besides sustainability, the Project shows signs of replicability.

- The Project currently being design for the Uruguay river by the Comisión Administradora del Río Uruguay (CARU – Administration Commission for the

Uruguay River) has applied to PROBIDES for advice, in order to replicate its experience in the design and implementation of this new project.

- Another example is the project on Esteros de Iberá in Argentina, which is taking PROBIDES as a model.
- The Ministry of Tourism has incorporated “El Uruguay Natural” as the emblem for the promotion of tourism. The development of eco-tourism experiences in the areas covered by the Project contributes to build-up the image of natural tourism in Uruguay.
- Regarding the technical experts who participate in the Project and the capacity for them to become vehicles for the replication of the Project elsewhere, the following observation can be made: two of the technical experts are now working for Governments of Departments, three are now working in a national project and one is working in the Esteros de Iberá project. The experiences and the staff of the Project have also been useful for the formulation of the Rio de la Plata Maritime Front project with Argentina.
- UNDP is using the experiences gained from the project to prepare another tourist development project based on nature in northern of Uruguay.

*Based on the information received and the considerations made, the consultants estimate that sustainability qualifies as **satisfactory**.*

5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A MORE IN-DEPTH PROTECTION OF THE BIOSPHERE RESERVE.

The Project achievements are highly significant, but it is always possible to improve the network of protected areas, sustainable uses of biodiversity and sensitization of the population. PROBIDES has become a “brand” which arouses the interest of donors and of the population, consequently it is possible to strengthen this even more and engage in additional activities that deepen the Project achievements even more.

The main recommendations concerning how to go more in-depth in protecting biodiversity during regional development are the following:

- It seems important to formally incorporate other local stakeholders and more stakeholders linked to the productive sector to PROBIDES management. It is possible to envisage an enlarge steering committee which also includes a representative from the MAB Committee of Uruguay (responsible for the managing the BR), key ministries, the private sector, NGOs and representatives from the communities. For example, the Ministries of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries, Tourism, and Public Works may become members of PROBIDES since they are agencies whose competency encompasses certain management issues of the area.
- If PROBIDES had status as a legal entity, it could be the direct recipient of the Projects and operate with greater agility. Moreover, PROBIDES could have an increased presence

and insertion in Montevideo so as to speed up any formalities and procedures whenever this is necessary.

- Apparently, PROBIDES has completed a stage in its development, and rather than think about an institutional project covering all its interests, it might be interesting for PROBIDES to now become a kind of umbrella providing support and managing several projects in the field of conservation and development. This could be the right time to draft action plans and seek funding for subprograms such as public protected areas, private protected areas, rather than wait until PROBIDES has its own new action plan. PROBIDES staff could be geared to managing and obtaining resources for specific subprograms.
- The university could develop more organizational ties with PROBIDES, of the kind that commit it institutionally. For such purpose, its involvement should exceed the mere membership in the Governing Board.
- Similarly, the Governments of the Departments and MVOTMA could also develop a closer and more effective relationship with PROBIDES.
- It would seem important that when the Protected Areas Act regulation is adopted, PROBIDES and the Ministry be given first priority for the areas included in the Bañados del Este BR, in its restricted definition, i.e. covering 350,000 hectares. In this manner, it would be possible to have good examples for the national program and this would ensure the prompt protection of the Wetlands areas. For these same reasons, to start protected areas subprogram in the context of PROBIDES would be extremely important. A subprogram which could be useful as an example of how to establish strategic agreements, attract funds and implement actions in the field.
- It could also be important to see that, when the discussions start concerning regional planning, the protected areas in the enlarged BR –i.e. 3,850,000 hectares-- are also considered as of a priority nature, and that the lessons learned from the Project regarding the convenience of having buffer zones around them be used in a beneficial manner.

6. LESSONS LEARNED

There are several lessons arising from the Project that can be useful for future initiatives with similar purposes.

- It seems important that in projects of the BR type, in which the land-use matrix consists of core protected areas and sustainable use areas, the private sector and the key ministries regarding land management be involved since the very beginning. In general, it does not seem sufficient to have the ministries of the environment involved.
- Basic or semi-basic studies may be necessary, but they should not be at the core of the Project and should be focused on fulfilling knowledge needs for management purposes. On occasion, scientists or experts in some techniques manage to attract too much attention geared to knowledge concerning vacuums and thus distract from the core biodiversity management objectives of the projects. The steering committees play a significant role in securing the proper balance between the activities and, in this regard, it

might be important for UNDP not to be just an observer, but for it to play a more active role.

- The publications which are the most useful for biodiversity conservation sustainable uses projects are the field guides, management plans, dissemination and information brochures, guides as to how things should be done, rather than scientific or technical publications. Occasionally, scientific or technical papers may become a core project objective to the detriment of field actions.
- Projects with multiple components that target preservation, sustainable uses and awareness may form a network that is easier to sustain than separate individual initiatives. The feedback among the components contributes to establish a conservation culture that imbues the initiative with greater political strength and assures that the initiative is more sustainable.
- The social capital of stakeholders interested in conservation/preservation may be the best guarantee of sustainability. On occasion training and investment in the establishment of social networks of stakeholders as a result of conservation are underestimated.
- Projects needing changes in the laws and legal provisions concerning land use may require eight or more years before their objectives are attained. These projects may need deep awareness levels among the local population and at Government level. Frequently, there is a kind of time pressure to have projects that only take 4-5 years.
- Biodiversity conservation/management projects have different needs during their execution stage. Sometimes, the staff is hired and it is expected that it will be there for the duration, and this introduces an absence of flexibility which may bring about a cumbersome management more closely tied to the staff than to the achievement of certain goals agreed upon before the project execution commences.

7. LIST OF ANNEXES

1. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION.
2. SCHEDULE
3. LIST OF INTERVIEWEES
4. SUMMARY OF FIELD VISISTS
5. LIST OF THE DOCUMENTS REVIWED
6. QUESTIONNAIRE USED AND ACHIEVEMENTS MATRIX
7. DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS
8. DAY-TRAINING SESSIONS, COURSES, WORKSHOPS AND SEMINARS
9. PUBLICATIONS

ANNEX 1. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE FINAL EVALUATION OF:

Project URU/97/G31 "Consolidation of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve"

1. INTRODUCTION

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned. A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all regular and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation. A final evaluation of a GEF-funded project (or previous phase) is required before a concept proposal for additional funding (or subsequent phases of the same project) can be considered for inclusion in a GEF work program. However, a final evaluation is not an appraisal of the follow-up phase.

A final evaluation is intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.

The project to be evaluated, and for which these ToR have been developed, is URU/97/G31 "Consolidation of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve" executed by *PROBIDES* (Programme for the Conservation of Biodiversity in the Eastern Wetlands) which is integrated by the Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and Environment (MVOTMA), the University of the Republic and Local Governments of the Biosphere Reserve. This project completed activities in October 2002 and was the second phase of a GEF Pilot Phase Project URU/92/G31 Conservation of Biodiversity in the Eastern Wetlands completed in 1995.

The objective of the second phase was to consolidate Pilot Phase activities necessary for the effective and sustainable conservation of this globally significant mosaic of habitats and its biodiversity, through the successful implementation by stakeholders of land-use practices that serve both ecosystem conservation and sustainable economic resource use. This was to include the passage of the Protected Areas Law in Uruguay and the finalization of a draft Land-Use Plan and Hydrological Plan integrated into a Comprehensive Plan. It also included further identification or refinement of biodiversity friendly resource use and non-traditional alternative, and the identification and approval, by the relevant bodies or authorities, of incentives and regulations to motivate landholders to adopt these land-use practices. Other elements were building capacities of private sector and NGOs for the implementation of protected private areas and of biodiversity friendly land uses; the participatory development of an ecotourism strategy; and the development of biodiversity curricula for the school system.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation is to be the final independent evaluation of the above stated project. It has been initiated in accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures and will be jointly financed through by the UNDP Country Office in Uruguay, the Government of Uruguay and the UNDP GEF. Its main objective is to analyze and document the results obtained through the execution of this project during the period 1997-2002. More especially the focus will be:-

- To evaluate results and impacts obtained through project actions
- To identify the problems or constraints which have affected the smooth implementation of the project and achievement of impacts
- To recommend any outstanding measures needed to assure the viability and sustainability of the Biosphere Reserve and the results obtained through the project
- To provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned to other GEF projects

3. SCOPE OF EVALUATION

In conformity with the recent GEF guidelines the following broad concerns should be included and rated in the evaluation:

- An analysis of the attainment of global environmental objectives, outcomes/impacts, project objectives, and delivery and completion of project outputs/activities (based on indicators).
- Evaluation of project achievements according to GEF Project Review Criteria including Implementation approach, Country ownership/Drivenness, Stakeholder participation/Public Involvement, Sustainability, Replication approach, Financial planning, Cost-effectiveness, Monitoring and evaluation

The specific issues to be addressed under these broad concerns are detailed in Annex I in the Outline of the Evaluation Report ***which forms a critical part of these Terms of Reference.*** Annex II provides more detailed guidance on terminology and the GEF Project review Criteria.

In addition to the issues to be included in the evaluation as outlined in Annex I, three characteristics affect the scope of this evaluation. The first is the fact that the project under evaluation is a follow up of a Pilot Phase project. The second is that it is to be undertaken almost a year after project activities have been completed. The third is that it involves a wide range of stakeholders and includes as an objective their participation in conservation efforts.

In regards the first issue while the main focus of the evaluation should be on the project Consolidation of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve, some attention should be given to the Pilot Phase as it provides the main baseline for the project. Furthermore, it implies that there has been GEF action in this region for over 8 years. In regards the second issue, while focus should be on the impact achieved during the period 1997 to 2002, given the timing of this evaluation it should be able to provide more conclusive information on the sustainability of these impacts.

In regards to the third issue, the evaluation should include adequate consultation with the stakeholders involved in the project to obtain their impressions on general project implementation and impact achievement. These include the national scientific institutions,

scientists and technicians, and the local population, especially the indigenous people of the area.

4. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

There will be two specific products of this evaluation.

- The first will be an oral presentation of preliminary findings to the UNDP Resident Representative a.i. and PROBIDES authorities including the Ministry of Environment, Municipal Governments and University of the Republic. This should be on the last day of the in-country section of the mission before departure from Uruguay.
- The second will be the final report to be prepared by the team leader with inputs from the national consultant, summarizing the evaluation findings. The evaluation report would summarize the findings, assessment of performance, lessons learned, recommendations and description of best practices following the outline included as Annex I of these Terms of Reference. The first version of this report should be presented in electronic format within one week of completion of the in-country part of the mission. This will be circulated to interested parties and comments sent to the evaluators. These comments should focus on possible errors in terms of data in the report rather than on questioning evaluators impressions. If there are discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and the aforementioned parties these should be explained in an annex attached to the final report.

5. METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION

The methodology to be used by the evaluation team should consist of prior review of key documentation to be provided by UNDP Uruguay as indicated in Annex III of these Terms of Reference, an in-country mission to the project site and a home-based follow up period for completion of the evaluation report. The in-country mission will consist of visits to the Biosphere Reserve and areas in which the project has had on the ground interventions; review of project reports and documentations, and interviews that have been carefully planned to meet specific goals of the ToRs and to cover the different project objectives and the range of stakeholders involved, both in the project area and at the national level.

6. EVALUATION TEAM

The team is to consist of two independent evaluators. An international consultant with extensive experience in biodiversity conservation and GEF projects will be the team leader and will be responsible for finalizing the report. A national consultant will form an active part of the team and has extensive experience in social sciences and project evaluation as well as a sound knowledge of the country's institutional framework and UNDP monitoring and evaluation criteria.

7. EVALUATION IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The UNDP Uruguay Country Office will be the main operational point for this evaluation. They will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits, co-ordinate with the Government of Uruguay the hiring of the national consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements

within Uruguay for the evaluation team. The hiring of the international consultant will be funded jointly through UNDP Uruguay and UNDP GEF. A budget for the mission is included in Annex IV. These Terms of Reference follow the UNDP GEF policies and procedures, and these together with the final agenda with list of interviews have been agreed upon by the UNDP GEF Regional Unit in Mexico UNDP Uruguay and the Government of Uruguay. These three parties will receive a draft of the final evaluation report and provide comments on it prior to its completion. The estimated time for the evaluation mission is 14 days excluding the period during which the first draft of the report is circulated for feed back.

- Desk review prior to in-country mission: **3 days** including travel time for international consultant and two days for national consultant. (6-8 October)
- Briefings for evaluators from the UNDP Uruguay Country Office and project team: **0.5 days** (9 October).
- Internal meeting of evaluator team and preparation of field visits and interviews **0.5 days**
- Stakeholder interviews in Montevideo **0.5 –1.0 day** debriefings. (9 October)
- Visits to the field and review of project reports and records: **3 days**
- Stakeholders interviews in project region: **3 days**
- Validation of preliminary findings with UNDP Country Office and stakeholders (2 different meetings) through verbal presentation of general impression **0.5 days** (17 October), and later circulation of initial reports for comments plus a period of 10 days to reading of draft report by interested parties
- Preparation of evaluation report following format in Annex I: **3 days** including revisions following receipt of comments on draft version.

ANNEX I OF THE TOR:

EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE AND SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE INCLUDED

(This incorporates the April 2003 GEF Guidelines on Terminal Evaluations)

1. Executive summary

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

2. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

3. The project(s) and its development context

- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

4. Findings and Conclusions

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) should be rated¹)

▪ **Project concept and formulation**

- Implementation approach (*) (i) appropriateness of problem conceptualization and of proposed solutions; analysis of Logical Framework Approach including intervention strategy and indicators; whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project implementation
- Country ownership/Driveness (the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, eg. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans. Recipient country commitment.
- Stakeholder participation (*) (i) (including information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation in design)
- Replication approach (ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects)
- UNDP comparative advantage
- Linkages between projects
- Management arrangements

▪ **Implementation**

- Cost-effectiveness (the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project’s outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project’s compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept.)
- Financial Planning (actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing)
- Monitoring and evaluation (*) (whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports)
- Implementation Approach (*) (ii) based on the analysis of the logical framework or intervention design at project inception how has the project implementation adapted to changing conditions (adaptive management); have changes been made to project design, and overall project management. This should also include whether comprehensive and realistic workplans that reflect adaptive management have been routinely developed. Have effective partnerships arrangements been established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region.;
- Stakeholder participation (*) (ii) effective information dissemination and stakeholder participation in implementation
- Execution and implementation modalities (effectiveness of UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the

¹ The ratings will be: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP, GoU., EU and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project.

▪ **Results**

- *Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of objectives (*)* (the extent to which the project's environmental and development objectives were achieved)
- *Sustainability (*)* (the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end.
- *Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff*

5. Recommendations

- Recommended actions to follow up or reinforce benefits from the project. These should highlight actions for the future strengthening of PROBIDES and implementation of its programme to enhance the sustainability of the project impacts.

6. Lessons learned

- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success. Observations should not be limited to the assessment of project outputs with reference to the development objectives, but should also cover the development of national capacity for conservation and sustainable utilization of natural resources, planning and

7. Annexes

- TOR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results

ANNEX 2. MISSION SCHEDULE.



AGENDA

Final Evaluation Mission of the GEF Project
URU/97/G31 “CONSOLIDATION OF THE BAÑADOS DEL ESTE BIOSPHERE RESERVE”
Dr. Eduardo Fuentes, International Consultant on Biodiversity and Development
Ms. Carmen Varela, (Sociologist), National Consultant
Mission to Uruguay, October 8 – 18, 2003

Wednesday, October 8th - MONTEVIDEO

- 12:55 p.m. Arrival at Carrasco International Airport (LA 900)
Transfer to Pocitos Plaza Hotel (Juan Benito Blanco 640 - Tel.:712 3939)
- 15:30 p.m. Ms. Katića Cekalovic, UNDP Resident Representative a.i.
Mr. Pablo Martínez, Coordinator of the UNDP Policies and Program Unit
Place: UNDP offices (Barrios Amorín 870, 3rd floor – Phone: 412 3356)
- 17:00 p.m. Preparatory meeting of the Mission between both consultants
Place: UNDP offices (Barrios Amorín 870, 3rd floor – Phone: 412 3356)

Thursday, October 9th - MONTEVIDEO

- 09:00 a.m. Preparatory meeting of the Mission between both consultants
Place: UNDP offices (Barrios Amorín 870, 3rd floor – Phone: 412 3356)
- 11:00 a.m. Dr. Enrique Lessa, University Delegate at the PROBIDES Board of Directors
(School of Science of the Universidad de la República)
Place: Facultad de Ciencias (School of Science) (corner of Iguá 4225 and Mataojo – Phone: 525 8618, extension. 143)
- 01:00 p.m. Ing. Agr. Alfredo Altamiraño, General Director of the Department of Renewable Natural Resources – Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (*Dirección Recursos Naturales Renovables- Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca*) and Ing. Agr. Ricardo Caysials
(Cerrito 318, 2nd floor – Phone: 915-6741)

- 02:00 p.m. Arq. Federico Bervejillo, Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment Representative (MVOTMA) at the PROBIDES Governing Board (Director of the National Office for Land Planning of the MVOTMA) and Arq. Daniel Heide, Technical Expert of DINOT.
Place: DINOT-MVOTMA (Zabala 1427, 1st Floor – Phone: 916 9054)
- 03:30 p.m. Lic. Víctor Cantón, Member of the PROBIDES Board of Directors – National Office for the Environment of the Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment (DINAMA - MVOTMA)
Place: DINAMA-MVOTMA (Rincón 422, 3rd floor – Phone: 917 0710, extension 4456).
- 06:00 p.m. Mr. Jaime Gorfain, Technical Meteorologist of the National Office of Hydrography– Ministry of Transportatioin and Public Works (DNH –MTOPI) (corner of 25 de Mayo 440, 5th floor, and Misiones – Phone: 099193530)

Friday, October 10th – ROCHA

- 06:30 a.m. Transfer to PROBIDES – Rocha (Ruta 9 km. 204 – Phone: 047 25005)
- 09:00 a.m. Ing. Agr. Alvaro Díaz, Director of the URU/97/G31 Project “Consolidation of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve”.
PROBIDES Technical Experts: Sandra Bazzani, Gonzalo Picasso and Alicia Torres
General presentation of the Reserve and the Project
- 12:00 p.m. Lunch
- 02:00 p.m. Presentation of the Results of Objectives 5 and 6 of the GEF Project
Technical Experts: Alvaro Díaz, Julio Pérez, Gabriela González, Diana Musitelli, Sandra Bazzani and Alicia Torres
- 06:00 p.m. Presentation of the Trust Fund
Technical Experts: Ing. Alvaro Díaz, Carlos Fagetti, Ana Castillos and Mabel Pena. (Ref: Project Objective 2)
Participation of the President of the Farmers Society of Rocha, Mr. Nicolás Shaw (Ing. Agr.)
- 07:30 p.m. Camaraderie get-together with technical experts of the Program and local stakeholders. List of participants attached.

Saturday, October 11th - ROCHA

- 09:30 a.m. Presentation of the Reserve's Master Plan and GIS (Ref. Project Objective 1).
Interviews with technical experts who participated in the drafting of the Master Plan: Jorge Acosta, Alicia Iglesias, José Luis Sciandro, Bethy Molina, Carlos Prigioni
- Protected Areas Act, Coastal Land Use Regulation (Ref: Project Objective 2 and Result 2.1)
Technical Experts: Alicia Torres, José Sciandro, Alicia Iglesias
- 12:30 p.m. Lunch
- 03:00 p.m. Visit to Rocha Lagoon. (Ref: Project Objective 3, Results 3.1 and 3.2)
Technical Experts: Carlos Fagetti
Local stakeholders involved in the management of the area: fishermen of the Lagoon
- 05:30 p.m. Return to PROBIDES Regional Station.
Drafting of the report
- 09:00 p.m. Dinner

Sunday, October 12th – ROCHA

- 08:30 a.m. Departure to Potrerillo (Ref: Project Objective 3, Result 3.1)
Tour of Potrerillo and interviews with local stakeholders involved in the management of the area
Technical Experts: Gonzalo Picasso, Alicia Torres and Martín Jaurena.
Local stakeholders: members of the Palmar Group, Jorge Pedraja and Park Rangers Néstor Pérez and Juan Acosta
- 12:30 p.m. Country lunch at Potrerillo
- 01.30 p.m. Visit to Santa Teresa Park. Interview with Lt. Col. Casuriaga of the Army Park Service (SEPAE)
- 02:30 p.m. Visit to the Cerro del Indio Farm of Ing. Agr. Octavio de los Campos and Karina Pijuán (ADEATUR members)
Technical experts: Martín Jaurena, Gonzalo Picasso, Alicia Torres.
- 04:00 p.m. Tour of Bañado de los Indios (De los Indios Wetlands) and visit to Ing. Agr. Juan Manuel Pérez Ferreira's farm, (rice grower).
Technical experts: Martín Jaurena, Gonzalo Picasso and Alicia Torres.
Return to Rocha

Monday, October 13th – MALDONADO / ROCHA

- 09:00 a.m. Departure to Maldonado. Visit to the “ñandú” (*Rhea americana*) –breeding farm – Chacra Vovo, Farmer Nair Mediburu (Ref: Project Objective 4).
Technical experts: Javier Vitancurt, Carlos Fagetti
- 12:30 p.m. Lunch
- 02:00 p.m. Visit to Aiguá, interviews with local stakeholders from the Candela Group (ONG). (Ref: Project Objectives 4 and 6)
Technical expert: Carlos Fagetti.
Local stakeholders: Candela Group members Cristina Tourné, Claudio de Sancti Lucía Battaglino, Zoila Martínez and Elsa Sosa; the first two are also Nature Guides graduates of the PROBIDES courses.
- Return to Rocha
- 05.30 p.m. Interview with teachers of the formal educational system of the department of Rocha, Head Teacher Nora Fernández and Teachers Graciela Cardoso, Carina Zepedeo and Ana Ribero at the PROBIDES Regional Station
Technical experts: Sandra Bazzani and Alicia Torres.
- 06:30 p.m. Meeting with Superintendent Inspector José Carlos Cal and Superintendent Elmer Alegre at the PROBIDES Regional Station
Technical experts: Alicia Torres and Sandra Bazzani

Tuesday, October 14th – ROCHA

- 08:30 a.m. Work on the Report.
- 11:00 a.m. Interview with Juan Calvo, President of the Rocha Tourism Cooperative
Technical expert: Carlos Fagetti.
- 12:00 p.m. Lunch
- 02:00 p.m. Interview with India Muerta Group member Gino de León, (Ref: Project Objectives 3 and 4) at PROBIDES Regional Station
Technical experts: Javier Vitancurt, Carlos Fagetti.

Wednesday, October 15th – TREINTA Y TRES / ROCHA / MONTEVIDEO

- 09:00 a.m. Interview with the Head of the Government of Rocha Irineu Riet Correa.
- 10:30 a.m. Visit to India Muerta (Ref: Project Objectives 3 and 4)
- 11:00 a.m. Transfer to Treinta y Tres.
- 01:00 p.m. Working lunch with: Head of the Department of Treinta y Tres, Wilson Elso Goñi, the Director of the Development Department Ing. Agr. Nicolás

Chebataroff and Carlos Prigioni, Technical Expert of the Development Department at the Hotel Treinta y Tres. Participation of Esc, (Notary) José Luis Cuello, member of the Envira Group NGO of the city of Vergara, Treinta y Tres.

02:30 p.m. Return to Montevideo.

06:00 p.m. Interview with Dr. Juan Gabito. Director of UTE – Administración Nacional de Usinas y Trasmisiones Eléctricas (electric power utility) (Paraguay 2431, 9th floor – Phone: 209 0239), Deputy Minister of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment and representative of said Ministry at the PROBIDES Board of Directors (tenure 1995 - 2000).

Thursday, October 16th - MONTEVIDEO

Work on the draft of the final report

Friday, October 17th - MONTEVIDEO

02:00 p.m. Final meeting with UNDP
Ms. Katiča Cekalovic, UNDP Resident Representative a.i.
Mr. Pablo Martínez, Coordinator of the UNDP Policies and Program Unit
Mr. Carlos Mendive, UNDP Program Officer
Place: UNDP offices (Barrios Amorín 870, 3rd floor – Phone: 412 3356)

04:00 p.m. Meeting of the PROBIDES Governing Board
Place: UNDP offices (Barrios Amorin 870, 3rd floor – Phone: 412 3356)

Saturday, October 18th – MONTEVIDEO

09:30 a.m. Transfer to Carrasco International Airport (PU 401 departure 11:15)

ANNEX 3. LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

United Nations Development Program (UNDP)

Ms. Katiča Cekalovic, UNDP Resident Representative a.i.

Mr. Pablo Martínez, Coordinator of the UNDP Policies and Program Unit

School of Science of the Universidad de la República

Dr. Enrique Lessa, University Delegate at the PROBIDES Board of Directors (School of Science, Universidad de la República)

Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries (MGAP)

Ing. Agr. Alfredo Altamirano, General Director of the Department of Renewable Natural Resources – Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries

Ing. Agr. Ricardo Caysials, Technical expert of the Department of Renewable Natural Resources – Ministry of Livestock, Agriculture and Fisheries

Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment (MVOTMA)

Arq. Federico Bervejillo, Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment (MVOTMA) Representative at the PROBIDES Board of directors (National Director of the Department of Land Planning of the MVOTMA)

Arq. Daniel Heide, Technical expert of the National Office of Land Planning (DINOT – MVOTMA)

Lic. Víctor Cantón, Member of PROBIDES Board of Directors – National Office for the Environment of the Ministry of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment (DINAMA - MVOTMA)

Dr. Juan Gabito. Director – National Electric Power Utility (UTE). Deputy Minister of Housing, Land Planning and the Environment and representative of the said Ministry at the PROBIDES Board of Directors (tenure 1995 - 2000).

Ministry of Transportation and Public Works (MTO)

Mr Jaime Gorfain, Technical Meteorologist of the National Hydrographic Office – Ministry of Transportation and Public Works (DNH –MTO)

PROBIDES

Ing. Agr. Alvaro Díaz, Director of Project URU/97/G31 “Consolidation of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve”.

Technical Experts

Mr Jorge Acosta (Agricultural Engineer)
Ms. Sandra Bazzani (Agricultural Engineer)
Ms. Ana Castillos (Agricultural Engineer)
Carlos Fagetti (Social Assistant)
Ms. Gabriela González
Ms. Alicia Iglesias (Architect)
Mr. Martín Jaurena. (Agricultural Engineer)
Ms. Bethy Molina (Agricultural Engineer)
Lic. Diana Musitelli
Ms. Mabel Pena (Accountant)
Prof. Carlos Prigioni
Prof. Julio Pérez
Mr. Gonzalo Picasso (Agricultural Engineer)
Dr. José Luis Sciandro
Ms. Alicia Torres (Agricultural Engineer)
Dr. Javier Vitancurt

Local Stakeholders:

Members of the Palmar Group, Mr. Jorge Pedraja

Members of the Candela Group: Ms. Cristina Tourné, Mr. Claudio de Sancti, Ms. Lucía Battaglino, Ms. Zoila Martínez and Ms. Elsa Sosa; the first two are also “Nature Guides”, graduate from the PROBIDES courses.

Member of the NGO Envira Group from the city of Vergara, Mr. José Luis Cuello (Notary Public).

Protected Areas Park Wardens Néstor Pérez y Juan Acosta (Potrerillo)

Army Park Service

Visit to Santa Teresa National Park. Interview with Lt. Cnel. Casuriaga of the Army Park Service (SEPAE)

Rocha Eco- and Agri-tourism Association (ADEATUR)

Ing. Agr. Octavio de los Campos
Ms. Karina Pijuán
Ms. Nair Mediburu

Rocha Agricultural Society

Ing. Agr. Nicolás Shaw, President of Rocha Farmers Association

Rice Producers

Ing. Agr. Juan Manuel Pérez Ferreira, rice grower

Educational system

Head Teacher Nora Fernández
Teacher Graciela Cardoso

Teacher Carina Zepedeo
Teacher Ana Ribero

Public school

Superintendent Inspector José Carlos Cal
Superintendent Elmer Alegre

Rocha Tourism Corporation

Mr. Juan Calvo, President

India Muerta Working Group

Arq. Gino de León

Government of the Department of Rocha

Dr. Irineu Riet Correa, Head of the Department of the Municipality of Rocha

Government of the Department of Treinta y Tres

Mr. Wilson Elso Goñi, Head of the Department of Treinta y Tres
Ing. Agr. Nicolás Chebataroff, Director of the Development Department
Mr. Carlos Progioni, Technical expert of the Development Department at Treinta y Tres Hotel

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AT THE MEETING WITH THE PROGRAM'S TECHNICAL EXPERTS AND STAKEHOLDERS. OCTOBER 10TH.

Councillors of the Departments – Members of the Legislature of Rocha

- Mr. Alberto Carpenter (Partido Nacional)
- Mr. Pereira Montes (Partido Colorado)
- Ms. Blanca Repetto (Partido Nacional)
- Mr. Alejandro Umpiérrez (Partido Nacional)

Government of the Department of Rocha

- Mr. Gino De León. Consultant.

Universidad de la República

- Ing. Agr. Mercedes Rivas.
Palmar Conservation Project School of Agriculture-PROBIDES.

Local Stakeholders. Production sector and Private protected areas

- Mr. Curt Alhig.
Farmer, former President of Rocha Farmer's Association (SAR)
- Mr. and Mrs. José González
Farmer. Agri-industrial production of canned products, marmelades and liquers with the brand "Caseras de India Muerta" ("India Muerta Homemades").
- Mr. and Mrs. Nelson de los Santos
Farmer. Rice grower and wild-boar meat producer for restaurants. Member of the India Muerta Group.
- Ing. Agr. Nicolás Shaw.
Farmer. President of Rocha Farmer's Association (SAR). Member of the Trust Fund
- Mr. Miguel Iewdiukow. Technical expert of the farm on Rocha Lagoon.
- Mr. and Mrs. Héctor Caymaris. Park rangers of Rocha Lagoon, on the farm where Mr. Iewdiukow works.

PROBIDES Technical Experts

- Sandra Bazzani
- Ana Castillos
- Álvaro Díaz
- Carlos Fagetti
- Gabriela González
- Diana Musitelli
- Mabel Pena
- Julio Pérez Corbo
- Gonzalo Picasso
- Alicia Torres
- Javier Vitancurt

PROBIDES Staff

- Irene Cardoso. Secretary.
- Mario Correa and Ms. Caseros

ANNEX 4. SUMMARY OF FIELD VISITS

- Rocha Lagoon – Department of Rocha
- Lake India Muerta (Multiple-use public reserve)
- (Public) Protected Area of Potrerillo – Department of Rocha
- Santa Teresa National Park – Department of Rocha
- Cerro del Indio Farm – (Private) Protected Area – Ecotourism Enterprise – Department of Rocha
- Bañado de los Indios (De los Indios Wetlands) – Department of Rocha
- Rice farm – Department of Rocha
- “Ñandu” (*Rhea americana*)-breeding farm - Chacra Vovo – Protected Area – Production and ecotourism enterprise

ANNEX 5. LIST DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

1. Project Brief and Annexes approved by GEF Council for the Consolidation of Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve
2. UNDP Project Document URU/97/G31 and Annexes, particularly Annex I Description of Pilot Phase Project Accomplishments and Annex II Lesson Learned from Implementation of Pilot Phase Project
3. Mid-term review report of URU/97/G31 by Enrique H Bucher September 14, 1999
4. URU/97/G31 PIR 2000
5. URU/97/G31 PIR 2001
6. URU/97/G31 PIR 2002 covering July 2001 to June 2002
7. URU/97/G31 PIR 2003 covering June to October 2002 and supplementary section covering whole period
8. URU/97/G31 Final Report October 2002
9. List of documents and working papers produced by the project URU/97/G31 (ANEXO 9)
10. Copies of publications or internal project reports containing specific evidence of project impacts particularly in terms of policy changes achieved through project actions
11. Project Brief and Project Document of URU/92/G31 Conservation of Biodiversity in the Eastern Wetlands
12. Final evaluation report of the project URU/92/G31 Conservation of Biodiversity in the Eastern Wetlands URU 92 G31 (By Pablo Canevari, Thomás Crisman, Renato Sales , 28th November 1995)
13. Baseline values for impact indicators. If this is not available then please provide a description of the types of information that the consultants will have access to for determining a baseline against which impacts can be measured (for example, the satellite imagery available for the Biosphere for 1966 , 1998 and more recently)
14. Budget indicating costs for each one of the immediate objectives, as well GEF and non-GEF contributions for each one of them.

**ANNEX 6. QUESTIONNAIRE USED AS A GUIDE DURING THE INTERVIEWS
AND ACHIEVEMENT MATRIX.**

UNDP comparative advantages.

Links between projects.

Agreements for the project management.

PROJECT CONCEPT AND FORMULATION.

IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH.

1. Conceptualization of the problem and its solutions. Use of lessons in these conceptualizations.
2. Function and use of the listing of objectives/results in the DP. Uses as guidance and for monitoring.
3. The need to adapt the listing during implementation.
4. Effective and not so effective associates used in the execution, and associates that would have been worth having.
5. Lessons learned from other projects used effectively in the project structure and execution.
6. Use of monitoring to modify implementation and/or objectives/results.
7. Effectiveness and possible improvements to the project management modality.

LAND OWNERSHIP

1. Origins of the project are linked to national and sectoral development programs.
2. Project achievements incorporated to the national and sectoral development plans and programs.
3. Regulation and policy changes made as a result of the project.
4. The committed State counterparts have remained.
5. State and non-State political stakeholders involved in the production and/or management of the project.
6. Number of enterprises that have benefited from the project.
7. Private financial contribution to achieve global benefits.
8. Cooperation with producer associations.

STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

1. Dissemination mechanisms and campaigns.
2. Consultations with NGOs, local groups, private sector, public sector, and academic groups for the structure, implementation/execution of activities.

	NGOs	LOCAL GROUPS	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR	ACADEMIC GROUPS
STRUCTURE					

3. Participation of NGOs, local groups, private sector, public sector, and academic groups in the structure, implementation and execution of activities.

	NGOs	LOCAL GROUPS	PUBLIC SECTOR	PRIVATE SECTOR	ACADEMIC GROUPS
STRUCTURE					
IMPLEMENTATION /EXECUTION					

SUSTAINABILITY.

1. Strategy for project sustainability.
2. Financial mechanisms to ensure the maintenance of global benefits once the project has been finalized.
3. Institutional agreements for sustainability.
4. Development of policy and regulation frameworks to sustain the project objectives.
5. Incorporation of future threats.
6. Institutional capacity development.
7. Identification and participation of local or national leaders in the processes.
8. Assimilation of the project objectives by public or private institutions.

9. Agreements between stakeholders for future actions consistent with the project aims.

REPLICATION

1. Transfer of knowledge and experiences to similar possible projects or to parties interested in magnifying the area of impact.
2. Expansion of the project area of impact.
3. Training for expansion to other regions or countries.
4. Use of project personnel to replicate at other locations.

IMPLEMENTATION.

COST-EFFECTIVENESS.

1. Use of the concept of increase in activity financing.
2. The project completed or exceeded all the planned activities in accordance with the original time span and cost-effectiveness.

FINANCIAL PLANNING.

1. Results of financial audit.
2. Cost of implementation by project objectives and results.
3. Identification and achievement of co-financing before and during execution.
4. Fluent financial management.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

1. Existence of a monitoring and evaluation plan for the biological and administrative aspects.
2. Existence of indicators used to measure project impact and achievements.
3. Sustainability of the monitoring and evaluation plan.

**ACHIEVEMENT MATRIX FOR THE PROJECT: CONSOLIDATION OF THE
BAÑADOS DEL ESTE BIOSPHERE RESERVE.**

<u>OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>INDICATOR OR TYPE OF COMPLIANCE INDICATOR</u>	<u>LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE ACHIEVED</u>
<p><u>DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE</u> To achieve generalized and permanent conditions in the population's quality of life, in a healthy and productive ambient of environmental excellence.</p>		
<p><u>OBJECTIVE 1.</u> An Land Use Regulation regulating the use and planning of the territory, including continental lands and waters and coastal zones, which will ensure the long-term ecological integrity of the BR.</p> <p>OUTCOME 1. Document finalized and ready for Government approval.</p>	<p>- Land Use Regulation with all three components finalized and approved at all Government and private sector levels, ensuring future compliance and hence the integrity of the BR.</p> <p>- Biological and chemical indicators show that the BR conditions were enhanced during project execution.</p> <p>Finalized document available.</p>	
<p><u>OBJECTIVE 2</u> Political framework and mechanisms of incentives and regulations to enable the successful implementation of the Master Plan.</p> <p>OUTCOME 2.1. National Law for Protected Areas approved.</p> <p>OUTCOME 2.2. Recommendations on policies regarding the BR, with the relevant incentives and regulations.</p> <p>OUTCOME 2.3. <i>Proposal to establish a Trust Fund for Sustainable Land Planning, including identification</i></p>	<p>Incentive and regulation system for conservation and sustainable uses of BR biodiversity approved at all corresponding Government levels and currently being implemented.</p> <p>Official evidence of approval.</p> <p>Document of recommendations of regulations and incentives.</p> <p>Formal proposal to the Government.</p>	

<u>OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>INDICATOR OR TYPE OF COMPLIANCE INDICATOR</u>	<u>LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE ACHIEVED</u>
and development of economic instruments for its capitalization.		
<p><u>OBJECTIVE 3</u> An effective system of protected areas, public and private, in the BR.</p> <p>OUTCOME 3.1. Public protected areas <i>established</i>.</p> <p>OUTCOME 3.2. Private protected areas established.</p> <p>OUTCOME 3.3 Management and Supervision System for the BR protected area network.</p>	<p>- The National Bureau for Protected Areas has established management standards for the PAs and monitors compliance.</p> <p>- Public and private protected areas with management plans and personnel implementing them.</p> <p>Participative management plans are available.</p> <p>Participative management plans are available.</p> <p>The National Bureau for Protected Areas has maps of existing and potential PA in the BR, it provides support to the managers by publishing the PA bulletin, and monitors ecotourism and habitats in the BR.</p>	
<p><u>OBJECTIVE 4.</u> Practices of territorial use compatible with biodiversity conservation and activities consistent with the Master Plan, adopted by the farmers, tourist entrepreneurs and other resource users.</p> <p>OUTCOME 4.1. Portfolio of alternative production practices, including required resources for their implementation and broad dissemination, to be presented before relevant private and State institutions and subsequently demonstrated/experimented in agricultural establishments.</p> <p>OUTCOME 4.2. <i>Ecotourism development plan,</i></p>	<p>- Documents showing official adoption of the practices by agricultural producers, tourism entrepreneurs and other users.</p> <p>- Evidence of changes in the traditional practices of producers and entrepreneurs as a result of the project.</p> <p>- Document(s) of portfolio of options with execution requirements.</p> <p>- Evidence of experimentation of new options by entrepreneurs and producers.</p> <p>Ecotourism plan with public and private sector participation.</p>	

<u>OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>INDICATOR OR TYPE OF COMPLIANCE INDICATOR</u>	<u>LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE ACHIEVED</u>
driven by the interested parties.		
<p><u>OBJECTIVE 5.</u> The capacities of the State, NGOs and private sector are strengthened for the effective implementation of agricultural and tourism policies, within the BR and Master Plan conceptual framework.</p> <p>OUTCOME 5.1. Public and private managers of protected areas are capable of managing wildlife and habitats for the conservation of biodiversity.</p> <p>OUTCOME 5.2. Private sector, NGOs and Government stakeholders are capable of responding to new policies, laws and State plans for the implementation of biodiversity-friendly land use technologies.</p> <p>OUTCOME 5.3. Private sector, NGOs and Government stakeholders are in a position to start to develop and market ecotourism products and services.</p>	<p>Evidence that the State sector, NGOs and private sector have proposed or implemented policy changes that are consistent with the Master Plan.</p> <p>Evidence that public and private managers are now capable of managing for conservation.</p> <p>Evidence that public and private managers are now capable of responding to new policies, laws and plans when applying technologies.</p> <p>Evidence that NGOs, private and Government sectors are capable of starting to develop and sell ecotourism products and services.</p>	
<p><u>OBJECTIVE 6.</u> Greater awareness at national and local levels regarding BR benefits.</p> <p>OUTCOME 6.1. Educational institutions and NGOs capable of performing formal and informal educational activities regarding the benefits of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.</p> <p>OUTCOME 6.2. Plan for the sensitization of public opinion.</p>	<p>Evidence that there is now more national and local awareness of the BR benefits</p> <p>Evidence that educational institutions and NGOs are now capable of performing formal and informal activities regarding the benefits of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.</p> <p>Sensitization plan and evidence of its implementation.</p>	

ANNEX 7 – DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS

The PROBIDES line of dissemination technical information was based on a global communications scheme allowing use of different aids and products: publications, documentation center, videos, exhibitions, posters, radio auditions, press releases.

Publications

Concerning material editing, high quality was pursued for the final product. The publications policy included various series destined to different PROBIDES publics. These are differentiated not only by their contents, but also by their presentation and form of distribution. Therefore, while research results were presented, the editorial lines used responded to the different program interlocutors:

a. In the region

- formal education system (teachers and students), tourism, productive sector, political and social stakeholders, environmental NGOs, general public;

b. Elsewhere in the country

- formal education system (teachers and students), tourism, political and social stakeholders, NGOs, academic community, general public;

c. Abroad

- environmental networks, specific tourism, international organizations, academic community.

The publications emerging from the work undertaken are of different natures: integrated series of a technical and scientific nature (Work Documents, Technical Information Dissemination and Technical Reports); integrated series of a didactic and educational nature, written in clear straightforward language, illustrated with color photos and drawings (for example Didactic Fact Sheets and Potrerillo Notebooks); a regular informative bulletin, “Baños del Este”, focused on informing the general public of the activities and projects underway.

The publications are available at the PROBIDES Regional Station Documentation Center and on sale in bookshops and other stores in Montevideo and on the Reserve. Copies of each number were donated to educational and cultural centers in the region and given to authorities, official institutions, communications media and NGOs. ANNEX 10 contains a list of all the publications edited during the execution of the Project.

Documentation center

The Documentation Center is another important achievement for information dissemination and training. The following results stand out:

- A database on CDS Micro/Isis and on CDS/Isis for Windows with 450 book entries plus registration of 11 regular publications to which the program is subscribed.
- Attention of 622 permanent users that included program technical experts, teachers, students attending the courses being dictated, university students, local reporters and town councilors.

- Joining the Pan-American Environmental Health Information Network (REPIDISCA) that coordinates all libraries on regional environmental subjects, and reaches 352 cooperating centers in Latin America and the Caribbean, through which the PROBIDES editorial production is distributed.
- The consolidation of the inter-institutional cooperation between university libraries through the RAU (Academic University Network), NGOs, ministries and city councils and INIA, which embraces a total of 17 institutions, to conduct searches and exchange material.
- Cooperation agreement between the University of the Republic and PROBIDES enabling the Central Information Service to provide web hosting service on the Academic University Network Server.

Communications media

Strong presence was obtained in local and national communications media through the production of a permanent agenda of contacts. Press releases containing information on the program's activities and projects were sent to the Biosphere Reserve communications media weekly. When more outstanding information or events were involved, these were also sent to the Montevideo media.

An Internet site was created regarding the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve and PROBIDES activities.

Information dissemination system

Press releases: 110 between 1999 – 2001.

Publications: 74 between 97 and 2002 (list attached).

Appearances in the local and national media:
(Annual average 1997-2001)

Written press	Local: 100 articles and releases (Includes Biosphere Reserve newspapers) National: 40 articles and releases (Mainly El País, El Observador y Búsqueda)
Radio broadcasters	Local: 60 interviews to PROBIDES technical experts National: 35 interviews
Journalistic programs and television newsreels	Local: 30 participations of PROBIDES technical experts (On Biosphere Reserve TV Channels) National: 10 participations of PROBIDES technical experts (Mainly on El Espectador, Sarandí and Nuevo Tiempo)

ANNEX 8: DAY-TRAINING SESSIONS, COURSES, WORKSHOPS AND SEMINARS

The strategy of education and training was implemented by means of: day-training sessions, workshops, courses and seminars.

a. Day-training sessions

Day-training sessions

April and May 1998 – Day-training sessions, held at PROBIDES headquarters, for Rocha Police Agents. Six day-training sessions were held with the participation of 86 police agents.

May 1998 – Day-training session at Quebrada de los Cuervos (Treinta y Tres), to train park wardens, with the participation of staff from MGAP, Quebrada de los Cuervos and PROBIDES.

September-October 1998 – Day-training sessions for Protected Area staff. Five day-training sessions were held for guides and park wardens from areas that PROBIDES manages or cooperates with. Ten people participated.

September-October 1998 – Day-training sessions on environmental conservation for senior citizen groups (Rocha and Treinta y Tres UNI 3). . Five day-training sessions were held with each group, with an average participation of eight people in Rocha and 15 in Treinta y Tres.

24 and 25 July 1998 – Seminar-workshop on ecological and rural tourism: strategy, markets and producers. Trainers: Economist J.C. Píriz (Salto Tourism College), Social Worker C. Fagetti and Agronomist L. García (PROBIDES). Thirty-four tourism operators from Rocha attended.

April 1999 – Day-training session on organic farming at PROBIDES headquarters, with the participation of various institutions: School of Agricultural Sciences, PROVA, REDES, IPRU y Centro Emmanuel. Thirty-three producers participated.

7 and 8 May 1999 – Seminar on scientific journalism, in La Paloma (Rocha), in cooperation with UNESCO, for 24 journalists and communicators.

June 1999 – Day-training session on capybara breeding, at PROBIDES headquarters, in charge of Consultant Dr. Paulo Becerra (Brazil). Thirty-three producers participated.

November 1999 – Day-training session on pesticides for rice, in charge of Consultant Dr. Luiza Chomenko (FEPAM, Brazil). Twenty people attended.

January-February 2000 – Park warden assistantships in Potrerillo de Santa Teresa. Sixteen park wardens participated, and the following cooperated: NGO Vida Silvestre, SEPAE (Ministry of Defense) and Government of the Departments of Rocha, Treinta y Tres and Maldonado.

27 June and 3 July 2000 – Workshop on Enhancing rural gastronomy based on mutton. It was held at El Rincón establishment and Bahía Hotel in La Paloma. It was jointly organized with PROBIDES, ADEATUR, La Paloma Gastronomic Association and Uruguayan Wool Board (SUL). Fifteen tourist and gastronomic entrepreneurs attended.

23 and 24 September and 27 November 2000 – Workshop on tourist strategic planning and marketing in charge of J.C. Píriz (Salto Tourism College). Organized by ADEATUR and PROBIDES. An average of 10 tourism entrepreneurs participated.

December 2000 and November 2001 – Gathering of environment monitors trained by PROBIDES. Members of NGOs from La Paloma, La Coronilla, Chuy, Melo, Pirarajá, Minas, Vergara (approximately 15 people per gathering) participated. The first took place at SEPAE (Santa Teresa, Rocha) and the second at La Paloma (Rocha).

- 13 March 2001 – Seminar on breeding native species, in charge of Javier Vitancurt (PROBIDES), at Granja Ñandú-Guazú establishment, for 33 farmers from Treinta y Tres and Cerro Largo.
- 26 May 2001 – Seminar on the bio-recycling of rice husk, in charge of Ana Castillos (PROBIDES) at the Government of the Department office of Treinta y Tres, for 23 farmers from that Department.
- July-December 2001 - Five days of training and experience interaction for 20 park wardens, held alternately in their respective areas: Potrerillo, Quebrada de los Cuervos, San Miguel, Laguna de Rocha, India Muerta.
- 19 July 2001 – Workshop on ecotourism marketing, in charge of Gabriel Martinols (Blanco Publicidad), at El Mayoral establishment, organized by ADEATUR and PROBIDES. Eleven people participated.
- 17 September 2001 – Seminar on agriculture and ecotourism, in charge of Carlos Fagetti (PROBIDES), for 10 rural producers from Treinta y Tres.

b. Courses

The participants in these courses came from the Departments of: Cerro Largo, Colonia, Lavalleja, Maldonado Rocha, Treinta y Tres,

Date	Course	N° registered	Student profile	Departments of the Reserves
7-13 December 1997	Introduction to the Monitoring of Protected Wild Areas	24	NGOs, teachers, Government of the Department staff	Rocha y Treinta y Tres
October-December 1998	Remote Environmental Education	203	Public school teachers and neighbors	Rocha, Treinta y Tres, Lavalleja y Maldonado
August-November 1999	Environmental Education for Monitoring	50	NGO members, neighbors and teachers	Rocha y Treinta y Tres
September-November 1999	Environmental Impact Evaluation	27	Councilors, municipal staff, teachers and NGOs	Rocha y Cerro Largo
October-December 1999	Nature Guides (remote, simultaneously at three locations)	50	Tourism operators, local youths, municipal staff	Maldonado, Lavalleja y Rocha
July-September 2000	Introduction to the environmental management of the Reserve (remote)	116	Staff from the ministries and the Rocha Government of the Department	Rocha
October 2000	Coastal integrated management – Train Sea Coast program at PROBIDES and FURG (Río Grande, Brazil)	25	Government of the Departments, ministries, NGOs	La Coronilla, Rocha
October-November 2000	Organic farming	12	Rural women	José Pedro Varela (Lavalleja)

Date	Course	N° registered	Student profile	Departments of the Reserves
October-December 2000	III Nature Guides (remote, simultaneously at three locations)	35	Tourism operators, , municipal staff, local youths	Rocha, Treinta y Tres y Cerro Largo
December 2000	Introduction to the environmental management of the Reserve	20	Staff from the Lavalleja Government of the Department	Lavalleja
December 2000 – January 2001	Remote Environmental Education	22	Residents from La Riviera, Puerto de los Botes	Rocha
April-July 2001	Environmental Education for monitoring water quality (remote)	96	NGOs, Government of the Department staff, teachers, rural producers	Melo (Cerro Largo); Minas (Lavalleja) y Pirarajá (Lavalleja)
28 May and 1 June 2001	Tools for Environmental Management	15	Professionals, ministries, educators	La Pedrera (Rocha)
7-9 September 2001	Indigenous flora of interest in apiculture	29	Apiarian producers	Don Bosco (Laguna Negra, Rocha)
October-November 2001	Introduction to the environmental management of the Biosphere Reserve	21	Police Academy students	Rocha
October-December 2001	Introduction to the environmental management of the Biosphere Reserve	56	Government of the Department staff and police	Treinta y Tres y Cerro Largo
November-December 2001	Organic farming	25	Rural producers and Ecochuy NGO	Chuy (Rocha)
June 2002	Coastal zone protection measures -Train Sea Coast program at PROBIDES with the participation of the Freplata program (RLA/99/G31)	25	Members of NGOs and Government of the Departments from Uruguay and Argentina	Colonia del Sacramento

c. Workshops and seminars

Workshops and seminars were held aimed at sensitizing varied public regarding the benefits of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve.

1. Back-up to the formal educational system

Program proposals were designed to be inserted in the formal curricula of Elementary, Secondary and Tertiary Education. They were implemented by way of demonstration in some educational units. Main activities performed:

Workshops and seminars

7 and 26 August 1999 – Workshop with field visits in Potrero Grande and Bañado de los Indios, with the Archeological Department of the School of Human Studies, regarding the

Archeological Value of the Biosphere Reserve, for 66 students from the High School and the Teacher Training Institute in La Coronilla, Rocha.

- 1 and 2 October 1999 – Field visit workshop to Rocha and Negra Lagoons, in cooperation with DINAMA, for 27 students belonging to the Teacher Training Institute in Melo, Cerro Largo.
- 6 November 1999 – Workshop with a visit to the Potrerillo de Santa Teresa, for 25 students belonging to the CLAEH Institute, on a Master's program in environmental management students.
- 11-13 November 1999 – Seminar for the presentation of the Biosphere Reserve, Master Plan and PROBIDES work, for 25 students taking the Course on Sustainable Development at the School of Social Sciences.
- April 2001 – Informative talks on the Biosphere Reserve, for 1st and 2nd year students and teachers from Florida CERP, Colonia CERP and teachers from the Teachers' Improvement Center from Montevideo.

Curricular courses and seminars

- June-September 1999 – Remote course on Environmental Education, for 188 teachers in service and future teachers from Lavalleja, Treinta y Tres and Cerro Largo.
- July-September 1999 – Curricular seminar, on Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve, for 21 students of 1st year of Teachers' Training Institute from Rocha, with 30 hours' required attendance.
- October 2000 – Remote course on Environmental Education, for 42 Teacher Training students from Melo, Cerro Largo.
- November 2000 – Curricular seminar on the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve, for 22 first-year students from Atlántida, Canelones CERP; remote modality, field visit to Potrerillo.
- August-November 2000 – Curricular seminar on the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve, for 21 second-year students of the Teacher Training Institute from Rocha, with 30 hours' required attendance.
- July-September 2001 - Curricular seminar on the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve, for 21 third-year students of the Teacher Training Institute from Rocha, with 30 hours' required attendance.
- September-October 2001 – Remote curricular seminar on the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve, for 60 second-year students of the Teacher Training Center from Melo, Cerro Largo.
- July-September 2002 - Remote curricular seminar on the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve, for 90 second-year students of the Teacher Training Center from Melo, Cerro Largo.

The vast majority of activities were performed in the Departments which form part of the Biosphere Reserve, Rocha, Treinta y Tres, Cerro Largo and Lavalleja. Some requirements were also met for the Teacher Training Centers outside the area of the Reserve.

2. Awareness building in public opinion

Within a strategy to sensitize public opinion, information and dissemination focused on varied public, including technical decision makers and politicians, the following activities were performed:

- Design and permanent updating of the Internet web site: www.probides.org.uy.
- Production of the video "*Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve*", 22 minutes' duration, in an agreement with the national producer Naturaleza Viva. The filming and editing of this video was executed between October 2000 and March 2001. This material constitutes part of the multimedia packaged produced to disseminate the values of the Reserve in different spheres. It was shown at different levels within the Reserve Departments.
- By means of an agreement with the Rocha Medical Cooperative, financing was obtained to make 90 copies of the video, which were handed to public schools and high schools in Rocha.
- Organization of a children's drawing contest in November 2001, after the videos were delivered to the schools, sponsored by UNESCO. As a result, 217 drawings were received.
- Production of didactic games on environmental subjects used in the information and dissemination activities pertaining to the 2001 Environment Day.
- Six talks were given for visitors in La Paloma Cultural Center on diverse subjects regarding the program and the Reserve.
- Six talks were given on biodiversity, especially fauna, of the Biosphere Reserve, in Rocha schools and high schools.
- Four photographic contests were held around the following topics: Skills, flora and fauna of the Uruguayan Atlantic coast (December 1998-March 1999); Skills, flora and fauna of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve (January-March 2000); Historic, cultural and natural heritage of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve (January-March 2001); History, culture and nature of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve (January-February 2002).
- In total 726 photographs were presented by 236 contestants. 109 photos were selected for prizes and exhibition, which were shown in different places both in locations within the Reserve and in the city of Montevideo; various were used in the editorial production and in the program's web site.
- Orchestration of a strong presence in communications media through the generation of a permanent agenda of contacts. Press releases were sent weekly to the national communications media and that of the Biosphere Reserve with information on the program's activities and projects. In total 59 press releases were sent, in addition to precise information on specific activities.
- Publication of material pursuing, in all cases, high quality of the final product, both in its presentation and in its contents. The policy for publications includes diverse series destined to varied PROBIDES public. Therefore, the language, diagramming, printing, number of copies, and form of distribution vary according to the receivers.

ANNEX 9 - PUBLICATIONS

- **Aves del Uruguay. Lista, estatus y distribución**

- **Birds of Uruguay. List, status and distribution**

Adrián B. Azpiroz. — Rocha: PROBIDES, 1997. 52 p.

Quantity printed: 1,500 copies.

It offers a guide to all the species living in the country and describes their habitats, including the maps of geographic distribution, as well as 153 color photographs.

- **Plantas acuáticas de los Humedales del Este**

- **Aquatic Plants from the Eastern Wetlands**

Eduardo Alonso.— Rocha: PROBIDES, 1998. 238 p.

Quantity printed: 700 copies.

Describes in detail 106 species of plants indigenous to the Eastern Wetlands, including phenology, biology, ecology and uses for each one of them. It also includes general information on the aquatic plants and the environments in which they develop.

- **Guía Ecoturística de la Reserva de Biosfera Bañados del Este**

- **Ecotourist Guide of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve**

PROBIDES. - Aguilar, Grupo Santillana: Montevideo, 1999. 304 p.

Quantity printed: 2,000 copies.

It presents environmental, cultural and tourist beauties and values of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve. It offers detailed information on agricultural and ecotourism establishments, handicrafts, events and services in over 40 locations. It includes color maps and illustrations.

- **Plan Director. Reserva de Biosfera Bañados del Este / Uruguay**

- **Master Plan. Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve / Uruguay**

PROBIDES.—Rocha: PROBIDES, December 1999. 159 p.

Quantity printed: 500 copies.

This is the product of an interdisciplinary team and of broad consultations with institutions and social stakeholders in the region. It offers a zoning proposal for the Reserve through 10 protected areas, as well as a description of each one of these areas from a physical, biological and socio-economic point of view. It includes a series of recommendations for the management of the area. The information is illustrated with over 30 maps and numerous color photographs.

- **Catálogo de artesanías de la Reserva de Biosfera Bañados del Este**

- **Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve handicraft catalogue**

PROBIDES.—Rocha: PROBIDES, January 2000. 54 p.

Quantity printed: 1,000 copies

It is the product of a survey done by PROBIDES of all the craft activities done in the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve. It contains data on over 450 artisans in the Department of Rocha and part of those in Maldonado, Lavalleja, Treinta y Tres and Cerro Largo.

- **Guía de establecimientos / Agro y ecoturismo en Rocha**

- **Guide of establishments / Agricultural and ecotourism in Rocha**

PROBIDES, ADEATUR.—Rocha: PROBIDES, January 2000. 42 p.

Quantity printed: 5,000 copies

This guide offers a systematization of the combination of rural tourism establishments in the Department of Rocha. The information includes activities, infrastructure, services, places of interest, rates and addresses. It includes plans and color photographs.

- **Legislación sobre Medio Ambiente en el Uruguay**

Environmental Legislation in Uruguay

José L. Sciandro.— Montevideo: Fundación de Cultura Universitaria, PROBIDES, July 2000. 832 p.

Quantity printed: 500 copies.

It offers a systematization of the national legislation in effect that has an impact on the environment. It is a work tool for those facing the task of regulating the environment, planning the land or attempting conservation measures. It includes different indexes, among which the one by subjects allows an approximation to the identification of the laws by means of a thesaurus specifically developed to that end.

- **PROBIDES / Programa de Conservación de la Biodiversidad y Desarrollo Sustentable en los Humedales del Este**

PROBIDES / Program for the Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Development of the Eastern Wetlands

Rocha, PROBIDES, May 2001. 24 p.

Quantity printed: 500 copies.

Institutional bilingual (Spanish-English) document about PROBIDES. It includes a presentation of the work scenario, the “Bañados del Este” Biosphere Reserve and its environmental values, as well as the main results achieved by the program, lessons learned and projects currently running.

- **Atlas ilustrado de los peces de agua dulce del Uruguay**

Illustrated atlas of fresh water fish of Uruguay.

Juan Reichert.— Rocha: PROBIDES, January 2002. 327 p.

Quantity printed: 750 copies.

It offers readers the opportunity of becoming acquainted with the varied fauna of fresh water fish of Uruguay through illustrations done by Juan J. Reichert. Over 200 species drawn using an extraordinary technique, following untold hours of capture, observation and maintenance.

- **SERIES: DIDACTIC FACT SHEETS**

-

No. 5: Planeta azul - Blue planet

Final editing: Pablo Rodrigo y Carmen Velasco. PROBIDES.— Montevideo: Productora Editorial, 1998. 24 p.

Quantity printed: 1,000 copies.

The blue immensity of the ocean appears before us, unknown, frightening but vital to the planet and its inhabitants.

No. 6: Ballenas y delfines en la Reserva de Biosfera Bañados del Este - Whales and dolphins in the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve

Author: Rodrigo García. PROBIDES.— Montevideo: Productora Editorial, 2000. 24 p.

Quantity printed: 1,000 copies.

It introduces a species of whales and dolphins that inhabit the Reserve coasts and refers in

depth to those most common and easy to sight. It describes diverse aspects of the cetacean biology and ecology, as well as the historic relationship of cetaceans with human beings.

- **SERIES: WORK DOCUMENTS**

Quantity printed: 60 to 100 copies of each.

No. 14: Misión de apoyo sectorial efectuada en Uruguay - Sectorial support mission carried out in Uruguay. Assistance for the development of an ecotourism proposal within the framework of the preservation of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve natural heritage.

José Luis López Sancho.—Rocha: PROBIDES, 1997. 79 p. and annex.

It contains this Spanish Consultant's recommendations for the development of ecological tourism in the Reserve area.

No. 15: De residuo a recurso - From waste to resource. Bio-recycling of rice husk in the Eastern Wetlands.

Rosana Díaz, Gabriela Malvárez, Ana Zorrilla.—Rocha: PROBIDES, 1998. 34 p.

Research done jointly with the School of Agricultural Sciences, contributing data beginning with the bio-recycling technology in relation to rice husk.

No. 16: Impacto productivo del cultivo de arroz sobre suelos de bañados: Productividad y conservación - Productive impact of rice cultivation on wetlands: Productivity and conservation

It studies soil dynamics in wetlands, in relation to its productivity changes for rice cultivation and to its own dynamics. The area studied covers the zone of the Bañados de India Muerta to San Miguel and an area outside the wetlands themselves.

No. 17: El proceso de salado con maduración de lacha - The anchovy (*Brevoortia* spp.) salting process with ripening. Work undertaken with fishers from the Rocha Lagoon

Sonia Fernández, Javier Vitancurt.—Rocha: PROBIDES, 1999. 36 p.

It presents trials made in Agreement with the Fisheries Research Institute, tending to standardize a salting methodology adapted to the oily species in the Rocha Lagoon (mullet and anchovy).

No. 18: Regulación Hídrica – Water Regulation.

Hidrocampo Ingenieros – (Hydraulic Field Engineers) with the participation of PROBIDES technical experts.—Rocha: PROBIDES, 1999.

Technical comments are made concerning the works proposed to be undertaken by neighbours and producers from San Luis Barrancas, San Miguel, right margin of the 2nd Canal, La Coronilla, within the framework of the Agreement for Water Regulation in the low basins of Rocha.

No. 19 Situación actual y perspectivas de actividades económicas en la Reserva de Biosfera Bañados del Este

Current situation and prospects of the economic activities in the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve

Alfredo Picerno – Rocha PROBIDES, 1999

Presents the results of research carried out pursuant to an Agreement with CLAEH, on how to estimate some of the economic impacts which the main economic activities have in the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve, as well as their future impact using different alternative

scenarios. The activities analyzed are: rice growing, forestation, dairy farming, cattle raising and tourism.

No. 20 Conservación y restauración del matorral psamófilo – Conservation and restoration of the psamophile scrub

Julio Campos, Andrea Bacigalupi, Beatriz Costa, Gabriela Pistone – Rocha: PROBIDES, 1999. 34 participants.

A study of the composition and structure of the psamophile scrub, as a principle to understand the general characteristics of the way in which it works and thus contribute to future activities for the conservation and restoration of the ecosystem.

No. 21: Seminario: Costa Atlántica. Estado actual del conocimiento y estrategia de investigación sobre la dinámica de la costa y sus barras lagunares - Seminar: Atlantic Coast. Current state of knowledge and research strategy on the coastal dynamics and its lagoon sandbars.

PROBIDES. —Rocha: PROBIDES, 1999. 144 p.

This publication is the product of a consultancy carried out by the Spanish expert Dr. Miguel Losada, hydromorphologist and specialist in coastal dynamics, who remained in the Department of Rocha from 10 to 15 March 1997. It also includes presentations by national technical experts Milton Jackson, Daniel Panario, Luis Texeira, Jorge Bossi and Juan Montaña.

No. 22: Cría de ñandúes en cautiverio. Proyecto PROBIDES – José Pienica Breeding rheas in captivity. PROBIDES project – José Pienica

Valentín Leites, Javier Vitancurt. —Rocha: PROBIDES, March 2000. 41 p.

In January 1998, PROBIDES and Mr. Pienica, agricultural producer from the Department of Rocha, initiated a rhea breeding experience. They plan to merchandize their byproducts (meat, skin and feathers), at the time they deepen the biological knowledge on the species.

No. 23: Isla del Padre (Río Cebollatí). Propuesta de manejo y recomendaciones para el desarrollo turístico de su entorno - Isla del Padre (Río Cebollatí). Management proposal and recommendations for the tourism development of its surrounding area.

Carlos Fagetti, Bethy Molina, Carlos Prigioni y Javier Vitancurt. —Rocha: PROBIDES, March 2000. 14 p. and annexes.

It presents a proposal to adequately manage the natural resources of the island by means of planned land use. It includes color cartography and an annex with biological information on the area.

No. 24: Proyecto de ordenanza costera del departamento de Rocha - Draft Coastal Land Use Regulation for the Department of Rocha.

Rocha: PROBIDES, April 2000. 36 p. and annexes.

Draft prepared at the request of the Rocha Government of the Department (IMR) Environment Bureau, by a group of technical experts belonging to the Dirección Nacional de Medio Ambiente (DINAMA-MVOTMA), the Dirección Nacional de Ordenamiento Territorial (DINOT - MVOTMA) and PROBIDES, in consultation with the IMR. It is a tool for the coastal strip management of the Department, whose function is to establish the soil classification and the coastal zoning.

No. 25: Educación Ambiental a Distancia. La experiencia de PROBIDES - Remote Environmental Education. The PROBIDES experience.

Sandra Bazzani, Julio Pérez, Alicia Torres. —Rocha: PROBIDES, April 2000. 27 p. and annexes.

It presents the Remote Environmental Education program developed by PROBIDES for the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve region. It has reached over 1,400 participants in four years.

**No. 26: Guía para el Manejo de la Estación Biológica Potrerillo de Santa Teresa
Guide for the Management of the Potrerillo de Santa Teresa Biological Station**

Laura García.—Rocha: PROBIDES, June 2000. 47 p.

It provides a conceptual and at the same time practical handbook, to guide and facilitate the management of the Potrerillo de Santa Teresa Biological Station. It establishes the objectives of this conservation unit, standards and a series of management programs that guide the use, conservation and development of its resources at the short and medium term.

**No. 27: Regeneración del palmar de butiá (*Butia capitata*) en condiciones de pastoreo.
Relevamiento de establecimientos rurales de Rocha - Regeneration of the palm tree grove (*Butia capitata*) in grazing conditions.**

Fernando Báez, Martín Jaurena.—Rocha: PROBIDES, June 2000. 34 p.

It presents an inventory of Rocha's rural establishments located in palm grove zones showing some type of regeneration. Both the population structure and the effect of human activities on the state of regeneration of the palm grove are analyzed.

No. 28: Estudios sobre la población de camarón rosado (*Penaeus paulensis*) en las lagunas costeras de la Reserva de Biosfera Bañados del Este - Studies on the penneid shrimp (*Penaeus paulensis*) population in the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve coastal lagoons

Walter Norbis.—Rocha: PROBIDES, June 2000. 41 p.

It presents the general characteristics of the penneid shrimps life cycle, past studies on their population structure and dynamics for our country, and the results of the work undertaken in PROBIDES on the population structure of the shrimp (*Penaeus paulensis*) caught in the Rocha lagoon during the years 1997 and 1998, in the Garzón lagoon in 1997 and in the Castillos lagoon in 1999.

No. 29: Biología y conservación del Dragón (*Xanthopsar flavus*, Icteridae) en la Reserva de Biosfera Bañados del Este - Biology and conservation of saffron-cowled blackbird (*Xanaloaxar flavus*, Icteridae) in the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve

Adrián B. Azpiroz.—Rocha: PROBIDES, June 2000. 30 p.

The saffron-cowled blackbird (*xanaloaxar flavus*, *icteridae*) is a species that has suffered an important population decline without evident causes for this process, but that have led the species to be currently included in the "endangered" category (IUCN 1996). This work offers information on the natural history of the saffron-cowled blackbird (*xanaloaxar flavus*, *icteridae*) obtained in the southeast of Uruguay, within the boundaries of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve.

Nº 30: El zorro de monte (*Cerdocyon thous*) como agente dispersor de semillas de palma. Estudios realizados en la Estación Biológica Potrerillo de Santa Teresa - The fox (*Cerdocyon thous*) as a palm-seed dispersing agent. Studies undertaken at the Potrerillo de Santa Teresa Biological Station

It provides the information obtained in one of the studies on plant and animal interactions undertaken at the Potrerillo de Santa Teresa Biological Station. It is an analysis of a part of

the seed dispersion process focused on the interaction between the *butia capitata* palm and the fox. It includes a chapter on carnivorous animals in general and the canidae species of Uruguay.

No. 31: Seminario-Taller sobre Monitoreo Ambiental - Seminar-Workshop on Environmental Monitoring

Walter Norbis, Luisa Chomenko (coord.).—Montevideo: Hemisferio Sur, 2000. 269 p.

It contains presentations and summaries of Uruguayan, Brazilian and Argentinean technical experts, given at the Seminar-Workshop on Environmental Monitoring (Rocha, November 1998).

No. 32: El programa PROBIDES: actividades, productos y lecciones aprendidas The PROBIDES program: activities, products and lessons learned

Álvaro Díaz.—Rocha: PROBIDES, January 2001. 24 p.

It presents information on the scenario, origin, structure and activities of PROBIDES from 1993 to 2000, together with an evaluation of the results obtained.

No. 33: Turismo de Naturaleza. Una opción para la conservación y el desarrollo sustentable en establecimientos rurales de la Reserva de Biosfera Bañados del Este. Rocha, Uruguay - Nature Tourism. An option for the conservation and sustainable development of rural establishments of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve. Rocha, Uruguay

Carlos Fagetti.—Rocha: PROBIDES, July 2001. 74 p. and annexes.

It systematizes the information on sites and opportunities for ecotourism on the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve. It includes a survey of both public and private establishments that perform agriculture and ecotourism in the Department of Rocha.

No. 34: Biología y conservación del palmar de butiá en la Reserva de Biosfera Bañados del Este. Avances de investigación - Biology and conservation of the *butia capitata* palm grove in the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve. Research progress.

Bethy Molina Espinosa (Coord.).—Rocha: PROBIDES, August 2001. 33 p. and annexes.

It constitutes the first approximation to the results achieved in the research of the *butia capitata* palm grove. It includes results of the following projects: "Biology and palm density", "Regeneration, herbage and germination", "Seed dispersion and depredation".

No. 35: Jornada sobre Forestación. La Paloma, 27 de abril de 2001 - Day-Training Session on Forestation. La Paloma, 27 April 2001

Ignacio Porzecanski (Coord.).—Rocha: PROBIDES, August 2001. 87 p.

It contains 16 presentations in the referred Seminar whose objective was to promote a discussion on the subject, in order to elaborate an updated line on the impact brought about by forestation on the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve. It includes a final synthesis.

No. 36: Evaluaciones ecológicas rápidas aplicadas a la Reserva de Biosfera Bañados del Este - Quick ecological evaluations applied to the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve.

Ricardo Rodríguez (Coord.).—Rocha: PROBIDES, September 2001. 74 p. and annexes.

It contains the results of applying the quick ecological evaluation methodology developed by nature conservation international agencies, to five spots in the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve: Estero de Pelotas, Paso Centurión, Sierra del Tigre, Sierra de los Ríos and Isla del Padre, between December 1998 and December 1999.

No. 37: Incentivos para la participación voluntaria en la conservación de la biodiversidad - Incentives for voluntary participation of biodiversity conservation

José Luis Sciandro. —Rocha: PROBIDES, November 2001. 34 p. and annex.

Upon the approval of the Law establishing the creation of the National System of Protected Areas, it propounds all referent to its implementation. This work formulates an approximation to the subject, with the objective of proposing different hypotheses of voluntary participation in the creation of the System. Significant examples of compared jurisdiction are analyzed and proposals are formulated on the basis of our current legal reality.

No. 38: Seminario Vertebrados amenazados del Uruguay: distribución y estado de conservación - Seminar Threatened Vertebrates of Uruguay: distribution and state of conservation. Rocha, 5 and 6 June 2001

Rocha: PROBIDES, 2001. 67 p.

It contains the presentations made during the above seminar in relation to the following subjects: sea turtles, threatened birds and mammals, status of amphibians and reptiles, experiences with field deer and threatened cetaceans.

No. 39: Calidad de agua en el departamento de Rocha - Water quality in the Department of Rocha

Florencia Forni y Flavio Scasso.— Rocha: PROBIDES, 2001. 22 p. and annexes.

It makes a diagnosis of the water quality in Rocha based on three specific objectives: knowledge of the water quality in natural and artificial environments through the analysis of physical-chemical information; classification of the environments according to the Water Code; elaboration of a document to serve as a basis to monitor water quality in the Department.

No. 40: Bases para un plan de manejo: Laguna Merín - Bases for a management plan: Laguna Merín

PROBIDES.— Rocha: PROBIDES, 2002. 55 p. and annexes.

It constitutes a contribution to the permanent discussion held in Uruguayan society on the subjects of protection of natural resources and protected areas. It gathers a series of concepts and experiences that the international organisms and programs have been proposing, capitalizes the interchanges constantly carried out between PROBIDES and the national and departmental authorities, and attempts to transfer them to a unique zone of the country.

No. 41: Sustentabilidad de las actividades productivas en la Reserva de Biosfera Bañados del Este. Análisis de impactos económicos, sociales y ambientales Sustainability of the productive activities on the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve. Analysis of economic, social and environmental impacts.

Jorge Acosta y Alfredo Picerno.— Rocha: PROBIDES, 2002. 57 p. and annexes.

The original basic objective of this study was to respond to the need to understand the demeanor, fundamentally from an economic point of view, of productive proposals (both new productions and new ways of making existing productions) that wager on the incorporation of “friendly” environmental practices. Five types of productions are analyzed: rhea breeding, nature tourism, capybara and natural or ecological meat production, and “INGO” rotation in the cultivation of rice.

No. 42: Curso Internacional de Gestión Ambiental. Herramientas para la Gestión Ambiental - International Course on Environmental Management. Tools for Environmental Management.

Ignacio Español Echániz.— Rocha: PROBIDES, 2002. 110 p.

It offers a complete vision of the Environmental Impact Evaluation, that serves as a starting point for the elaboration of environmental impact studies and the participation in the administrative process that determines them.

No. 43: Ambientes acuáticos de la zona costera de los Humedales del Este. Estado actual y estrategias de gestión - Aquatic environments of the Eastern Wetlands coastal zone. Current situation and management strategies.

Flavio Scasso.— Rocha: PROBIDES, 2002. 40 p.

It analyzes general aspects of usage and management of aquatic environments belonging to the Atlantic watershed. Due to the great variety of environments and their diverse states of conservation, the strategies needed differ according to the natural characteristics and the use of the watershed. In addition, it proposes strategies for the conservation of natural environments and for the restoration of degraded sectors.

No. 44: Proyecto de desarrollo de las Áreas Protegidas Lagunas de Garzón y Rocha. Bases para un Plan de Manejo - Project for the development of the Protected Areas of the Garzón and Rocha Lagoons. Bases for a Management Plan.

Javier Vitancurt, Álvaro Olazábal (coords.).— Rocha: PROBIDES, 2002. 43 p. and annexes.

It presents a global proposal for the area management carried out by the Government of the Department of Rocha and PROBIDES, including legal aspects, area characterization, zoning proposal, objectives for the area to be managed, general recommendations, concrete measures for the proposal for the area and needs for their implementation (infrastructure, equipment, human resources and agreements).

No. 45: Evolución de las urbanizaciones en la costa atlántica de la Reserva de Biosfera Bañados del Este (1966 – 1998) - Urbanization evolution on the Atlantic coast of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve (1966 – 1998)

Mercedes Casciani.— Rocha: PROBIDES, 2002. 70 p.

The objective of this study is to characterize and determine the evolution of the urbanizations located on the Atlantic coastal area between 1966 and 1998. It analyzes the tourist activity, visualizing tourism as an environmentally adequate activity if the land on which it is developed is planned and correctly managed.

No. 46: Propuesta de uso público y conservación para el tramo costero Santa Teresa-Cerro Verde - Proposal of public use and conservation for the coastal tract Santa Teresa-Cerro Verde

Final editing: Alicia Iglesias. Technical team: Mercedes Casciani, Alicia Iglesias, Ignacio Lacomba, Bethy Molina, Carlos Prigioni, Ricardo Rodríguez. Cartography: Mercedes Casciani. PROBIDES, May 2002. 11 p. and annexes.

Guidelines are given for the elaboration of a proposal for the creation of an Area of Public Use and Conservation of the Atlantic coastal tract that includes the Parque Nacional de Santa Teresa and the Cerro Verde surroundings. It describes the general characteristics of the area, the values to be conserved, and it establishes general recommendations for the area management.

• **BAÑADOS DEL ESTE NEWSLETTER**

Quantity printed: 1,500 to 2,000 copies of each one.

No. 11: February-March 1998. 12 p.

Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve: Zoning proposal. **Editorial:** The significance of a Master Plan. **Main Subject:** Master Plan recommendations and proposals. **Article of interest:** Creation of the Agriculture and Ecotourism Operators' Association. **Progress of the research:** Studies on prawns in the Rocha lagoon.

No. 12: June - July 1998. 12 p.

Technical fact sheet: The ñandú (*Rhea americana*). **Editorial:** PROBIDES and the Law creating a National System for Protected Natural Areas. **Main Subject:** Meat production in protected areas. **Article of interest:** National System for Protected Natural Areas and its legal framework. **Progress of the research:** Economic activities in the Reserve area.

No. 13: October – November 1998. 12 p.

Technical fact sheet: The white mouth croaker (*Micropogonias furnieri*). **Editorial:** PROBIDES and the Law creating a National System for Protected Natural Areas (II). **Main Subject:** The hydrological situation of the low Rocha basins. **Article of interest:** Handicraft production on the Reserve. **Progress of the research:** The Rocha lagoon: a new area for the reproduction of the white mouth croaker (*Micropogonias furnieri*).

No. 14: March - April 1999. 12 p.

Technical fact sheet: Wright whale (*Eubalaena australis*). **Editorial:** Once again the hydrographic regulation. **Main Subject:** Quick ecological evaluations: New contributions for the zoning of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve. **Progress of the research:** Conservation of the psamophile scrub.

No. 15: June - July 1999. 12 p.

Technical fact sheet: Margay cat (*Felis wiedi*). **Editorial:** Technical information and conscious participation: PROBIDES work experiences. **Main Subject:** Master Plan for the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve: New progress for the zoning of the area. **Progress of the research:** Breeding rheas in captivity.

No. 16: October 1999. 16 p.

Technical fact sheet: Darwin frog (*Melañophryniscus montevidensis*). **Editorial:** To conserve and defend our genetic heritage. **Main Subject:** Atlantic coastland planning: Indispensable condition for sustainable development. **Progress of the research:** Regeneración del palmar de butiá en condiciones de pastoreo en el departamento de Rocha. Regeneration of the Department of Rocha palm tree (*butia capitata*) grove in grazing conditions.

No. 17: April 2000. 24 p.

Special Edition on the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve Master Plan. **Editorial:** The Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve Master Plan. **Progress of the research:** Rocha lagoon: reproductive cycle of the white mouth croaker (*Micropogonias furnieri*) and its relation to environmental factors.

No. 18: October 2000. 16 p.

Technical fact sheet: Capybara (*Hydrochoerus hydrochaeris*). **Editorial:** The concept of Biosphere Reserve in Uruguay: the sustainable development as a necessary answer.: **Main Subject:** Sustainable development in the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve. **Current projects:** Trust fund for the sustainable use of land.

No. 19 May 2001. 16 p.

Technical fact sheet: Green turtle (*Chelonia mydas mydas*). **Editorial:** Environmental health of the world and of our country. **Main Subject:** Integrated management of the Atlantic coastal zone. **Progress of the research:** Effects of grazing on the regeneration of the palm trees (*butia capitata*) grove. PROBIDES – School of Agricultural Sciences –Palmar Group.

Nº 20: December 2001. 12 p.

Technical fact sheet: River seals. **Editorial:** Natural protected areas: a virtual system in transit toward the implementation on land. **Main Subject:** Public and private natural protected areas. **Progress of the research:** Rocha lagoon: the white mouth coraker (*Micropogonias furnieri*) and small-scale fishermen.

- **REMOTE ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION COURSE**

PROBIDES. —3 ed. —Rocha: PROBIDES, 1998.

Quantity printed: 500 copies of each one.

Unit 1. 16 p.

Contents: Important concepts in Ecology. Environment, biosphere, population, community, ecosystem, types of ecological systems, natural resources.

Unit 2. 16 p.

Contents:

The ecosystems. The value of biodiversity. The Eastern Wetlands. Land ecosystems of the Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve. Plant formations. Marine and lagoon ecosystems of the Reserve.

Unit 3. 20 p.

Contents: Man-nature relationship. Worldwide environmental problems. National environmental problems. Conservation and sustainable development.

Unit 4. 20 p.

Contents: Evolution of human settlements and urbanization process. Urban environment. The stakeholders of urban activities.

Unit 5. 8 p.

Contents: Towards an urban environmental management. Methodological guidelines for the elaboration of a local environmental diagnosis. Environmental history of the community. Updating the city map. Survey of the community organization and social infrastructure. Bases for the elaboration of a local action Project.

- **INTRODUCTION TO ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT IN THE BAÑADOS DEL ESTE BIOSPHERE RESERVE / REMOTE COURSE ON ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION.**

Rocha: PROBIDES, July to September 2000

Quantity printed: 500 copies of each one.

Unit 1. 20 p.

Contents: Welcome. Practical advice on how to study. I. Basic concepts. II. The environment provides us with resources. III. Live beings in the environment. IV. The ecosystems or ecological systems. V. Other concepts of importance. VI. Historical perspective on the process of man-nature integration. VII. The environmental subject at international forums. VIII. Sustainable development. IX. What is understood by environmental impact? X. Environmental management. Glossary. To learn more.

Unit 2. 20 p.

Contents: I. Biological diversity or biodiversity. II. Conservation of biodiversity and sustainable development. III. What are protected areas? IV. What are biosphere reserves? V. Protected areas in our country: current situation and perspectives. VI. Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve: definition, boundaries and zoning proposed by PROBIDES. VII. The Reserve territory: physical, biological and human aspects. Glossary. To learn more.

Unit 3. 24 p.

Contents: I. Introduction. II. What are environmental problems? III. Global environmental problems. IV. Diagnosis of the world environmental situation. V. Main environmental problems affecting Latin America and the Caribbean. VI. Environmental problems in Uruguay. VII. Glossary. To learn more.

Unit 4. 20 p.

Contents: I. Introduction. Environmental management. II. Regulation and institutional aspects of interest for environmental management. III. Legal regulation of protected areas. IV. A close look at a law: the Environmental Impact Evaluation, tool for management. V. A close look at an integrated management experience on the Atlantic coast. VI. Towards the incorporation of environmental management systems in enterprises and organizations. VII. Bases for the elaboration of a participative environmental diagnosis as a management-action tool. VIII. Guidelines for the elaboration of the final work. To learn more.

• **ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION FOR MONITORING / TRAINING COURSE IN MONITORING WATER QUALITY**

Rocha: PROBIDES, April 2001

Quantity printed: 300 copies of each one.

Unit 1. 24 p.

Contents: **Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve** Welcome. Practical advice on how to study. 1. Basic concepts. 2. Biological diversity or biodiversity. 3. Conservation of biodiversity and sustainable development. 4. What are protected areas? 5. What are biosphere reserves? 6. Protected areas in our country: current situation and perspectives. 7. Bañados del Este Biosphere Reserve: definition, boundaries and zoning proposed by PROBIDES. 8. The Reserve territory: physical, biological and human aspects. Glossary. To learn more.

Unit 2. 24 p.

Contents: 1. Water as a resource. 2. The hydrological cycle. 3. Hydrographic watersheds as work units. 4. Main activities and conflicts due to use of water in the region. 5. Importance of the vegetation covering of the watersheds. 6. Management of hydrographic resources in our country. 7. Water quality. 8. Evaluation and monitoring of water quality. 9. To learn more.

- **BROCHURES ON PROTECTED AREAS**

- **Bañado de los Indios.** December 1999. 2,000 copies.
- **Cabo Polonio December** 2000. 5,000 copies.
- **Potrерillo de Santa Teresa.** 2001. Reprint of 1,000 copies.
- **Laguna de Rocha.** January 2002. 3,000 copies in an agreement with La Paloma Environmental Group.

(The number of copies varies in relation to the average number of visitors to each area).