

# REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY

**Presidency of the Republic**

**Secretariat of Environment (SEAM)**

**Global Environment Fund (GEF)**

**United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)**

**Final Evaluation**

**Paraguayan Initiative for the Protection of Wilderness Areas**

**Paraguay Silvestre Project – PAR/98/G33**

**Evaluation Team**

**Ronny Ricardo Muñoz Calvo**

**Celeste Acevedo Gómez**

**International Consultant**

**National Consultant**

**July, 2011**



## GENERAL INDEX

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 <i>Purpose of the Evaluation</i>	4
1.2 <i>Key issues addressed</i>	4
1.3 <i>Evaluation Methodology</i>	5
<b>2 THE PROJECT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 <i>Beginning and duration of the Project.</i>	5
2.2 <i>Identified problems</i>	6
2.3 <i>Objectives (immediate and development)</i>	6
2.4 <i>Actors</i>	7
<b>3 EVALUATION RESULTS</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 <i>Project Formulation</i>	8
3.1.1. <i>Conceptualization/design</i>	8
3.1.1.1. <i>Adaptation to the project's design</i>	9
3.1.1.2. <i>National Ownership</i>	10
3.1.1.3. <i>Participation of the Actors</i>	12
3.1.1.4. <i>Replicability</i>	13
3.2 <i>Project Implementation</i>	13
3.2.1 <i>Implementation Approach</i>	13
3.2.2 <i>Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E)</i>	15
3.2.3 <i>Participation of Actors</i>	16
3.2.4 <i>Financial Planning</i>	17
3.3 <i>Fulfillment of the results established for the project</i>	18
3.3.1. <i>Achievement of results and objectives</i>	18
3.3.1.1. <i>Project Results</i>	18
3.3.1.2. <i>Consolidation of Protected Areas.</i>	22
3.3.1.3. <i>Unanticipated Results</i>	29
3.3.1.4. <i>Results achievement levels</i>	30
3.3.1.4.1. <i>Project relevance</i>	30
3.3.1.4.2. <i>Project effectiveness</i>	30
3.3.1.4.3. <i>Project efficiency.</i>	31
3.3.1.4.4. <i>Additionality</i>	32
3.3.2. <i>Sustainability</i>	34
3.3.2.1. <i>Financial Resources</i>	34
3.3.2.2. <i>Socio-Political Aspects</i>	35

<i>3.3.2.3. Institutional framework and governance</i>	<u>35</u>
<i>3.3.2.4 Environmental Risks</i>	<u>36</u>
<i>3.3.2.5 Contribution to improve national/local personnel skills</i>	<u>36</u>
<i>3.3.3 Project Performance Rating</i>	<u>36</u>
<i>4 Conclusions</i>	<u>39</u>
<i>5 Recommendations</i>	<u>472</u>
<i>6 Lessons Learned</i>	<u>44</u>

## Acronyms

AP	Wilderness Protected Area
CDR	Audit of Financial Control
CONAM	National Environmental Council
DEX	Direct Execution
DGPCB	General Directorate of Protection and Biodiversity Conservation
DPNVS	National Parks and Wildlife Directorate
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
INFONA	National Forest Institute
NEX	National Execution
NGO	Non-governmental organization
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
POA	Annual Operating Plan
PRODOC	Project Document
SEAM	Secretariat of the Environment
SINASIP	National Protected Areas System
TFCA	Tropical Forests Conservation Act
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

The evaluation of the Project PAR/98/G33 "Initiative for the Protection of Wilderness Protected Areas of Paraguay"<sup>1</sup>, requested by the United Nations Development Programme has as its purpose the valuation of the actions taken in the framework of this project.

The overall objective of this Final Evaluation is to analyze the implementation of the project, to review its progress in compliance with the project objective and its expected results.<sup>2</sup>

### 1.2 Key issues addressed

The assessment allowed establishing the project worth<sup>3</sup> with respect to the following criteria: relevance, effectiveness, sustainability, results and efficiency. As follows:

- a) Relevance. The key issues surveyed during the evaluation as to the project relevance were the project design, bonding and care needs in the following contexts: a) the Convention on Biological Diversity; b) the GEF Biodiversity area, c) the environmental objectives of Paraguay; d) the needs of actors related to the project, both national and local; c) project consistency, and d) the production of lessons learned.
- b) Effectiveness. The key issues surveyed during the evaluation as to the project effectiveness were: a) how effective the project was with respect to its expected results and meeting its objectives; b) how were the risks managed; c) which are the lessons that can be rescued for future projects.
- c) Efficiency. The key issues surveyed during the evaluation in terms of project efficiency were: a) the provision of timely or untimely support, for the execution of actions; b) administrative arrangements were necessary; and c) the use of local capacity during the project development.
- d) Results. The key issues surveyed during the evaluation results regarding the topic were: a) how effective the project was in relation to long-range goals; b) similarly to the approach advocated by the Convention on Biological Diversity and national environmental policies, and c) what could the future actions be for the use and dissemination of results.
- e) Sustainability. The key issues surveyed during the evaluation in terms of sustainability topic were: a) if sustainability criteria were properly integrated into the project design, b) financial sustainability during and after the project; c) the institutional, governance, socio-economics ,environmental, systemic capacity and replicability, and d) the future sustainability of the results.

---

<sup>1</sup> Generically called Paraguay Silvestre

<sup>2</sup> Terms of Reference (TOR) of this Consultancy. The TOR are included on Appendix 1

<sup>3</sup> According monitoring and evaluation policies of the UNDP/GEF (UNDP a, 2011 and UNDP b, 2011),

### 1.3 Evaluation Methodology

The methodology selected for the evaluation process was a participatory approach, with the purpose of addressing the variability consultation of actors. Methodologically, the assessment was guided by the specifications of UNDP (2011). Appendix 2 is the agenda and itinerary of the mission. The following evaluation activities were developed:

- a) **Revision of documents:** It observed the analysis of content of the examined documents, and the extraction of relevant information. See Appendix 5, list of consulted documents.
- b) **Interviews with relevant actors.** Semi-structured Interviews were conducted, and a *Focus Group* was included with the park rangers of the four Protected Areas (PAs) of the Project. Also included as a tool, the matrix of actors and the pre-established questions; and the form to record and systematize the interviews. Appendix 3 is a list of interviewees and in Appendix 6 information extraction instruments used.
- c) **Field visit.** San Rafael AP was visited. See details in Appendix 4.

## 2 THE PROJECT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

### 2.1 Beginning and duration of the Project.

The PAR/98/G33 Project generically called "Paraguay Silvestre", was designed between July 1997 and June 1998 (Block "B") adopted by the GEF Executive Council on May 28, 1999, and signed by the Republic of Paraguay on June 5, 2000, World Environment Day.

The approved budget reached the sum of USD 8,896,363.00 (eight million, eight hundred ninety-six thousand, three hundred sixty-three U.S. dollars)

It began with the constitution of the Principal Technical Unit (UTP) and the contract of Technical and Operational Managers and Area Managers, from the first day of October of the year 2001.

Although originally had a duration of 8 (eight) years, at the beginning of the project it is established that the term of the Project would be the year 2004<sup>4</sup>, so the tasks and investments were distributed so as to accelerate and optimize the execution of the Project.

The Review Mission GEF Consultant, Dr. Eduardo Fuentes, in May 2003, restores the original term until 2008, restoring the execution period to eight years.

In 2005 the Mid-Term Evaluation was made (Talvela & Torres, 2005). Subsequently, in 2006 a Substantive Revision was performed and the execution period was extended until the year 2008 (UNDP, 2006).

The implementation is extended in request of SEAM until December 2010, and in May 2011 proceeds to Final Evaluation of the Project.

---

<sup>4</sup> As was stated in the PRODOC

## 2.2 Identified problems

The Project "Paraguay Silvestre" sought to operationalize the management and conservation of four selected Wilderness Protected Areas, each one located in different eco-regions of Paraguay: Interior Atlantic Forest, Cerrado, Chaco-Pantanal and Chaco Seco. The selected sites contain a range of representative samples of the rich biodiversity of Paraguay and its important ecosystems. Protecting the native species and their habitats from threats, the project would protect globally important values. The activities strengthen a lot of management and administration functions of the traditional parks, including operational plans, monitoring and evaluation. Training in conservation methods would be provided to park staff, conservation values would be given to key actors in decision-making and local communities through awareness campaigns and sustainable use of biodiversity would be supported. The Project would also support conservation activities in buffer zones to protect critical habitats and maintain biological corridors with neighboring parks. An important goal of the project is to establish the *modus operandi* for the management and administration of national parks that are suitable with the context of Paraguay. (UNDP, 2000)

## 2.3 Objectives (immediate and development)

The objectives mentioned in the Project document (PRODOC) are maintained, in the following logical framework (ML)

**Development Objective:** That the rich deposit on Biodiversity of Paraguay be preserved.

**Project Purpose:** The integrity of 4 globally important Protected Areas is ensured and the conservation capacity is improved.

In UNDP (2000) the following Project objectives are listed:

- i) Establish a participative planning system for the management and administration of Protected Selected Areas;
- ii) Strengthen the operations of the Protected Areas in the four sites;
- iii) Train people that work in conservation on methods of biodiversity management
- iv) Overcoming the obstacles in the sustainable use of biodiversity components
- v) Develop awareness campaigns for major stakeholders; and
- vi) Manage the habitats in critical conditions in the corridors and buffer zones

The expected results had changes respect to those defined in the design phase. In 2006, were ratified and included new results<sup>5</sup> (UNDP, 2006), indicating that "*...at the results of the Mid Term Evaluation, a review of the implementation strategy focusing mechanisms "output" was elaborated, based on the Systemic Sustainability areas and in the actual transfer of the capacity installed in the Secretariat of Environment. Both points lead to a review of the intervention approach by shifting the focus of work on 4 wilderness protected areas (ASP) to one that includes a systemic approach in critical areas necessary for the sustainability of these 4 ASPs and optimize as replicable models.*"

---

<sup>5</sup> These are the same results that are indicated in the TORs, and that should be valued in the final stage of the project.

In the final stage, the project maintained the three following results:

1. The four priority Wilderness Protected Areas are legally and operationally consolidated, and count with the broad participation of stakeholders in their management so that the management objectives can be achieved.
2. Individual and institutional capacities of key actors in the management of the four Wilderness Protected Areas have been strengthened, and local, regional, national and political support for the Wilderness Protected Areas has been mobilized following an awareness campaign.
3. The coverage and conservation capacity of the four Wilderness Protected Areas have been improved through replicable models of sustainable use of buffer areas and permitted use zones, and better connectivity between fragments of neighboring natural habitats.

Since 2006, two new results were added to the project:

4. National System of Wilderness Protected Areas strengthened to create sustainability mechanisms of the four Wilderness Protected Areas as a correlation model.
5. The management experience of the four prioritized, capitalized and systematized Wilderness Protected Areas in such way to facilitate replication with other protected areas (knowledge management).

## **2.4 Actors**

The principal actors that have been part of the Project could be distributed in the following way:

- 1) Executing Project State Institution: Secretariat of the Environment (SEAM)
- 2) International organization resource donor: Global Environmental Facility (GEF)
- 3) International Organization Administrator of financial resource: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
- 4) Non-Governmental Organizations of Paraguay
- 5) Local Public Institutions: Municipalities and Governorates, in both instances the Directorates of Environment
- 6) Local Communities involved: Private owners, Indigenous and Rural Communities.
- 7) Organized Groups: women, farmers, environmentalists

### **3 EVALUATION RESULTS**

#### **3.1 Project Formulation**

##### **3.1.1. Conceptualization/design**

For the actors of the project, it came at the right time given the pressures that threaten the conservation of biodiversity in the four APs included in the project. In addition to the differential cost of land relative to current prices favored securing the land.

The Project was originated from technical studies that located the 4 APs in a special conservation conditions, as they protect ecosystems of national and global importance that are not represented in other APs in the country, and was strategic for Paraguay, as APs were only identified as priorities for their conservation in various documents.

Supported APs lacked of basic level of consolidation before 2000, and were subject to pressures associated with risk of colonization, change of use, hunting and illegal logging that threatened to destroy the remnants of Paraguay's unique ecosystems.

The selection of APs, was adequate in terms of the need to protect unique ecosystems and of global importance, at risk. The value placed by interest groups to the results obtained, fosters and confirms the relevance of this selection. Due to this approach, it states that proper selection of APs leads to the results of the implementation of the project services have relevance and significance for different stakeholders.

The selected areas lacked sufficient government attention before receiving the intervention of the project. At that time, because of the potential risks and threats clearly identified, it was possible to determine as a real need the imperative to run in the short term, protection and conservation measures.

After the substantive review conducted in 2006, the logical framework was redefined, including the result 5, which considered the systematization of management experiences of the 4 APs prioritized in order to facilitate replication in other areas.

The inclusion of an axis of systematization results enabled knowledge management, use and transfer to stakeholders and other APs. Also, applied research was generated that allowed to solve some problems or points about these, as the formulation of policies and instruments for implementation, monitoring cases of illegal hunting and Vedas fishing activities.

Institutional weakness shown by the SEAM during the implementation phase was not properly detected in the formulation stage, so project design did not consider significantly the issue of institutional strengthening.

Likewise, the original project design lacked an integrative approach<sup>6</sup>, which was incorporated by recommendation of the mid-term evaluation, which allowed the system to incorporate key aspects, which should be supported, as is the case for strengthening the SEAM and knowledge management.

The initial formulation of the project indicated that the Department of National Parks and Wildlife at that time (DPNVS) would be strengthened and positioned with roles and responsibilities at similar or superior level to what exists at the time of project design, however, after the creation of the Secretariat of Environmental (SEAM) in the year 2000, DPNVS functions were assumed by a Department, which meant a decline in the institutional hierarchy of protected areas issue.

---

<sup>6</sup> As determined by the substantive revision.

Protected Areas subject positioning in a lower institutional hierarchy meant that there were lacks of sectorial view regarding protected areas, and limited to institutionalize and integrate the project with other institutions. It also hampered the production of institutional synergies at the local and national levels. Likewise, diverse actors question if instead of being designed only for four APs, could have been proposed the strengthening of the National System of Wilderness Protected Areas (SINASIP).

In the same way, it proved unfeasible to establish synergies with NGOs in the field of investment in infrastructure for park rangers.

The project also lacked options for resolving specific situations, many of them in pre-requisite character, that needed attention for its resolution, and that prevented the proper functioning of the project.

Interventions established in the project were designed in a standardized way for the APs, without differentiating actions that would meet specific situations of each.

The design resulted from an AP conceptualization attached to the figure of the national park, which somewhat limits the implementation of the program, especially in the Reserve for San Rafael National Park, since this conservation unit at the beginning of the project was not a legally established AP yet.

The design was mostly focused on activities within protected areas, which somehow let it lacking in developing strategies for handling the pressure from the buffer zones.

However, it is important to note that the inclusion of San Rafael in the project is supported by all stakeholders consulted, and in the same way all agree that given the complexity of this area, its consolidation could not be responsible for the project; and that its solution more than technical, corresponded to a political nature and intersectoral character.

While it is possible to challenge the physical investments in APs, whose properties are legally under the control of private owners, as is the case of San Rafael, the prevailing criteria that remains and gives value to the project is that of protecting unique ecosystems and of global importance by preceding these over criteria of landownership.

In the project design the acquisition of property was not expected. The problem of land tenure in the case of San Rafael and Rio Negro, proved to be an element of risk of consideration and an important responsibility for the institution executor of the project.

#### **3.1.1.1. Adaptation to the project's design**

The original project design was adapted to the real context of application in two occasions. The first project took place in 2003 from the mission of reviewing the project, and the second in 2006 from the substantive review. In this second chance, the expected results were redefined and other methodological conceptualization was established for achieving the objectives. It was stated that the objective achievement was performed with the obtaining of five results, and that achievement of these would be limited to the extent of legal consolidation of the four APs.

The six original results were concentrated in a reformulation that rests on three outcomes (R1, R2 and R3), and in the formulation of two additional results; R4) National System of Wilderness Protected Areas strengthened to create mechanisms of sustainability of the 4 APs as conservation model; and R5) the management experience of the 4 prioritized, capitalized and systematized ASP, in a way to facilitate replication with other areas (knowledge management).

In Appendix 7 "Observed changes in the project design" are systematized in the various adaptations occurred to the project design during its implementation.

During the whole period of the project development prevail the "AIM" of the project: "Preserving the rich biodiversity storehouse of Paraguay"; and the "Purpose" of the project "To ensure the integrity of the four protected areas of global importance and improve the conservation capacity."

The specified results in PRODOC are actually results at outcome level, and correspond to changes generated from the implementation of investments and products provided by the project.

Result No.1: The 4 priority AP's are legally and operationally consolidated (R1 and R2) and count with the broad participation of stakeholders in management so the management objectives can be achieved.

Result No.2: The individual and institutional capacities of key actors for the management of the 4 APs have been strengthened, and the support of local, regional, national and political actors has been mobilized following an awareness campaign.

Result No.3: Coverage and conservation capacity of the 4 AP's have been improved through replicable models of sustainable use on buffer zone areas and permitted use zones and better connectivity between habitat fragments.

Result No. 4: SINASIP strengthened to create mechanisms for sustainability of the 4 AP's as a conservation models.

Result No.5: The experience of handling the 4 prioritized, capitalized, and systematized AP's in such a way to facilitate replication with other areas.

Considering the aspects mentioned above, it may be noted that the adaptation to the design was very satisfactory, given that it managed to incorporate results on two important aspects, particularly in the enhancement of SEAM.

### **3.1.1.2. National Ownership**

The reported results have been addressed and incorporated into the country environmental strategy, also in SINASIP Strategic Plan and SEAM Financial Strategy.

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

As an outstanding condition, the key actors highlighted at national level are actively involved in the identification, planning and/or implementation of actions for the conservation of the 4 APs. The participation of NGOs, organized groups and local governments that supported the conservation of the four APs stands out, through the various activities undertaken by the project.

Although the resources allocated by the government to the whole Paraguayan AP system is low<sup>7</sup>, it should be noted that due to the project, at its the finalization SEAM counts with a Financial Strategy, with which to launch and guide actions to accomplish resources for the four APs of the project. From this strategy, major effects are expected, insofar as it raises the financial needs of the entire system of protected areas of Paraguay.

---

<sup>7</sup> As prove it, it can be seen the difficulty that the SEAM had to absorb the support staff hired for the 4 Aps during the project. See Section 3.2.1

During the project implementation period, the central government promulgated various regulations that as regulatory framework co-assisted to achieve the project objectives. In Appendix 8 it is possible to observe an inventory of these regulations that collaborated with the project implementation. As an example, some examples of the rules promulgated are cited:

1. Law No. 1863/02 that approves the Agrarian Act. The National System of Wilderness Protected Areas<sup>8</sup> is also stated and its importance is recognized as a tool for preservation and protection of natural resources, inalienable and perpetuity in the Agrarian Act of Paraguay (Law, where a part is dedicated to the public and private nature conservation initiatives, considered not for expropriation and not subject to change, as long as they conform to the regulations issued in the Protected Areas Law and existing subsystems.
2. Law No. 3001/2006 "Appraisal and Compensation of Environmental Services"
3. Law No. 3003/2006 "which approves the Agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Paraguay, in the framework of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act (TFCA) for the establishment of a Tropical Forest Conservation Fund and a Tropical Forest Conservation Council... "

Although in Appendix 8 is possible to observe the legal regulations inventory issued by SEAM, municipalities and governorates, in the paragraphs below the topics addressed by the issued regulations are identified.

4. Regulatory decisions issued by the Secretariat of Environment for the protection, operation and management of Protected Areas for the period 2000-2010:
  - a. **PARK RANGERS AND SUPERVISION OF PROTECTED AREAS.** Definition of functions of Park Rangers and its Supervision in Wilderness Protected Areas under public domain that make up the National System of Protected Areas.
  - b. **MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.** i) Recognition of the Management Committee of Médanos del Chaco National Park, as a coordination of actions within its boundaries and buffer zone; ii) Recognition to the Management Committee of the Paso Bravo National Park as an instance of coordination of actions within its boundaries and buffer zones; iii) Definition of Nature. Objectives and Responsibilities of Management Committees of Wilderness Protected Areas in the public domain; iv) Recognition of the Management Committee of Defensores del Chaco National Park, v) Recognition of the Management Committee of the Reserve area for San Rafael National Park, Department of Itapúa vi) Recognition of the new Board of Directors of the Management Committee of Paso Bravo National Park; vii) Extension of the art. 2° resolution n° 581 dated April 20, 2005: "by which is recognized the Management Committee of the Chaco Biosphere Reserve, as coordinating body for environmental management and sustainable development; viii) For which it is recognized the Management Committee of the Chaco Biosphere Reserve, as a coordinating body for the management and sustainable development.
  - c. **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT IN PROTECTED AREAS.** Establishment that every document of EIA related to Protected Areas, its Buffer Zones and wildlife pass through the Directorate of Biodiversity."
  - d. **ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES.** i) Approval of Minutes of Intervention Model to be used by the Directorate of Protected Areas, dependent of the DGPCB; ii) Appointment of members of the Secretariat of the Environment in the framework of the new organizational structure project PAR98/Gg33 "Initiative for the Protection of Wilderness Areas of Paraguay; iii) Approval of the new organizational structure project PAR98/G33 "initiative for the Protection of Wilderness Areas of Paraguay; iv) Adoption of Signaling Manual of the National Wilderness Protected Areas of Paraguay and the Guide for signaling in the wilderness protected areas; v) Establishment of the Technical Committee of the

---

<sup>8</sup> Created through the law No. 352/94.

Secretariat of Environment, to assess and report on the verification of environmental and administrative management in the protected wilderness area of Médanos del Chaco; vi) Approval of the sheet to be used for the National Registry of Wilderness Protected Areas of Paraguay.

- e. **MANAGEMENT PLAN.** i) Directs the development of the Management Plan of the Médanos del Chaco Park and the beginning of measurement tasks of the same and are designated SEAM units responsible for carrying out such actions as necessary to that end; ii) Approval of Park Management Plan of the Defensores del Chaco National Park; iii) Approval of the Management Plan of Paso Bravo National Park; iv) By which it is approved the Management Plan of Médanos del Chaco National Park.
  - f. **USAGE.** i) Regulation of the Conservation and Rational Utilization and Sustainable of Wildlife in Paraguay; ii) Establishment of Regulations for Public Use of Wilderness Protected Areas in the public domain;
  - g. **MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES.** Allocation and Regulation of the Management Categories; the Zoning and Uses and Activities.
  - h. **WILDLIFE.** i) To rescind the resolutions of quota allocation for the Commercialization of wildlife and establishes requirements for the operation of storage facilities for live animals; ii) Approval of the list of protected species of endangered wildlife species; iii) Establishment of the basic structure of management projects of exotic native plant nurseries, iv) Partial Correction of the Art part 2 of Resolution No. 1944/06, dated October 2, 2006 "by which it is established the period of fishing Veda, v) Approval of the List of Threatened Flora and Fauna Species of Paraguay; vi) Approval of the List of Threatened Wildlife Species of Paraguay.
5. Regulatory decisions issued by local governments for the protection, supervision and management of Wilderness Protected Areas
- a. Municipality of Mariscal Estigarribia, Department of Boquerón. Declares Médanos del Chaco National Park and Tte. Agripino Enciso National Park of environmental and touristic interest.
  - b. Governorate of Boquerón. Declares the Reserve of Chaco of Regional Interest.

Considering the aspects mentioned above, it may be noted that national ownership very satisfactory.

### **3.1.1.3. Participation of the Actors**

Appropriate awareness campaigns were developed which allowed improving the community perception about protected areas.

Consultations about the operation, methodology and progress of the project were also made, taking into account the key actors involved. Queries for the approval of management plans of the four Aps stand out, the participation of local management committees, municipalities and governorates; NGOs and as well as other groups: indigenous people, women and farmers.

For the design and evaluation of project activities these actors were considered, however an active participation of universities was not shown.

The project was able to contribute to the creation of local management committees, to the strengthening of skills and training processes for the management of APs in the governorates and municipalities. With the completion of the project, the continuity of these initiatives will depend on SEAM, which shall develop the actions that will allow its functionality in supporting the conservation of the four APs.

The most important NGOs in Paraguay in the field of conservation of APs had their presence in the actions executed. Among private actors, the donors, the international conservation organizations and the country in general were perhaps the most strengthened, not only for their participation in project activities, but also for their knowledge and expertise in the topics developed by the project, as well as achieving a better position before the State.

#### **3.1.1.4. Replicability**

The project succeeded in generating experience in the institutional framework of SEAM, responsiveness to emerging situations not covered by the UNDP, and strategic organizational experiences in NGOs and other stakeholders. Currently, a new project on biological corridors is being prepared, with a view to its submission to GEF. This project resumes the project experiences. Likewise, SEAM has also capitalized gained experiences with the project in its process of internal restructuring, as well as in the implementation of innovative methodologies initially implemented by the project for the four APs throughout the Protected Areas System of Paraguay.

The project achieved significant contribution in the knowledge transfer process through participatory events such as training, exchange of experiences, the local revision of proposals, the presentation and dissemination of results, and lessons learned, among other actions.

After completion of the project demonstration, aspects of it remain in force in the field. Through the obtained results, SEAM has the ability to display the implementation of innovative initiatives results, such as technical and participatory methodology used for the consolidation of protected areas, even when a weak institutional structure is present.

An important feature lies in that the project succeeded in increasing the capabilities of the actors involved in the conservation of Protected Areas System of the country, both of individuals and institutions.

With the project implementation, a possible way to develop the consolidation of new APs in the Republic of Paraguay was shown and the products of this process are estimated replicable: the methodology of work followed, the legal establishment of APs, and the development of management tools, and administrative and financial sustainability.

Considering the aspects mentioned above, it is possible to point out the project replicability as satisfactory.

### **3.2 Project Implementation**

#### **3.2.1 Implementation Approach**

The usage of the Logical Framework, during the implementation, was present as a tool that facilitated annual planning, management and monitoring. The same was operationalized through budget instruments (POAS), and project monitoring (CDRs and PIRs).

The monitoring and evaluation activities permitted and facilitated adequate analysis in the strategic assessment of 2003 and the substantive review in 2006.

As to the mode of execution and implementation, the project starts in 2001, under national execution modality (NEX) by SEAM. The decision to run under the modality of direct execution (DEX) was made in 2003. In 2006, the Project ran the risk of paralyzing the activities. After substantive review and the tripartite commission agreements of that year, returns to the NEX implementation modality, which were maintained until completion in December 2010.

Despite being one of the established commitments in the Project Framework Agreement, SEAM did not incorporate budgeted staff by the State for the attention of the technical advisories that the project had implemented until 2006, due to lack of interest from the political authorities of SEAM, that considered unnecessary the maintenance of the referred function. Currently, from the support staff hired for the 4 APs during the project, only one official is maintained who works as a park ranger in the Médanos del Chaco AP.

An important limitation that the project had to face is related to the location of it within the institutional structure of SEAM. The beginning of the Project implementation coincided with the beginning of activities of the new environmental authority established in the year 2000: SEAM. The former Department of National Parks and Wildlife, in which the project would originally be hosted, was absorbed by SEAM becoming the Department of Protected Areas (DAP), which hierarchically depends of the General Directorate of Protection and Biodiversity Conservation (DGPCB). The DAP, lacks equivalent powers to a Directorate level within SEAM, and does not even have an own framework within the operative budget of SEAM; its operation depends on the DGPCB, which includes other agencies. These conditions allow to reinforce the supported thesis of the consulted actors, in relation that the project was unfortunately hosted in an weak administrative instance and with low institutional capacity to properly and consistently elevate the importance of protected areas in the country.

This situation of institutional migration was an unpredictable factor during the project design phase during the years 1996 and 1997.

To this limitation of structural and operational order, it is important to add other aspects that limited the actions of the national counterpart, which relate to:

- a. The process of installation and structural adjustment in which SEAM was immersed at the time of the beginning of the project execution in 2001. The SEAM, founded on mid-2000, was installing its new structures and adapting the inherited structures.
- b. The financial budget and human resources intended to APs were insufficient to meet all APs in the country in general and in particular the 4 APs covering the project, situation prior to the creation of SEAM in 2000. This situation was aggravated when SEAM is created and the APs descend in the organizational structure of the new institution.
- c. The high mobility presented at General Directorate levels, being SEAM already in operation. For example, during the project execution period, the General Directorate of Protection and Biodiversity Conservation has had a total of eight different directors. The high turnover of managers, plus the creation of the institution and the absence of a guiding institutional and environmental framework, had an impact in which the project was affected by different visions and management ways in its national directorate.
- d. The high institutional complexity scenario that the project encountered the same that was not foreseen in the original design of it. The national system of wilderness protected areas, at the time of the beginning of the project already presented weaknesses in its operational and methodological capacity, representing a limitation under the responsibility of the project counterparty.

The deficit in the administrative capacity of the counterparty and the weakness in the support at a political level, proved being limiting aspects for the proper development of the project activities and achievement of results; therefore a new initiative should be able to break the institutional inertia of the APs, and properly solve the paths which ensure and facilitate operations.

Regarding the treatment given to indigenous communities, the project received a positive adaptive management. The rights of indigenous people and their relationship with conservation strategies for the protected areas, is particularly importance. The country is facing an important moment where indigenous people supported by various NGOs, claim the vindication for what they consider their rights to ancestral lands. This sociopolitical dynamic significantly conditioned the project achievements in the AP San Rafael, where by opposition of indigenous representatives the dialogue on the management plan was temporarily affected.

The resources provided by the project exceeded to those destined to the DGPCB. This asymmetry budget, between the project budget for 4 APs and the assigned budget for the entire national system of protected areas, favored the perception among political government authorities; the project could solve the deficit and the financial resource needs of SEAM. This asymmetry budget and its impact in the project implementation, was neither visualized at the time of project design.<sup>9</sup>

The inclusion of NGOs in the development of project activities favored communication of key aspects to citizenship; as well as awareness and community involvement in conservation of APs.

The Secretariat of Environment lacks ministerial level, and directly depends of the Presidency of the Republic. This makes SEAM, possess a low interference level in strategic decision-making of State, which made it difficult the project institutionalization sectorially. Both the creation of SEAM as its lack of ministerial level are variables that could not be visualized during the phase of project design.

From NGOs the excessive centralism of the project in the figure of the minister was questioned, as well as the excessive bureaucracy<sup>10</sup> that permeated and limited the implementation of activities in the field. However, it must be remembered that in the design phase a Project Committee was included, to support and recommend policy and decision making. Unfortunately this committee, failed to effectively influence, given its ephemeral institutional life during the implementation phase. Regarding management processes, UNDP management procedures were maintained, which everyone involved must understand and address.

At the stage of DEX, there were 9 managers and advisers for each one of the four APs. Clearly the operational capacity of the project exceeded what SEAM could have had, not only for the four APs included in the project, but for entire the wilderness protected areas system as well.

### **3.2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)**

It should be noted that the project execution was monitored by the UNDP local and regional office in a satisfactory manner. The instruments used are consistent and allow annual reviews, based on audits, financial control (CDR) and project implementation reports (PIR). Upon completion the project had five financial audits<sup>11</sup> and the accomplishment of 10 PIR, with an average rating of Satisfactory.

The monitoring of the effectiveness of applied management to the 4 APs was held through the implementation of the developed methodology by the World Wild Fund (WWF), entitled "Measuring of Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas."

---

<sup>9</sup> It might be of interest to indicate that during the substantive review was proposed the developing of the financial strategy for the SEAM

<sup>10</sup> In the case of the AP San Rafael, the maintenance services had to be done in Asuncion, while these services are offered in Encarnación, which is located at a minor distance.

<sup>11</sup> 2003, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2010

### 3.2.3 Participation of Actors

Numeral 63 of the Agreement between the Government of the Republic of Paraguay and the United Nations Development Programme, known as PRODOC, noted the establishment of a Project Directorate Committee *to provide a participatory forum to oversee the project, promote inter-sectorial integration of policies and programs, and coordinate broader efforts of conservation. The Directorate Committee will assist the executing agency to facilitate interagency coordination of the conservation activities/development activities and work to integrate lessons learned from project implementation in other conservation programs.*

The 16<sup>th</sup> of October of 2001, by Resolution No. 435/01, the Directorate Committee of the Project Paraguay Silvestre is established. In the legislation creating the Committee its functions and the institutions that comprise it are established. Likewise, some general administrative guidelines are established, such as meeting period, entities that hold the Presidency and the Coordination Committee, and the depository instance of official documentation of the Committee, among other subjects.

According to the analyzed documents, this Directorate Committee had a short-range operation. The minutes or records of meetings held by the Committee indicate that there were meetings, and also note the topics covered by the same. From these acts is deduced that at least one institutional member stated in Resolution 435/01 presented his resignation to the committee, claiming conflict of interests, since said member also had the profile to compete for some of the consultancies to be developed in the project framework and was not appropriate to be in both the Committee and in the Consultancy (Com. Per. O. Ferreira, May 2011).

For the moment of the substantive review conducted in 2005, it is possible to observe a change in the functions of this Directorate Committee. In the following table are detailed the functions in one and another period:

<b>Table 3.2.3.:</b> Comparison of the functions of the Project Directorate Committee according to the substantive review of 2005.	
<b>Before the Substantive Review</b>	<b>After the Substantive Review</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Revises Annual, Final Report, Independent Evaluations, and related documents</li> <li>- Evaluates Project results</li> <li>- Provides feedback to strategic planning</li> <li>- Ensures the implementation of recommendations resulting from the evaluations.</li> <li>- Provides the government with advisory on policies based on lessons learned during the project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides feedback to strategic planning,</li> <li>- At request of a party it is informed on Activity Plan, Purchasing Plan, hiring personnel, procurement of goods and services, technical product approval</li> <li>- It is directly informed of the audit project results,</li> <li>- Participates in the preparation process of PIR and in the evaluation of activities</li> </ul>
Own elaboration based on SEAM RES No. 435/01 y UNDP, 2006	

According to UNDP (2006) *it is recommended to propose TdR for the consultative group of protected areas (which would act as a Directorate Committee)* and as line of action, is indicated the creation and establishment of the Advisory Committee or the National Council of Wilderness Protected Areas, prescribed by law No. 352 for the first semester of 2007. With regard to this recommendation, it was not possible to access to further information about its implementation. However, according to the data gathered during the interview process conducted within the framework of this final evaluation, during the final phase of the Project, the Biodiversity Committee of the National Environmental Council served as an advisory group. (Com. Per. I. Basualdo, May 2011)

### 3.2.4 Financial Planning

In brief, it is worth indicating that the investment made through December 2010, reached USD 8,825,304.46, leaving a remaining fund estimated at \$ 88,794.35. Within five years of implementation the amount invested reached USD 5,047,914.30 (56.74%). It should be noted that budget implementation was extended to nine years, obtaining an investment at the end of the period of USD 8,825,304.46 (99.20%). See Table 3.3.2.4.1.

<b>Table 3.3.2.4.1: Budget Execution. "Paraguay Silvestre" Project PAR/98/G33 - N° 14325</b>	
<b>YEARS</b>	<b>Totals o/ CDR<sup>12</sup> UNDP</b>
2000	0.00
2001	390,561.00
2002	1,397,523.00
2003	1,506,167.00
<b>SUB TOTAL to 2004</b>	<b>3,294,251.00</b>
2004	713,518.10
2005	1,040,145.20
2006	1,488,549.94
2007	879,617.78
2008	911,774.66
2009	225,864.24
2010	271,583.54
<b>SUB TOTAL to 2010</b>	<b>5,531,053.46</b>
<b>TOTALS 2004+2010</b>	<b>8,825,304.46</b>
GEF s/ Disc. Prj	8,896,363.00
F-30000	19,616.63
UNDP 4000 2006	-1,880.82
<b>TOTAL PROJECT BALANCE</b>	<b>88,794.35</b>

Source: UNDP (2010)

The budget implementation was low in the period 2000-2003, being that during the year 2000, no funding was executed because the execution starts in 2001. After 2004, remains poor, showing very low rate of implementation in 2004. The following rating could be indicated:

Low Budget Execution: Years 2005, 2007 and 2009;

Regular Budget Execution: Years 2006, 2008 y 2009; and

High Budget Execution: In year 2010.

In the Table 3.3.2.4.2., a detail of what is indicated can be observed.

<sup>12</sup> Financial instruments and financial statements comply with the requirement of being audited.

<b>Table 3.3.2.4.2. Percentage of Budget Execution of the Project Paraguay Silvestre, Period 2000-2010</b>	
<b>Years</b>	<b>% Budget Execution</b>
2000-2003	56
2004	26
2005	40
2006	74
2007	47
2008	77
2009	59
2010	99
Source: Own elaboration based on information provided by UNDP	

### **3.3 Fulfillment of the results established for the project**

#### **3.3.1. Achievement of results and objectives**

##### **3.3.1.1. Project Results**

So far the project succeeded in ensuring the integrity of 4 protected areas of global importance and enhance its conservation capacity. Below the project results are valued as they are set in the current project logical Framework. For which are considered the advances obtained on key indicators. The analysis is done from a descriptive, explanatory and valorative argument, which also accounts for the opportunities and challenges that the project went through during the implementation phase.

As a preamble to the description of the results, it is worth mentioning that according to the expressions of the consulted actors the principal merit of the project consists in that after the Project completion, the four APs persist and remain despite the rapid development process and environmental degradation of natural areas to which the country underwent during the last ten years. Likewise it is indicated that these areas might have suffered extreme damage, and in some case might have given the disappearance of APs, if not for the interventions made by the project. As a point that must be worked, is mentioned that through the project a limited development was obtained in the implementation of APs management and financial strengthening strategy.

**RESULT No. 1: THE 4 PRIORITY APs ARE LEGAL AND OPERATIONALLY CONSOLIDATED (R1 AND R2) AND COUNTS WITH THE BROAD PARTICIPATION OF STAKEHOLDERS INTERESTED IN THEIR MANAGEMENT IN A WAY THAT THE MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES CAN BE ACHIEVED.**

**Legal regime of protected areas.** The Preventive Registration of Rio Negro, Paso Bravo and Médanos del Chaco was concluded. For the 4 APs, their limits in the field are recognized by SEAM and the Ministry of Public Works and Communications.

**Profile of park rangers.** All park rangers received training courses which raised the profile of these officials.

**Equipment and infrastructure.** The 4 APs were supported by equipment upgrades, radios and accommodation. With regard to infrastructure development, this was completed in Paso Bravo directly with project funds; in San Rafael the negotiations for the cession of a municipal land in Alto Vera were facilitated, and the preparation of building plans was financed, promoting an agreement for another project (ARAUCARIA) to finance the construction itself; likewise, in Médanos del Chaco an agreement with the European Community was facilitated by which the project Paraguay Silvestre financed the building plans while construction itself was financed by this cooperation.

In the case of PN Rio Negro, a co-management agreement was established. Thus, the office of the AP Rio Negro was installed (equipped with Internet access) in the Municipality of Bahia Negra, as well as the Biological Station. In AP San Rafael in a property owned by the NGO Guyra Paraguay, a facility was built, consisting of a biological station, housing and house of rangers and firefighters.

**Local Management Committees.** Five Local Management Committees (CLG, its Spanish Acronym), recognized by SEAM were created late 2007, which are monitored by the Department of Protected Areas, whose officials participate in meetings.

In these CLG (its Spanish Acronym), various sectors or actors participate, among which are included local communities, local governments (Municipalities, Governorates), the landowners, NGOs, indigenous groups, farmers, local schools, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Health.

During the period of implementation of activities in APs, the decisions of the CLG (its Spanish Acronym), were taken into account. Currently, the operation of the Local Management Committees has declined, and its reactivation should be taken as a priority aspect for the future management of the four APs.

**Resolution of Approval of Management Plans.** Management plans of Médanos del Chaco and Paso Bravo have the resolution approval by SEAM and Rio Negro, have documents of "management plan" completed and which are under consultation. In San Rafael the preparation process of the management plan began, which was later discontinued due to discrepancies with indigenous organizations in the area. After several discussions between SEAM and these indigenous organizations, an agreement was signed where SEAM committed to provide all the information about the AP, a recognition work of traditional knowledge in San Rafael was started, which should be the basis for the preparation of a management plan.

A management plan for one of the indigenous territories comprised within the limits of San Rafael is under preparation.

**Illegal activities within the APs.** Data for the year 2008/09 report a reduction around 85% in the number of illegal activities within the boundaries of protected areas compared to previous years. For this period only two events reported illegal activity, one in San Rafael and one in Paso Bravo, which had coordinated intervention and detention of offenders.

**RESULT No. 2: THE INDIVIDUAL AND INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES OF KEY ACTORS FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF THE 4 APs HAVE BEEN STRENGTHENED, AND THE SUPPORT OF LOCAL, REGIONAL, NATIONAL AND POLITICAL ACTORS HAS BEEN MOBILIZED FOLLOWING AN AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.**

**Training of local groups.** The target groups participated in training programs; in these were included park rangers, technicians of the APs, the CLG (its Spanish Acronym), SEAM personnel, Local Governments personnel, and women groups.

**Attitudinal changes in stakeholder groups.** Positive changes in attitude are demonstrated toward conservation, in stakeholder groups. The survey conducted in November 2009, showed that at least 70% of the population recognizes -positive effects of APs on conservation. Values obtained were highly positive for Médanos del Chaco (97%), and San Rafael (98.3%). The results always important, but to a lesser extent, were for Rio Negro (43.8%) and Paso Bravo (63.8%).

**Knowledge of the role of APs in the protection of environmental services.** Changes in the knowledge of stakeholder groups in the role of APs are shown in relation to the protection of environmental services provided by natural systems protected by the APs. The 2009 survey indicated that at least 90% of the target groups are aware of the main environmental services provided by APs.

**Knowledge of regional actors about the location and boundaries of the APs.** The consulted actors agree that stakeholder groups effectively know the limits of the APs. However, the 2009 survey, yielded results that did not confirm this view since to the question of whether they knew the limits of the AP, the response rates were: Médanos del Chaco, 95% report not knowing the limits, Rio Negro, 98% idem, San Rafael 96% idem, and Paso Bravo, 86.9% also expressed not knowing the limits.

By the end of the year 2010, the completion of a study on the coverage the media give to the AP subject was planned. Other data show that since 2007 there has been a decline in the media coverage compared to previous years, however environmental issues still receive a good exposure in the press, ranging from written, radial, television programs and SEAM electronic newsletters.

**Availability of information about the environment.** The availability of information for SEAM information system users, has improved significantly. This through: 1) The support of the project for the creation and installation of the "environmental library", 2) The strengthening of the teledetection department, through the provision of equipment, software, hardware and training related to SIG management, and information generation; supported the construction of the Web design of SEAM and the correspondent site maintenance.

Institutional capacities were increased since the SEAM infrastructure was improved, its equipment, fleet vehicles, training of park rangers, and availability of operational resources for the managements of APs, and development of instruments.

**RESULT No. 3: COVERAGE AND CONSERVATION CAPACITY OF THE 4 APs HAVE BEEN IMPROVED THROUGH REPLICABLE MODELS OF SUSTAINABLE USE IN BUFFER ZONES AND AREAS OF PERMITTED USAGE AND BETTER CONNECTIVITY AMONG HABITAT FRAGMENTS.**

Productive projects were developed in the buffer zones of three of the four<sup>13</sup> APs. This favored the development of the following activities with the communities involved:

1. Sensitivity towards APs
2. Productive options and improvement of incomes
3. Assistance in the production
4. Support in the commercialization.

Experiences were generated on the conservation of APs, from the development of productive projects<sup>14</sup> developed in buffer zones. With significant acceptance (100% of those involved) by the communities.

In Paso Bravo, the work was done with 5 communities and 165 families. By decision<sup>15</sup> of SEAM, PHASE II did not continue in this AP. SEAM decided to support the fishing activities in Rio Negro.

Experiences in the development of productive projects are positive; from those generated in Paso Bravo the following are identified:

1. A change in the attitude of project participants towards the conservation of APs was noticed. Before the project, many residents had no knowledge of the concept of a park or an AP.
2. Experiences in the reproduction of forest species were generated.
3. Areas with forest loss through reforestation were recovered.

**Changes in vegetation coverage in buffer zones.** Through a study comparing vegetation coverage in buffer zones in the period between the years 2004-2009, the following changes were determined: San Rafael: 77,544 hectares. With no variation regarding 2004 values; Médanos del Chaco: 683,209 hectares. With no variation, except for an increase of 3.3% of agricultural use; Rio Negro: 329,232 hectares. Variation of the lowest values of 2.6% mostly, while agricultural use increased 3.39% and Paso Bravo: 207,070 hectares. Variation of inferior values to 6.5% mostly, while agricultural use increased by 11.4%.

#### **RESULT No.4: STRENGTHENED SINASIP TO GENERATE SUSTAINABILITY MECHANISMS OF THE 4 APs AS CONSERVATION MODEL.**

**SINASIP Master Plan Update.** The SINASIP Master Plan, which had more than 15 years, has been updated, and the socialization process has been completed. In late 2010, the SEAM was conducting the final review of the document for its publication.

**Financial sustainability strategy.** The study for the establishment of a financial sustainability strategy for SINASIP has been completed and is used in the institutional budget justification, specifically related to the increase of SEAM park rangers. In 2010, Congress confirmed 15 new park ranger positions, subject to a prior training program.

**Operational Multisectoral Mechanism for SINASIP governance.** The National Environment Council (CONAM, its Spanish Acronym) works as multisectoral operating mechanism; that also

---

<sup>13</sup> In San Rafael, 24 projects were not executed by the organized groups.

<sup>14</sup> The SEAM, prepares the information on all projects of sustainable use. Therefore are not reported: 1) the change in income from this type of projects, 2) the % income of target groups, 3) % of the target groups involved.

<sup>15</sup> Given the impossibility of having the necessary human resources available for technical support.

acts as the AP National Committee, where issues related to APs are resolved, before receiving the approval of SEAM.

**RESULT No.5: THE MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE OF THE 4 PRIORITIZED APs, CAPITALIZED, AND SYSTEMATIZED IN SUCH A MANNER TO FACILITATE THE REPLICATION WITH OTHER AREAS.**

**Printed and distributed materials.** Diverse forms, diverse materials were prepared: The Paraguayan Swamp; Environmental Indicators, SINASIP Financial Strategy, and SINASIP Master Plan Update, among more than 40 printed publications through the project or other institutions. Support was given to the creation of SEAM database, and the incorporation APs information on the web. A digital catalog was also prepared where the major milestones are presented, as well as specific publications on studies conducted in the four APs.

**Monitoring and evaluation system is in execution.** The monitoring and evaluation system remained in execution under UNDP. Both generated useful information for decision-making. However, the results indicate that there are still weaknesses in SEAM in implementing planned actions along the project execution period.

**Lessons learned from the project.** There is a document prepared in a participatory manner on lessons learned from the project. The same has been socialized among stakeholders.

**3.3.1.2. Consolidation of Protected Areas.**

Regarding the degree of progress in the consolidation of the Protected Areas referred to in the Project "Paraguay Silvestre", the major milestones and related notes for each AP are presented in Table 3.3.1.2.1. In Appendix 11, the four APs are described, their ecosystemic importance in the national and global levels. According to the information collected, the four APs remain valid, as the value of shares for their conservation and the results obtained by the project, especially the effects and impacts expected to be achieved in the future.

The results of the project should be valued indispensably in the light of prevailing conditions in the national context where development and conservation of protected wilderness areas result incipient. The comparison of the current management characteristics between the APs of Paraguay and the APs supported by the Project (see Appendix 9 and 10), allows to establish that effectively the current situation of seconds, turns out to be comparatively better.

In table 3.3.1.2.2, it is possible to compare the percentage of implementation of APs project management tools, compared to the same percentage of total APs in Paraguay. As can be seen project APs meet 100% of stocks of management tools: Management Plan, Operational Plan, Public Use Plan, Monitoring Plan, Ecological Assessment Research Plan, Judicial Measure and Management Committee.

In table 3.3.1.2.3, it is possible to compare the percentage of existence of the necessary infrastructure for the management of APs. In this case the differences observed are minor, but the

values of the indicators of the project APs, always turned out to be greater. Infrastructure mentions the following: Park rangers housing, administration housing, control stations, interpretation centers, recreational zones, self-guided trails and signaling. In the case of the four project APs, it should be noted that the infrastructure in the same would not have been possible without the project intervention.

**Table 3.3.1.2.1.: Consolidation of the Protected Areas referred to in Project "Paraguay Silvestre".**

<b>Paso Bravo National Park</b>						
<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
Rapid Ecological Evaluation(EER, its Spanish acronym) Participatory Rural Appraisal (DRP, its Spanish acronym) SEAM Resolution No. 265/04 recognizes Management Committee	Monitoring of change in land use and forest fires. Beginning of work with communities in buffer zone	Final settlement of legal measure, demarcation and delimitation on the ground. Monitoring, supervision and control in the buffer zone. Gender perspective and environmental education workshops in communities in buffer zone	Monitoring of changes in land use and forest fires.	Participatory preparation of the Management Plan. Monitoring, supervision and control in the buffer zone.	Approval of the 2009-2013 Management Plan by resolution of SEAM. Monitoring, supervision and control in the buffer zone. Construction (2 posts, one house) and equipment of the administrative headquarters and the interpretation center.	(2006 - 2010) Consolidation of community organizations, development of productive projects, synergies with other partnerships. Effectiveness with an improvement of 70%
NOTE: The title of the property on which this AP is built, is under the name of the Paraguayan State. The project institutionally supported SEAM, in the purchasing process of the 93,000 hectares.						

Reserve for San Rafael National Park						
2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
SEAM Resolution No.32/2000 recognizes the Management Committee. Preparation of Rapid Ecological Evaluation (EER, its Spanish acronym) and Participatory Rural Appraisal (DRP, its Spanish acronym)	Extended by Decree No. 5577/2005. The strengthening of the Management Committee. Monitoring of change in land use and forest fires. Beginning of community work Support for forest fire control	Gender perspective and environmental education workshops in local communities. Control and supervision. Community work Forest fires. Preparation of biological study as basis for the Management Plan.	Participatory preparation of the Management Plan. Monitoring of change in land use and forest fires.	Control and supervision.	Control and supervision in buffer zone. Signature of interinstitutional cooperation agreement among SEAM, ACIDI and Tekoha Yma Jeea Pavé.	Participatory community mapping and study of occupation, use and traditional knowledge of the Mbyá Guaraní people from Itapúa and Caazapá regarding their lands, natural resources and a management plan proposal on Tekohá guasú. Management effectiveness with a 35% improvement.
<p>NOTE: Features with prior measuring and demarcation, preventive registration, a management plan for discussion and approval; as well as a management plan for indigenous territories. A mobile home for park rangers, located in a property of potential transference to the State to locate offices outside the boundary of the AP, in Alto Vera. Were accomplished: 1) forests were maintained, which is supported by the evidence of coverage studies comparing data from 2004-2009; 2) implementation of control activities through joint patrols with the NGOs, community partition in the AP management; 3) the interest for the conservation of the AP increased in communities and universities; 4) San Rafael was ranked as a conservation icon, which in the future will enhance its conservation and consolidation strategies;. 5) Demands for more support to local initiatives were made, because of the lack of productive projects implementation.</p> <p>Of the four APs, San Rafael is perhaps the one found in a more limiting sociopolitical environment to provide benefits to the conservation and protection guarantee of its biodiversity. The properties remain in private hands, and are in a highly productive area of food grains. In addition, the cost of land by hectare is high. There has been a frontal position of the owners towards the AP, especially indigenous people claiming what they consider ancestral lands. At the project conclusion, large network of stakeholders that enhance their conservation is found as the main result. Represented by a solid organization of municipalities, indigenous communities, NGOs, firefighters, and organized groups (women, education centers).</p>						

<b>Médanos del Chaco National Park</b>						
<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
Decree No. 2726/04 establishes the Médanos del Chaco National Park. Declaration of Departmental interest by Ordinance No. 04 of the Governorate of Boquerón. Recognition of the Management Committee, by SEAM Resolution No. 1214/1204. Preparation of Rapid Ecological Evaluation (EER, its Spanish acronym) and Participatory Rural Appraisal (DRP, its Spanish acronym)	Monitoring of change in land use and forest fires. Community work and food sovereignty with indigenous communities.	Management Plan approved by SEAM Resolution No. 906/06 Gender perspective and environmental education workshops in communities. Community work and food sovereignty with indigenous communities.	Final settlement of legal measure and delimitation on the ground. Administrative equipment and construction. PN-TAE-PNMCh Complex. Use of the interpretation center for lectures to students. Monitoring of change in land use and forest fires.	Use of the interpretation center for lectures to students. Work on food safety with Guaraní Ñandeva communities. Declaration of Tourist Interest by the Municipality of Mcal. Estigarribia.	Monitoring of biological diversity. Control and supervision in buffer zone. Use of the interpretation center for lectures to students. Community work. Attention to visitors. Effectiveness in the management with an 84% improvement.	Open to visitors.
<p>NOTE: This AP is established in fiscal lands. In 2004 the properties were no longer used as AP figure to favor petroleum activities. Through the Project Paraguay Silvestre hard work was done and a lobby performed at the level of the Legislative Power, basing that the reversal done could harm the stability and protection of the AP, which ultimately led the government to reverse its decision and perform again the appropriation of properties as AP.</p> <p>With the project the AP had 5 park rangers, after completion of the project it only maintains 2. Agenda must be resolved with indigenous people. The threat remains because of the risk of gas exploration.</p>						

<b>Río Negro National Park</b>						
<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>
Preparation of Rapid Ecological Evaluation (EER, its Spanish acronym) and Participatory Rural Appraisal (DRP, its Spanish acronym).	Monitoring of change in land use and forest fires. Jobs at Community level. Support to construction of community radio.	Monitoring, supervision and control in buffer zone. SEAM resolution recognizes the Management Committee. Community work with EcoClub Chaco Pantanal youth.	Monitoring of change in land use and forest fires. Gender perspective workshops in communities.	Control and supervision in the buffer zone. Temporary installation of the PNRN's office in the municipality of Bahia Negra.	Participatory preparation of the Management Plan. Control and supervision in the buffer zone. Final settlement of legal measure and delimitation on the ground.	Concertation workshop of the Management Plan results. Effectiveness in the management with a 150% improvement.
NOTE: Through INDERT, 44,000 hectares were obtained to be affected to AP under SEAM management. The process of adjustment and legalization should continue. This park faces the difficulty that its surface is divided into two sections separated from each other by a significant segment of land, consisting of private owned properties.						

Source: Elaborated based on SEAM modifications (2010)

**Table 3.3.1.2.2: Comparison of the percentage of implementation of management tools of APs of the project, regarding the percentage of implementation in the totality of Paraguay APs**

Indicator	Management Plan	Operational Plan	Public Use Plan	Monitoring Plan	Research Plan	Rapid Ecological Evaluation	Legal Measure	Management Committee
% of Total Paraguay APs	28	44	9	13	0	31	38	28
% of the Project APs	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Own elaboration. Based on project results and SEAM data (2010)

**Table 3.3.1.2.3: Comparison of the percentage of infrastructure achievement for the management of the APs of the project, regarding the percentage of existing infrastructure in the totality of Paraguay APs**

Indicator	Park ranger housing	Administration Housing	Control Stations	Interpretation Centers	Recreational Zones	Self-guided trails	Signalization
% of Paraguay APs that possess the infrastructure	27	40	23	23	33	27	40
% of Project APs that possess the infrastructure	50	75	50	25	50	50	75

Source: Own elaboration. Based on project results and SEAM data (2010)

### 3.3.1.3. Unanticipated Results

The project had to develop the strategy to strengthen the system of protected areas of SEAM to achieve its purpose, which was supported in the improvement of its operational capability and work strategy.

SEAM was supported with two important tools that are critical to strengthen its capacity in terms of management and finance. In this sense, along with the project contributions a strategic plan and a financial strategy for the SINASIP were designed.

Advances were made in the work with indigenous people (San Rafael, Médanos del Chaco) in planning and technical assistance for the use of lands located within the APs; similarly progress was made in the treatment of gender issues and conservation of APs. These experiences will facilitate the treatment of the indigenous issue in the policy and management development of APs, integrating these populations. Previously, communities and especially indigenous people were not involved in the definition of Management Plans.

The project conducted activities visible to Paraguayan communities and society. SEAM observed an increase in its capacity to exert field presence and position itself nationally through the project; the park ranger figure had much enhancement.

An approach between park rangers and the communities was achieved within APs and buffer zones. The creation of local groups that contribute to the protection of APs was promoted. Such as the group of San Rafael environmental advocates, which helps control illegal logging and hunting in San Rafael<sup>16</sup>; the group of forest firefighters in San Rafael, who supported the forest fire struggle that threatened to devastate the ecosystems of San Rafael in 2005 and that to date has 30 instructors who provide training in other APs. An Environmental Management Plan was also designed for the municipality of Alto Vera, which contained management actions in the buffer areas of AP.

Inputs generated by project are also considered, which are currently used for the analysis of reforms of the National System of Wilderness Protected Areas (SINASIP, its Spanish acronym) and the definition of a new AP in the Chaco (Refugio del Chaco), on land owned by the Paraguayan Navy.

Supported the supervision and control, for dismantling 40 sawmills located in APs grounds, and confiscation of goods used for the alteration of APs by the Environmental Prosecutor's Office of the Judicial Power.

The project provided input for the development of territorial planning, private investment attraction for the protection of land within the APs, preparation of a project to be presented to the Fund for the Global Environment called "Water and Biodiversity", drafting of Wildlife decrees, and discouragement of productive investment within the APs.

The project called for various institutional actors, which had the information that eventually had consistency for the necessary evidence for policy decision making. An example of this is the instrumentation of land clearance permits, according to the plans of use, overseen by the National Forest Institute (INFONA, its Spanish acronym), whose action discriminated applications located within APs.

It established the concept of APs in nearby populations, local governments and municipalities, which contributed to a change of view on local actors that formerly looked upon as a problem for development.

---

<sup>16</sup> Through an agreement with the foundation Gurya Paraguay, provide park ranger services, guides, firefighters and maintenance of the biological station.

It contributed to the development of new initiatives: 1) construction of an agenda to define new management categories at national level, 2) SINASIP review, and development of new conservation proposals with participation of an entity such as ITAIPÚ Binacional.

#### **3.3.1.4. Results achievement levels**

##### **3.3.1.4.1. Project relevance**

Once the project is concluded, the validity of the initial proposal is verified which consisted in the project relevance for the conservation of globally important ecosystems that are protected within the four APs.

As well is verified the thesis that these ecosystems were at risk and that in the last decade (2001-2010) the threats to their preservation would increase due to hunting, logging, colonization and conversion processes for agricultural uses.

Validity of inclusion criteria of the four APs in the project is also maintained, as well as actions taken to achieve consolidation. Both are part of Paraguay conservation strategies.

In terms of results, while results were obtained at a product level, such as measurement, legalization, training, equipment, etc. it deserves to be mentioned that the project achieved significant results at an effect level:

##### **3.3.1.4.2. Project effectiveness**

“If it was not for this project these protected areas would not exist nowadays”.  
-consulted Actors.

The reported results are proportional to the ones expected when considering the problems the project originally aimed to address. This valuation deserves greater weight if is taken into account that at the third year of execution, the project ran the risk of delaying its implementation.

It should be noted that the level of obtained results corresponds to the ones originally proposed and the modifications presented after the substantive review.

The most relevant fact is that current evidence and the various actors involved in the conservation of APs, point out that in real terms the current existence of APs supported by the project would not have been possible if the project was not executed. With the project, biodiversity was effectively protected and likewise generate global environmental benefits. This is a very important conclusion reached by the consulted actors.

Although the project had to go through various difficulties (political, administrative, budget execution, socioeconomic and cultural), these were overcome through institutional arrangements and mechanisms that facilitated its continuation in a context that presenting great implementation difficulties.

It is worth mentioning that with the results shown in Tables 4.3.2.1, 4.3.2.2.1, 4.3.2.2.2 the achievement of results 1, 2, 3 is demonstrated. These results contributed to the purpose of ensuring the integrity of 4 globally important Protected Areas and to improve the conservation capacity. These also contributed to preserving the valuable Biodiversity deposit of Paraguay.

Result 4 was also achieved. The current concern relates to the gap occurring at the end of the project, because during its development, the technical, methodological and financial support offers essential support. Therefore, the value of institutionalizing and implementing the "SINASIP Strengthening Strategy" and "Financial Sustainability Strategy" is emphasized.

Result 5 was also achieved. Results were incorporated after the substantive review along with result 4 so that the merit of having reached them lies in that compared to the previous ones lesser time was available for its materialization. Results, 4 and 5, as well as results 1, 2, 3, also contributed to achieving the development objective and project purpose.

#### **3.3.1.4.3. Project efficiency.**

According to available information<sup>17</sup> the analysis of the project efficiency can be performed based on the planning of the project document results, in relation to expenditure in terms of execution time and administration expenses. These two indicators will provide relevant information to assess the project efficiency, considering the context in which it was executed.

Project efficiency was affected by the extension of the execution time<sup>18</sup>. The project should be initially implemented over a period of 5 years (2000-2004)<sup>19</sup>, however due to problems<sup>20</sup> shown by the counterparty during the first four years; the implementation period took 9 years. This meant an extension of about 80% of scheduled time.

Efficiency in achieving results was affected by issues such as the weak operational capacity of SEAM as well as level of discontinuous political support at a project directorate level.

The extension of the duration of the project was related to the low level of annual budget execution since the average annual investment reached 60%.

The low execution level, besides influencing in the extension of the duration of the project, meant an increase in administrative costs<sup>21</sup> at an amount close to 8%.

However, the capacity generated by the project must be balanced to generate interest from those involved in conservation at the national and international level, in investments, and to overcome the additional assumptions referred to in PRODOC. This information will be detailed in the following section.

So far the project has succeeded in ensuring the integrity of 4 protected areas of global importance and enhance the conservation capacity. However, it is to be noted that regarding San Rafael, this cannot be guaranteed until they are solved: 1) land tenure, 2) harmonization of claims of indigenous communities present in the San Rafael area with AP conservation objectives, 3) the proper categorization based on what should be protected or managed for future generations, and 4) the approval of the management Plan. As for Rio Negro, the management Plan must be approved.

---

<sup>17</sup> Type of disaggregation of financial information system. The financial information system does not allow an analysis of cost efficiency due to the dissociation between expenses and results. The project has no mechanism to track actual costs for components and activities.

<sup>18</sup> The decision to continue the execution was successful, since the additional time allowed to complete some processes and consolidate the results achieved to date. It was also a wise decision to terminate the project in late 2010 as the remaining resources resulted significant compared to administrative costs that should be invested for possible application in 2011.

<sup>19</sup> According to PRODOC.

<sup>20</sup> Affected by low institutional capacity of the counterparty and a low level of political support, which affected at a low level of appropriation.

<sup>21</sup> Analysis carried out in terms of the project budget, not from actual costs for UNDP, due to the implementation of the execution period, projections were affected and increased real expenses (Per Comm. V. Gerard. May 2011)

#### **3.3.1.4.4. Additionality**

In table 3.3.1.4.4. The results of estimates on the Project financial information are presented, including disbursements, PRODOC budgets, budgets added later to PRODOC, and the prospective budget. According to this, the expected amounts projected reach USD 83,747,100.00. Sum significantly higher than USD 12,756,363.00 listed in PRODOC. This difference corresponds to the increase in the corresponding items to the additional disbursement budgeted and to additional disbursement not expected in PRODOC

On this last point it was estimated that the total disbursement expected upon completion of the co-financing project increased from USD 3,555,000.00 to USD 74, 546,100.00. Sum that includes USD 250,000.00 managed by UNDP, USD 15,196,100.00 contributed by the partners, and a state contribution of USD 58,500,000.00<sup>22</sup>, on land (Rio Negro and Paso Bravo) contributed in kind by the State. Although it should be noted that the state contribution for the value of land was a prerequisite to the project installation.

Underestimating this fact, it can be observed that the PRODOC co-financing assumption was achieved and overcome in about five times over budget, from USD 2,705,000 to USD 15,196,100.

---

<sup>22</sup> 137,000.00 hectares, USD 500/hectare. Paso Bravo with 93,000 HA y Río Negro with 44,000 HA.

**Table 3.3.1.4.4.: Revision of the financial information up to December 30th, 2010**

Name of the partner (including private sector)	Nature of the contributor [8]	Amount use in the Project preparation (PDF A, B, PPG)	Budgeted amount in the Project document [9]	Budgeted amounts after finalization of the project	Total disbursement expected to December 30, 2010	Total disbursement expected upon project completion
Contribution of GEF	GEF	305,000.00	8,896,000.00		8,825,304.46	9,201,000.00
Co-financing in cash – managed by UNDP	United Nations Agency		250,000.00		250,000.00	250,000.00
Co-financing in cash – managed by the partner						
Co-financing in cash – managed by the partners			2,705,000.00	12,491,100.00	3,936,100.00	15,196,100.00
Guyra NGO (1)	NGO			352,000.00	341,000.00	352,000.00
ICA/IDRC BD	International Agency			19,000.00	19,000.00	19,000.00
AECID BD	International Cooperation Agency			330,000.00		330,000.00
WILAC BD	International Agency			10,000.00	10,000.00	10,000.00
UNDP/TNC/Guyra/SEAM (2)	International Agency			300,000.00		300,000.00
GEF/Multilateral(3)	Multilateral			2,000,000.00		2,000,000.00
Bilateral Donors (4)	Bilateral		2,105,000.00	500,000.00	1,800,000.00	2,605,000.00
RBD (5)	International Agency		600,000.00	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00	1,600,000.00
Multilateral Donors	Multilateral			100,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00
FAO	United Nations Agency			40,000.00	40,000.00	40,000.00
NGOs	NGOs			792,100.00	792,100.00	792,100.00
Change of debt by nature (6)	Government			7,400,000.00	175,000.00	7,400,000.00
Co-financing in Kind			600,000.00		59,100,000.00	59,100,000.00
Government of Paraguay	Government		600,000.00		59,100,000.00	59,100,000.00
Total for Co-financing			3,555,000.00	12,491,100.00	63,286,100.00	74,546,100.00
Total of the Project 2010		305,000.00	12,451,000.00	12,491,100.00	72,111,404.46	83,747,100.00

Source: Own elaboration based on UNDP 2010, considering the state contribution in kind for the approximate value of USD 58 million, in properties for the APs Rio Negro and Paso Bravo.

### 3.3.2. Sustainability

Generally the project sustainability can be classified as "Likely". The risk of failure can be considered as negligible for the sustainability of three out of four APs, excluding San Rafael, expecting that key results continue in the future. As explained above, in the case of San Rafael, the AP was supported by the project, and it probably would have gone without it; but the underlying problem, which consists of land tenure, was beyond the scope of the project. Likewise, the project also succeeded in developing the "SINASIP Strategic Plan" and "Financial Sustainability Strategy," instruments aimed to ensure the sustainability in aspects representing risk, as are the financial, institutional and political. The implementation and effectiveness of both strategies will depend on the future leadership of SEAM and of the support this may receive from the political levels in the country.

#### 3.3.2.1. Financial Resources

The financial sustainability of the four APs now depends on the budget allocation received from the central government. Although, different NGOs and other international agencies provide resources to strengthen the conservation of these<sup>23</sup> permanent resource flows could not be guaranteed over time.

It concerns that the public resource assigned to the DGPCB is extremely low. In the period of 2004-2009, were budgeted only USD 273,965, representing an annual average of USD 9,132<sup>24</sup> per AP. This amount can be considered completely inadequate considering that the minimum budget requirements of the Directorate are close to USD 71,570 annually<sup>25</sup>.

The issue of financial sustainability of the four APs transcends the project action framework. Since this topic is for all SINASIP, the project supported the preparation of the Master Plan actualization studies and the SINASIP financial sustainability proposal.

The equipment provided by the project is duly inventoried and has become part of SEAM institutional equity. However, the lack of budget undermines the maintenance and good condition of the same.

For this purpose, the lack of proper financial budgeting for the Department of Protected Areas specifically the allocation of resources for the four APs should be resolved, and if this problem is not solved, it could lose all effectiveness of the obtained results during the project execution, and concomitantly the biodiversity conservation status currently protected would be seriously jeopardized.

---

<sup>23</sup> The only wilderness protected area under public domain authorized to charge to its visitors is the Ybycuí National Park. SEAM (2009).

<sup>24</sup> Estimation based on obtained information from SEAM Strategic Plan. (SEAM, 2009).

<sup>25</sup> Estimation based on obtained information from SINASIP Financial Sustainability Plan (SEAM, 2009).

### **3.3.2.2. Socio-Political Aspects**

Although during its execution, the project achieved an impact on various aspects, including those related to socio-political aspects that were developed somewhat favorably to the four APs, once this has finished, questions whether these areas maintain the minimum level of necessary support to ensure that in the future continue implementing new initiatives in the conservation field.

The most important challenge that should address the sustainability strategy is derived from the national agenda in the production sector, since in the short term lines of action concerning the APs consolidation are not displayed.

The sustainability of the four APs will depend on political will and support that from SEAM can be given to strategies and tools designed in the project. In this regard, the participation that governorates, municipalities, NGOs, communities and organized groups could have will be fundamental.

It is manifested that the evaluators retain concern due to lack of political and institutional clarity regarding the importance of recovering project trained personnel through some kind of figure, such as hiring that once represented a commitment of the counterparty.

As for political support<sup>26</sup>, the project had its ups and downs during the implementation phase. The political institutional aspect has special importance for the sustainability of APs, especially in the figure of the Secretary of Environment. Depending on the degree of support or commitment that the political authority of the Secretariat of Environment acquires, a project would move forward and achieve results on expected time, including the strengthening of its capacity to withstand shocks and external threats. Some elements to be addressed in this political issue are the following:

1. Installation of the Project in the National Agenda.
2. Inclusion of the Project activities as reinforcement for the development of special operations, such as the “Soberanía” Project of wide diffusion in the citizenship.
3. To influence in the levels of the Presidency of the Republic for proper decision making favorable to the conservation of the four APs and the general system.

### **3.3.2.3. Institutional framework and governance**

It is in the institutional framework, an aspect given by SEAM, where the four major sustainability weaknesses of the four APs are observed. Several aspects are affecting the previous valuation, among which is possible to note: 1) lack of visibility in national budget allocation to the biodiversity conservation issue in general and AP in particular, 2) the weak position of the Department of Protected Areas, to have a solid direction within the organizational structure, 3) the low number of park rangers, 4) the inconsistent and low institutional presence in the AP.

---

<sup>26</sup> This endorsement was tested in key moments of the project: 1) Restitution of the management category of National Park to AP Médanos del Chaco, situation that had been caused by the hydrocarbon exploration; 2) Attention to the threat of forest fires in San Rafael; 3) Endorsement in the processes of substantive revision.

The limited personnel issue for APs is critical, because of the low budget capacity of SEAM needed to keep the park rangers in the field. The commitment of the Paraguayan State through SEAM was that the responsible institution of the project had to absorb the 25 park rangers and 4 administrators who worked during the project, but due to financial constraints this could not be achieved. The final result is that currently only one<sup>27</sup> out of the 25 existing park rangers remains during the project implementation.

It is important to give continuity to the project for its sustainability through the effective participation of APs surrounding communities. The project achieved its objective temporarily because it provided stronger presence within APs developing its capacities and relying on information.

Regarding governance of the areas, SEAM must take actions to: 1) rescue of project trained personnel, 2) incorporate new personnel; 3) provide ongoing training to personnel.

The development of APs local management capacities was a permanent result, given by the formation and strengthening of local management committees and organized groups. This condition strengthens the sustainability of APs, through an increase in APs governance levels. However, after the project completion local committees were weakened. Currently, the sustainability of management committees is threatened due to lack of local leadership.

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

#### **3.3.2.4 Environmental Risks**

Environmental risks are not presented as a significant problem and the threats of this issue are considered as not relevant to the conservation of the four APs. Instead, and contrary to this, the risks arising from productive activities performed by human beings, press on the stability and sustainability of the obtained results; therefore SINASIP shall develop the necessary strategies to eliminate these threats.

#### **3.3.2.5 Contribution to improve national/local personnel skills**

National personnel were supported by the project through processes and training, participation in national and international conferences, which enabled to increase skills in national and local levels.

### **3.3.3 Project Performance Rating**

The Project performance level was satisfactory. The overall project results were satisfactorily achieved since they reach the objective of preserving the rich biodiversity deposit of Paraguay. For more detail on this, see Table 3.3.3. The overall quality of monitoring and project evaluation was satisfactory; it allowed to guide and adjust the strategic actions for the achievement of results. The overall quality of the implementation and project execution was satisfactory, since the difficulties were resolved, to sustain the project in a complex political and institutional context, and manage the intervention facilitating synergies and institutional arrangements, applying adaptive management, which helped strengthen the conservation of the four APs. The catalytic role allowed the production of public good, demonstration, replication and extension of results. One aspect which must be given special attention refers to results that may be threatened by the overall probability of risk for sustainability, regarding the absence of provision of financial resources, socio-economic aspects, institutional framework and the country governance. With regard to aspects of environmental risks these are considered unlikely.

---

<sup>27</sup> Initially were two, but to the date of preparation of the present document, the other one resigned SEAM.

**Table 3.3.3: Project Performance Rating**

<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<i>M &amp; E Overall Quality</i>	S	Allowed to guide and adjust the strategic actions to the achievement of results.
<i>M &amp; E in the Project startup design</i>	S	The design was able to anticipate the needs and methods to solve the conservation problem of the four APs. However, low institutionality was not sufficiently valued; aspect as seen has represented a major constraint for the implementation.
<i>M &amp; E Implementation Plan</i>	HS	It was a strong element that ensured evidence for decision-making at the required time.
<b>IA and execution of EA</b>		
<i>Overall quality of Project implementation /execution</i>	S	It was possible to solve difficulties, maintain the project within a complex political and institutional context and manage the intervention facilitating synergies, institutional arrangements, and adaptive management that allow strengthening the conservation of the four APs.
<i>Implementation agency execution</i>	HS	The UNDP role as an implementing agency was outstanding. It provided support to the government of Paraguay, characterized by low institutionalism in managing this type of projects: it assumed a DEX execution period, which prevented the project to succumb. This had the recognition of authorities for the excellent work accomplished.
<i>Implementing agency execution</i>	MU	SEAM was limited in its institutional capacity to implement project activities jeopardizing its continuity, so that the decision to move to the DEX modality was taken in an important period of the implementation.
<b>Results</b>		
<i>Overall quality of project results</i>	HS	Is high because the project had to face several periods of adjustments in results, and despite the difficulties facing those involved appreciate that these results meet the conservation needs in the context of the four APs.
<i>Relevance</i>	HS	The project was extremely relevant, since the four APs, and globally important ecosystems, could hardly been protected.
<i>Effectiveness</i>	S	It managed to protect the four APs and globally important ecosystems.
<i>Efficiency</i>	VS	By the elapsed implementation time, this mainly influenced SEAM weak institutionality.
<b>The catalytic roll</b>		
<i>Public good production</i>	Yes	New approaches and methods were developed; community management, co-management of APs, and investment in conservation in the country were encouraged.
<i>Demonstrability</i>	Yes	The management of buffer zones and the incorporation of communities, NGOs, and local groups in managing APs.
<i>Replication</i>	Yes	Not only the project results are spread, but also the lessons learned.
<i>Extension</i>	Yes	Work methodologies developed are implemented by SEAM in the entire SINAP.

<b>Sustainability</b>		
<i>Overall probability of risks for sustainability</i>	Yes	Risks to the sustainability are presented in financial, socio-economic, institutional framework and governance aspects.
<i>Financial Resources</i>	Yes	There are financial risks. Upon completion, financial risks are expected, given the low capacity of the government for budget allocations. The interest of international investment entities, national and international NGOs is maintained. With the project, a financial strategy was designed for SEAM which incorporates the SINASIP financial sustainability issue. Its implementation would reduce the degree of financial risk.
<i>Socio-Economic</i>	Yes	The variability of political support at high levels in decision making, to Paraguay APs. In the future, comprehensive strategies should be established, which comprising the others involved in conservation in Paraguay, local groups, NGOs, could continue to insist, remark and maintain the topic scheduled in time of low political support.
<i>Institutional framework and governance</i>	Yes	Due to the low institutional level of SEAM.
<i>Environmental Risks</i>	No	No environmental hazards are identified. The threats are anthropogenic in nature due to the expansion of the agricultural boundary.
<i>Overall project results</i>	S	The project results achieve the project objectives.
Source: Own elaboration. Nomenclature <sup>28</sup> : Highly Satisfactory (HS); Satisfactory(S); Very Satisfactory (VS); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately unsatisfactory (MU)		

<sup>28</sup> According to UNDP (2011)

## 4 Conclusions

1. The four APs currently exist and remain, having overcome the accelerated development process and environmental modification to which their surroundings underwent over the past ten years. If not by the project intervention these areas would have suffered extreme damage, and the integrity and existence of these would have been compromised. Main results are indicated below:

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

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

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

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

2. The project allowed the achievement of significant unexpected results: 1) The concept of APs installed in buffer zones and nearby communities; 2) Favored and agenda to define new management categories, 3) Provided input for reforms in the Wilderness Protected Areas National System SINASIP), 4) Promoted the development of new conservation proposals involving the Itaipú Binacional Entity, 5) Strengthened the SINASIP institutionally 6) SEAM adopted monitoring project tools for the entire system of APs of Paraguay; 7) Encouraged the integration of indigenous people in decision-making; 8) Supported the increase of SEAM capacity to exert field presence and positioning in the national scope; 9) Favored the approach between park rangers and communities; 10) Supported the issue of supervision and control, for the dismantling of 40 sawmills located in AP grounds, confiscation of property used for the alteration of APs, 11) Provided input for the development of land management plans, attraction of private investment for land protection within the APs, preparation of the "Water and Biodiversity Strategy", drafting of Wildlife decrees, and discouragement of productive investments within the APs.

3. As for the Project effectiveness, it is worth mentioning that the achievement of results (1,2,3) contributed with the purpose of ensuring the integrity of the four globally important APs improving the conservation capacity. Also, contributing with the development objective of conserving the rich biodiversity of the deposit in Paraguay.
4. The attainment of result 4 was also achieved. In this point the concern refers to the absence representing the project culmination, because during its tenure the technical, methodological and financial support gave essential support to SEAM. Therefore, the value of institutionalizing and implementing the "SEAM Strengthening Strategy" and the "Financial Sustainability Strategy of Protected Areas" is emphasized.
5. Result 5 was also achieved. Results were incorporated after the substantive review along with result 4 so that the merit of having reached them lies in that compared to the previous ones lesser time was available for its materialization. Results, 4 and 5, as well as results 1, 2, 3, also contributed to achieving the development objective and project purpose.
6. Project efficiency was affected by the extension of execution time. On this aspect, SEAM weak operational capacity influenced as well as the discontinuous level of political support at the project management level. The average annual investment reached 60%. The low execution level as well as being affected by the extended project duration led to an increase close to 8% in administrative costs.
7. The counterparty administrative capacity deficit and the weakness in the political level support resulted in limiting aspects for the proper development of project activities and achievement of results.
8. As for sustainability, background and record of actions indicate that results obtained are likely to continue and to increase, and a negligible risk is estimated to the sustainability of three out of four APs, excluding San Rafael, where the underlying problem consists on land ownership. Sustainability can be strengthened by implementing the "SINASIP Strategic Plan" and "SINASIP Financial Sustainability Strategy" which were products provided by the project, and with which the Paraguayan State could face financial, institutional and political risks facing protected areas in Paraguay.
9. Both, the value of ecosystems of the four APs strengthened by the project, as actions for their conservation and results obtained by the project remain in effect; especially for the effects and impacts expected to be achieved in the future.
10. The project provided capacities at a country level and not only within the framework of the four APs. SEAM, DAP, NGOs, communities, local governments and organized groups were benefited.
11. The project called for various institutional actors, which had the needed information for policy decision making directly or indirectly related to the Project.
12. Diverse aspects support the relevance of design and methodology implemented, among which deserve to be mentioned that:
  - 12.1 The selection of APs was adequate in terms of the need to protect unique globally important ecosystems at risk. The value assigned to obtained results by stakeholders, favors and confirms the selection relevance.
  - 12.2 It proved possible to develop the consolidation of new APs, and as product process, the work methodology followed by the project is estimated replicable.

- 12.3 Given the complexity of San Rafael, the project could hardly achieve its consolidation, its solution rather than technical corresponded to one of a political type and intersectoral character.
- 12.4 The inclusion of organizations in the development of project activities favored the public communication of key aspects to the citizenship, as well as awareness and community involvement in the conservation of APs.
- 12.5 This project lacked options for the solution of specific situations, necessary of attention to solve very specific problems within the APs.
- 12.6 The applied research inclusion allowed solving specific situations in the conservation problem of APs.
13. The project sustainability can be qualified as "Probable" with the key results expected to continue in the foreseeable future, with a negligible risk for the sustainability of three out of four APs, being excluded the AP San Rafael.
- 13.1 The lack of political clarity and proper financial budgeting for the Department of Protected Areas and specifically for the four APs, could inactivate the project achieved results, and particularly affect the conservation status of the currently existing biodiversity in the areas.
- 13.2 Among the greatest risks for the conservation of the four APs, were identified: 1) insufficient institutional capacity of SEAM, 2) change in land use, 3) illegal logging and hunting, 4) invasion to the APs, and 5) low political interest.
- 13.3 It's important to give continuity to the project for the sustainability through the effective participation of communities surrounding APs.
- 13.4 The AP San Rafael was supported by the project, and probably would have disappeared without it, but the underlying problem, which consists of land tenure, did not correspond to the Project responsibility scope.
- 14 General Project results were satisfactory since the objective of preserving the rich repository of biological diversity in Paraguay was achieved. Adjustment capacity generated by the project management, based on monitoring results and project evaluation, was a determining factor for the project final integrated result to be satisfactory. The overall quality of project implementation and execution was satisfactory; since it was able to overcome difficulties, sustain the project in a complex political and institutional context, and manage the intervention facilitating synergies and institutional arrangements, and adaptive management, which allowed strengthen the conservation of the four APs. The catalytic role allowed public good production, demonstration, replication and extension of results. The results may be threatened by the overall probability of sustainability risks, as to the lack of financial resources provision, socio-economic aspects, institutional framework and country governance. The aspects related to environmental risks showed no impact on the project development.

## 5 Recommendations

1. The Executive and Legislative branches, should consider the strategic value of protected areas in the national development, and make the decision to strengthen the institutionality of SEAM, SINASIP and financial budgets for the management of protected areas.
2. To ensure the sustainability of results, the State of Paraguay shall implement the "Strategic Plan of SINASIP" and "Financial Sustainability Strategy", which will ensure sustainability in those areas where levels of risk were identified, as are the Financial, institutional and political.
3. It is a necessity that SEAM makes institutional efforts to have the budgetary resources according to the needs of APs, the same to meet the needs of expropriation and property transfer to SEAM, and management of AP itself and of buffer zones, to thereby try to reduce the anthropogenic risks of impairment of ecosystems protected. The Central Government shall allocate those resources within the performance management framework promoted by the Ministry of Finance, in order to ensure sustainability of results through the achievement of the effective conservation of the four globally important APs, supported by the project.
4. SEAM must promptly resolve the lack of proper financial budgeting for the Directorate of Protected Areas and specifically the allocation of resources for the four APs. Given that if this problem is not solved, project obtained results could be inactivated and committed the current protected biodiversity conservation status.
5. The design of a new initiative should be able to break the current inertia in the institutional framework of SEAM to ensure the conservation of APs, find and implement adequate ways to ensure and facilitate the operations. This also includes the incorporation of an intersectoral vision due to the high complexity involved in the management of buffer zones.
6. With respect to the management model of APs, the authorities responsible for administering the State must:
  - 6.1 Overcome the challenge that implies alignment, or not, of its environmental policy to the issues of the rights of indigenous people over their ancestral lands.
  - 6.2 Incorporate changes that affect the processes of decentralization supported by SEAM, and the transference of strategic and operational roles to municipalities and governorates
  - 6.3 Consider other actors in the environmental policy design, especially addressing the problems with private investment, producers and owners involved.
7. The SEAM must innovate in management aspects through mechanisms that allow:
  - 7.1. To effectively manage the implementation of "SINASIP Strategic Plan" and "Financial Sustainability Strategy" provided by the Project.
  - 7.2. To develop a contingency plan that would help resolve and minimize the identified risks to the sustainability of the achieved project results.
  - 7.3. To establish a formal community work program and provide continuity to the actions carried out with local organizations, women groups, local management committees, municipalities and governorates.
  - 7.4. To perform actions to reactivate management committees strengthened by the project.
  - 7.5. To incorporate the issue of indigenous territories and strategic needs for the conservation of the four protected areas within the framework of environmental policies of the country.
  - 7.6. To give continuity to initiatives such as the productive projects developed in the AP Paso Bravo
  - 7.7. To assign personnel for timber control in the AP Médanos del Chaco.

- 7.8. To develop, through SINASIP, strategies needed to eliminate threats generated by productive actions of anthropogenic origin pressing the stability and sustainability of obtained results.
  - 7.9. It shall take action to: 1) project personnel rescue, 2) incorporate new personnel, 3) provide ongoing training to personnel.
  - 7.10. Execute formalized management plans and investments referred with resources provided by the financial strategy.
8. The sustainability of the four APs will depend on political will and the support can be given to strategies and tools designed in the project by SEAM. In this regard:
    - 8.1. Participation of governorates, municipalities, NGOs, communities and organized groups involved will be essential.
    - 8.2. A significant state presence is required for the maintenance of results in terms of personnel and actions in the APs.
  9. The Paraguayan State should reaffirm its interest in ensuring the sustainability of the AP San Rafael, to this end is a priority the approach with owners and the agreement definition on an agenda that allows catalyzing threats to protected ecosystems in the short and medium term. This requires the development of a joint strategy that meets the following key aspects: 1) land tenure; 2) definition of the proper management category, 3) the rights on indigenous territories, 4) resources assurance for land payment, and 5) the expropriation and legal transfer of property in favor of SEAM.
  10. In the case of the AP Rio Negro, the fragmentation of protected territories should be addressed, and every effort should be made to attach the body located between the two sections so as to allow the formation of a single group that promotes the protection of a continuous ecosystem and not of fragments.

## 6 Lessons Learned

1. In terms of design, the following lessons learned were achieved:
  - 1.1 A project of this nature must contain a political incident component in decision making at the level of the government and congress.
  - 1.2 In the design phase the conceptualization should incorporate gender issues, entailment with neighboring communities and indigenous populations in a systemic and holistic manner.
  - 1.3 It should incorporate in its design activities that include knowledge of local groups.
  - 1.4 An appropriate working methodology for the consolidation of new APs. The development of capacities provides some assurance to the sustainability of APs.
  - 1.5 Future projects should include a specific component for investment in conservation activities of buffer zones at national level, within a framework that allows the strengthening of SEAM and its relationship with the communities surrounding APs.
  - 1.6 The implementation of actions that can address solutions to very specific and strategic issues, such as land tenure should be considered from the design phase for the success of a new project; or otherwise that the problem solution be implemented before the beginning of the project. Effective mechanisms should be planned from the beginning to facilitate decision making for those cases where coordination or direction instruments stop working properly.
  - 1.7 An appropriate selection of APs, leads to the results of the implementation of project services have relevance and significance for stakeholders.
2. Regarding the institutional aspects the following lessons learned were achieved:
  - 2.1 A weak institutional capacity represents an important risk factor for the implementation and sustainability of intervention results of protected areas conservation.
  - 2.2 A management agency attached to the commitments and reestablished procedures, is guarantee for the proper management results and resources. This represents a success factor in cases which present weak institutionality.
  - 2.3 When a project is limited in its management due to low institutional capacity of the executor, the timely intervention of the implementing agency will be necessary, and properly valued.
3. As for conservation of protected areas policy aspects, the following lessons learned were achieved:
  - 3.1 In terms of sustainability of results, financial and institutional political aspects, take on greater importance, so the State must ensure compliance during and after completion of the implementation phase.

- 3.2 Depending upon the degree of support or commitment that the political authority of the Secretariat of Environment acquires, a project can move forward and achieve results on expected time, including promoting its implementation promoted and strengthened its capacity to withstand shocks and external threats.
  - 3.3 A project should facilitate the development of actions to generate evidence for advocacy and public policy generation in conservation of the four APs.
  - 3.4 A project political viability may be compromised while not able to function as a catalyst for state and institutional policy.
- 4 Regarding implementation aspects, the following lessons learned were achieved:
- 4.1 Prior the beginning of implementation, the verification of institutional conditions in which will work will be of great importance and will allow adjustments in the organizational structure.
  - 4.2 A proper inclusion of organizations facilitates and provides sustainability to the actions taken and results achieved.
  - 4.3 The consolidation of an AP located in a high pressure enclave for the development of production activities is limited to the actual feasibility that is taken for securing land tenure
  - 4.4 Projects of the nature of the Project should be implemented in a decentralized manner, and its administrative structure located in the APs.
  - 4.5 Provide community participation and owners from the beginning favors stage of project design, implementation and accountability.
  - 4.6 When considering the development of productive projects sufficient time to complete all stages should be provided, to the accompaniment of commercialization.
  - 4.7 The development of conservation actions such as productive projects must consider the conditions and needs of the residents of the communities surrounding APs.
  - 4.8 The development of applied research allows the resolution of specific issues on conservation problems or parts of them.
  - 4.9 A project must seek the integrality with SEAM, and on a sectorial basis, according to the institutionality of the country, foster inter-agency work, and incorporate work with the private sector.

## **7 Appendices to the evaluation report**

**7.1 Appendix 1: Terms of reference of the evaluation (TORs)**

**United Nations Development Programme  
Country: Paraguay  
Project Document**

**“Initiative for the protection of Wilderness Areas of Paraguay”**

**Paraguay**

**Terms of Reference  
Final Evaluation**

**JANUARY 2011**

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR FINAL EVALUATION**

**Project** : 14325  
**Consultancy** : Project Paraguay Silvestre Final Evaluation  
**Type of contract** : On Result  
**Amount Gs.** : According to economic proposal

### **1 INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 UNDP/GEF Monitoring and evaluation policy (M&E)**

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP<sup>1</sup>/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. promote accountability for resource use;
- iv. provide feedback and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of applicable tools is used continuously throughout the lifetime of the project, e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators, mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all medium or full size projects supported by GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation. The final evaluation is intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project, look for signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It also identifies/documents lessons learned and makes recommendations to improve the design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.

#### **1.2 Project Objectives and its Context**

##### **SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT AND ITS CONTEXT**

Project Paraguay Silvestre (PAR/98/G33) “Initiative for the protection of Wilderness Areas of Paraguay” can be considered the only initiative conceived prior to the creation of the Secretariat of Environment (SEAM), which was implemented in parallel with the strengthening process of this institution in its first five years.

The first stage of the project execution 2001-2003 was conducted under the national execution modality, during which little progress was made in project implementation and management weaknesses were identified. This situation led to change the execution modality in April 2003; the processes and deliberations were analyzed and documented in tripartite meetings held in November 2003 and April 2004.

<sup>1</sup> United Nations Development Programme

<sup>2</sup> Global Environment Fund

Since 2004, SEAM had a major change in institutional approach giving strong impetus to decentralized environmental management, strategic alliances and to effective and efficient implementation of its programs and projects.

In late 2005, a mid-term evaluation (EMT, its Spanish acronym) was conducted, which was the basis for the project substantive review in October 2006. In this review, three main objectives were covered: i) to effectively integrate the recommendations to the project originated by EMT, within which highlights the new systemic approach with the inclusion of the referred result to SINASIP and to the Knowledge Management; ii) as to execution mode, this review returned to the "national execution", although under a new operational mode to facilitate appropriate implementation of field activities, a practice that stayed active to date.

Following are reproduced the aim, purpose and results of the project as were agreed/confirmed in the substantive review of 2006:

**Aim:** To preserve the rich biodiversity storehouse of Paraguay.

**Purpose:** To ensure the integrity of the 4 globally important protected areas and to improve the conservation capacity.

### **Expected results**

**Result N° 1:** The 4 priority APs are legally and operationally consolidated (R1 and R2) and counts with the broad participation of key actors in its management so the management objectives can be achieved.

**Result N° 2:** Individual and institutional capacities of key actors for the management of the 4 APs have been strengthened, and the support of local, regional, national and political actors has been mobilized following an awareness campaign.

**Result N° 3:** The coverage and conservation capacity of the 4 APs have been improved through replicable models of sustainable use in buffer zones and permitted use zones and a better connectivity between habitat fragments.

**Result N° 4:** SINASIP strengthened to generate sustainability mechanisms of the 4 APs as conservation model.

**Result N° 5:** The managing experience of the 4 priority APs, capitalized, and systematized in a way to facilitate replication with other areas.

## **2 EVALUATION OBJECTIVES**

The Final Evaluation (EF, its Spanish acronym) is a requirement for UNDP and GEF projects and therefore it is initiated by the UNDP Country Office in Paraguay. This evaluation will be conducted according to guidelines, rules and procedures of UNDP and GEF.

The overall objective of this Final Evaluation is to analyze the project implementation, review the project accomplishments in fulfilling the project objective and expected results. This evaluation will establish the relevance, implementation and success of the project, including the sustainability of results. This evaluation will also collect and analyze specific lessons and best practices regarding strategies used and implementation arrangements, which may be relevant to other projects in the country and in other countries worldwide.

The main actors of this evaluation are: The Secretariat of Environment (SEAM), Local Governments, Management Committees, NGOs, among others, as found in Section IV ii below.

The final evaluation must submit a comprehensive report regarding the performance of a finished project evaluating the project design, implementation process, achievement of results and objectives, including changes in the objective and results during the implementation, if relevant. The final evaluations also have three complementary purposes:

- To promote accountability, transparency together with evaluate and disclose the level of compliance and achievement of the project;
- Provide feedback and comments on recurrent key issues in the portfolio that require attention and improvement on the key issues identified above, as for example in the mid-term evaluation.

Please refer to Section 7 for details regarding the scope of this evaluation.

### **3 EXPECTED OUTPUTS OF THE EVALUATION**

It is expected that the evaluation team deliver the following products:

Oral presentation of the main conclusions of the evaluation: this must be submitted at the UNDP Country Office before the evaluation mission has been completed, this will allow verifying, validating and clarifying the findings of the evaluation.

Evaluation Report: This report must be sent electronically to the UNDP Country Office (CO), to the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordination Office (RCU) and to the project team within no more than 2 weeks after completion of the mission. The parties will review the document and will deliver remarks and/or comments to the project team no later than 1 month after the report had been delivered. The evaluators will consider the comments for its inclusion in a final report that must be submitted no later than 1 week after delivery of comments. If case discrepancies in impressions and findings are shown between the evaluation team and the parties mentioned above, an appendix should be included at the end of the document explaining these. The UNDP-GEF-RCU and UNDP-CO will sign a final form of document approval that will be attached to the final report (see Appendix 5). The structure of the evaluation report it's described in Section 7.

General considerations of the report:

- Format: Times New Roman - 11, Single spacing, automated table of contents; number of pages (bottom centered), the use of graphics and photographs is suggested, when relevant
- Length: Maximum 50 pages total, excluding appendices
- Deadlines: First draft within a period no longer than two weeks after the end of the mission

### **4 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

This section provides a summary of the approach or methodology of evaluation. However, it should make clear that the evaluation team must conduct a review if necessary. Any change should be according to international criteria, norms and standards for practitioners adopted by the Evaluation Group of the United Nations. Any change must be supported by the UNDP Country Office before being implemented.

(i) **Revision of documents:** The list of documents to review is included in Appendix 1. All documents will be delivered to the evaluation team by the UNDP Country Office and the Project Team. The Project Team and the UNDP Country Office will prepare a note of each document describing its relative importance and key sections where the evaluator should pay special attention. The evaluator should consult all relevant information sources that include among others: The UNDP and GEF evaluation policy, the project document, minutes and decisions of the Directorate committee, project budget, operational plans and work, progress reports, PIRs, project files, UNDP documents and guidelines, national legislation relevant to the project and any other material that may be useful. The project coordinator will also deliver a report with the main lessons and achievements of the project.

(ii) **Interviews:** The team will conduct interviews with the following institutions and individuals, at minimum SEAM (DAP, DPE), NGOs (ACIDI, GUYRA, ALTERVIDA) Governorates and/or municipalities (at least one).

(iii) **Field Visits:** Field Visits must be made to the following places: at least one of the four wilderness protected areas (Paso Bravo, Rio Negro, Médanos del Chaco, San Rafael), to define in conjunction with the evaluators.

(iv) **Semi-Structured interviews:** The team should develop a process for conducting semi-structured interviews to ensure that all issues are covered. Group discussions (*focus groups*) will be carried out with the beneficiaries of the project when necessary.

(v) **Questionnaires**

## 5 EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation to be conducted will focus on the analysis of two fundamental project aspects, namely:

- The technical approach and actions taken to date considering the project original objectives, which will allow to redefine or confirm the project sustainability strategy;

- The Evaluation of management mechanisms aimed at redefining or ratifying the project management.

To achieve these separate but interrelated approaches, it is established that the evaluation will be conducted by two consultants: one national (see terms of reference in Appendix 6), and the other International (see terms of reference in Appendix 7). This last will be the *team leader* in charge of writing the final report.

The hiring of these consultants will be financed by the project budget.

## 6 ARRANGEMENTS FOR IMPLEMENTING THE EVALUATION

### 6.1 Management arrangements

The evaluation was requested by UNDP, led by its Country Office in Paraguay, as Project Implementation Agency. This office has the overall responsibility for coordination and logistical arrangements of the evaluation, as well as gives necessary support to the evaluation team (travel, lodging, work space, communications, etc.) together with the timely delivery of travel expenses and contract payments, to be provided through the project. The UNDP Country Office, in conjunction with SEAM and the project team will organize a mission to the site (travel arrangements, meetings with key actors and beneficiaries, interviews and field visits). The evaluation team will receive a brief oral summary of the Country Office and the RCU, through a tele-conference at the beginning of its mission. The team is expected to also give an oral summary of the results and preliminary conclusions of the evaluation mission to CO and RCU. If further discussions are necessary with the CO and RCU concerning the mission and the project, these can be coordinated while the evaluation is carried out.

Payment arrangements and specifications: Evaluators will be hired with the project budget. The payment will be 20% upon delivery of work schedule and report index; 40% upon delivery of the first draft to SEAM, to the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Office and project team. The remaining 40% will be paid upon approval of the final report by SEAM, the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Office, according to the product detail included in the terms of reference in Appendix 6 and 7. The quality of the final report will be evaluated by the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU. If the quality does not meet the standards or requirements of the UNDP-GEF, the evaluators will be asked to rewrite or revise (if necessary) the document before payment of the last installment.

These terms of reference are based on UNDP-GEF policies and procedures and have been agreed, as well as the mission agenda, between the UNDP-CO, UNDP-GEF-RCU and the project team. The final report must have been accepted and approved by UNDP before being used in a public way. For this, the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF-RCU must formally approve the report (see Appendix 5).

## **6.2 Main activities and deadlines**

The total duration of the evaluation will be of 19 days according to the following plan:

Preparation for field work: (4 days, including travel time)

- Obtain project documentation and other material containing project information (PIRs, TPR reports, mid-term evaluation and other evaluations, etc.).
- Become familiar with the overall development situation of the country (through reviewing the CCA, UNDAF and other country reports).
- Prepare the mission in detail, including methodology, in cooperation with UNDP-CO and the project team.
- Have a conference with the UNDP-GEF Regional Advisor

Mission: (9 days)

- Meeting with UNDP-CO team;
- Meetings with relevant national key actors
- Joint review of all project available material, with special focus on project results and outputs
- Visit to project site
  - Monitoring and reviewing completed and ongoing activities (capacity building, awareness/education, demonstration activities of sustainable use, community development, etc.).
  - Interviews with beneficiaries and key actors, including representatives from the local authority, local environmental authority, communities, etc.

Draft Report (4 days): this must be delivered no later than two weeks before completing the mission.

- Final Interviews/validation with UNDP-CO, UNDP-GEF-RCU and the project team
- Project draft in the appropriate format
- Telephonic Review of the final conclusions with UNDP-CO and the RCU Regional Technical Advisor
- Complete and submit the final report for comments. The parties will deliver comments within a month period.

Final Report (2 days)

- Final delivery of the evaluation report, including comments from key actors and team members.

## **7 SCOPE OF THE FINAL EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE COVERED**

### **7.1 Scope of the evaluation**

The scope of an EF (its Spanish acronym) will depend on the project type, size, focal area, and country context. In all cases, the EF must properly examine and evaluate the perspectives of various key actors. In most cases, an EF will include field visits to verify the project achievements and interviews with stakeholders who are essential to a national and local level, where appropriate. It also discusses the use of GEF resources and co-financing in the broader context of the country.

It is generally expected that the evaluations in the GEF explore the following five major criteria:

- **Relevance.** The extent to which the activity is appropriate for development priorities and national and local organizational policies, including changes over time.
- **Effectiveness.** The extent to which a goal has been achieved or how likely to be achieved.
- **Efficiency.** The extent to which the results have been delivered with more economic resources possible, also known as cost effectiveness or efficiency.
- **Results.** The positive and negative, the foreseen and unforeseen, changes and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct products of the project, results in the short and medium term and longer-term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects and other local effects.
- **Sustainability.** The likely ability of an intervention to continue delivering benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally, financially and socially sustainable.

The following should be covered in the report of EF:

#### ***General overview of the evaluation.***

The (EF) report will provide information of when the evaluation took place; places visited, who was involved, key questions, and the methodology used.

### ***Evaluation of the project results.***

The EFs will evaluate at minimum the achievement of outputs and outcomes and provide measurements for the results. This seeks to determine the extent to which the project results were achieved, or expected to be achieved, and evaluate whether the project has led to any positive or negative consequence. While evaluating the results of a project, the EFs will seek to determine the extent of achievements and failures in achieving the project objective as stated in the project document and also indicate whether there are any changes and if these changes were approved and achieved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator in conjunction with the project team should seek to calculate the initial conditions (baseline) so the achievements and results can be properly established. As in most GEF projects the achievement of results can be expected before the end of the project, the evaluation of the project results should be a priority. The results are the effect in short-or medium term, probable or achieved products of an intervention. Examples of results may include, but are not restricted the strengthening of institutional capacities, building, higher public awareness (when driving behavior changes), and transformation of policy and market frameworks.

To determine the level of achievement of project results and objectives, the following three criteria will be evaluated in the EF:

- **Relevance:** Were the project results consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and priorities of country? Evaluators should also measure the extent to which the outcomes specified in the project document and results are really results and not products or inputs.
- **Effectiveness:** Are project results proportional to the expected results (such as described in the project document) and the problems the project sought to address (e.g. original project objectives or modified)? In case the original or modified results are only products/inputs, then the evaluators should measure whether there was any real project result, if any, then, if they are proportional to the realistic expectations of these projects.
- **Efficiency:** Was the project cost effective? Was the project the lowest cost option? Was the project implementation delayed, and if it was, did this affect the effectiveness of cost? Whenever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. project results with other similar projects.

The assessment of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency should be as objective as possible and include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally the project monitoring system should provide quantifiable information that will lead us to a strong evaluation of the project effectiveness and efficiency. As projects have different objectives, the evaluated results are not comparable and cannot be accumulated. To monitor the portfolio strength, the project results will be classified as follows:

**Highly Satisfactory (HS):** The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Satisfactory (S):** The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Moderately Satisfactory (MS):** The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU):** The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.

**Unsatisfactory (U):** The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.

**Highly Unsatisfactory (HI):** The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency.

Evaluators will also evaluate the positive and negative current (or anticipated) or long-term emerging project effects. Given the nature of long-term impacts, it may not be possible for evaluators to identify and fully evaluate them. Anyway, evaluators will indicate the steps taken to evaluate project impacts, especially impacts on local populations, local environment (e.g. increased number of individuals of endangered species, improved water quality, increased the amount of fish, reduced greenhouse gas emissions) and when possible indicate how the findings on the impacts will be reported to GEF in the future.

### ***Evaluation of sustainability of project results***

The EF will evaluate at minimum, the "likelihood of sustainability of results at the end of the project, and provide a classification for this." Sustainability assessment will give special attention to the analysis of risks that could probably affect the persistence of the project results. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors other than project results will affect the sustainability. More details about the sustainability assessment are provided in Appendix 2.

### ***Catalytic role***

The final evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effect is identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project has done.

### ***Evaluation of monitoring and evaluation systems***

The EF will value whether the project met the requirements of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) project design and the implementation of the M&E project plan. GEF projects must adequately budget for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources for the implementation of the M&E plan. It is also expected that project managers use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to improve and adapt the project. Due to the long duration of many GEF projects, they are encouraged to include plans for long term monitoring to measure outcomes (such as environmental results) after project completion. It is expected that the EF report includes separate evaluations of achievements and shortcomings of these two types of M&E systems.

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix 1: List of documents to be reviewed by evaluators

Appendix 2: Explanation of GEF Terminology

Appendix 3: Financial Planning - Co-Financing

Appendix 4: Management and Monitoring Response Table

Appendix 5: Review and Approval Form

Appendix 6: TdR of National Consultant

Appendix 7: TdR Implementation Specialist

Appendix 8: Evaluation report structure

## APPENDIX 1. LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY EVALUATORS

<b>TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>
• Project Implementation Report – PIR (year 2004-2010).	PROJECT – UNDP
• Tripartite 2004, tripartite 2005.	PROJECT – UNDP
• Mid Term Evaluation 2005.	PROJECT – UNDP
• Substantive revision of the project, year 2006.	PROJECT
• GEF <i>Evaluation Office</i> Report on CO and Paraguay Silvestre	PROJECT
• Reports of the National Coordination and Main Technical Advisor.	PROJECT
• Lessons learned from the Project Paraguay Silvestre	PROJECT
• List of publications.	PROJECT
• List of training courses.	PROJECT
• List of consultancies	PROJECT
• List of agreements	PROJECT
• Other documents related to the project	
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE DOCUMENTS</b>	
• Audits.	PROJECT
• Project budget and execution year 2004-2010.	PROJECT

## APPENDIX 2. EXPLANATION OF GEF TERMINOLOGY

**The Implementation Approach** includes an analysis of the project logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in planning the implementation, changes in project design and the handling/management/administration of the project in general.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

- The use of Logical Framework during the implementation, as a management tool and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)
- Effective partnerships established for project implementation with relevant key actors involved in the country/region
- Lessons from other relevant projects (i.e. same focal area) incorporated into project implementation.
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

**National Ownership** is the relevance of the project for development and environmental agendas of the country, recipient country commitments, and regional and international agreements (when applicable).

Some elements of effective ownership may include:

- The concept of the project is originated from sectorial plans and development of the country.
- The project results (or potential outcomes) have been incorporated into sectorial plans and development of the country.
- Relevant representatives of the country (i.e. government officials, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in the identification, planning and/or project implementation
- The beneficiary government keeps a financial commitment towards the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project objectives

For those projects whose main focus and actors are mostly in the private sector than in the public sector (i.e. IFC projects), elements of effective ownership that demonstrate the interest and commitment of local private sector towards the project may include:

- The number of companies involved in the project: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending events of diffusion, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- The amount contributed to by the participating companies to achieve environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: investments in equity, guarantees provided, project activities co-financing, contributions in kind, etc.
- Project collaboration with industry associations

**Participation of Key Actors** consists of three processes that are related, and usually, overlapping. These are: dissemination of information, consultation and participation of "key actors." Key actors can be individuals, groups, institutions and other agencies that have an interest or a role in the outcome of the project funded by the GEF. The term also includes those who may be negatively affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

### Dissemination of information

- Implementation of appropriate sensitization /awareness campaign

- Consultation and participation of actors
- Consulting and using skills, experience and knowledge of NGOs, communities and local groups, private and public sector and academic institutions in the project design and evaluation activities

#### Participation of key actors

- Project institutional networks well placed in all national or community organizational structures, for example, encouraging community decision-making structures incorporating local knowledge and transferring management responsibilities to local or community organizations as the project draws to closure
- Building partnerships between different key actors of the project
- Fulfillment of commitments towards local key actors and key actors consider they have been properly involved

**Sustainability** measures the extent of the continuation of benefits within or outside the scope of a particular project, once the external assistance of the GEF has come to an end. Relevant factors to improving the sustainability of project results include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy
- Establishment of tools and financial and economical mechanisms to ensure the steady flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities and market transformations to promote the project objectives)
- Development of appropriate institutional arrangements by the public and/or private sector
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks which promote the project objectives
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors that affect the future flow of benefits
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, experts, etc.).
- Identification and involvement of *advocates* (e.g., individuals in government and civil society that could promote the sustainability of project results)
- Achieving social sustainability, for example, that project activities be integrated or incorporated (mainstreaming) within the economy or community productive activities
- Reaching consensus among key actors as to the course of action on the project activities

**Replicability** in the context of GEF projects is defined as lessons and experiences arising from the project, those that are replicated or expanded in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can be in the field of: appropriate replica (lessons and experiences that were replicated in different geographic areas) or of extension (lessons and experiences that are replicated from the same geographic area but funded by another source). Examples of replication approaches include:

- Transfer of knowledge (i.e., dissemination of lessons through documents on the outcome of the project, training workshops, exchange of experiences, national and regional forums, etc.).
- Expansion of demonstrational projects
- Capacity building and training of individuals and institutions to expand the project scope in the country or other regions.
- Put individuals, institutions or companies into trained for the project into service to replicate the project results in other regions

**Financial Planning** includes actual project costs per activity, financial management (including disbursement issues) and co-financing (see Appendix 2 for further discussion on co-financing) if there has been a financial audit, the findings of major relevance should be presented in the TE.

Adequate financial plans include:

- Rigorous financial controls, including reporting and planning, that enable project management to make decisions based on the budget at any time, allowing a flow of proper funds, on time, and for payment of tangible project products
- Diligence in managing funds and financial audits

**Cost-effectiveness** evaluates the scope of the environmental objectives and of project development, as well as products related to effort, cost and implementation time. It also examines the project compliance with the application of the concept of incremental cost. The cost-effectiveness factors include:

- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have been possible without funding from the GEF) and ensure co-financing and associated financing
- The project met the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected results in terms of the scope of the Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule and cost-effective as initially planned.
- The project used a benchmark approach or comparative approach (level did not exceed the project costs developed in a similar context). A benchmark approach in projects on Climate Change and Ozone measures the cost-effectiveness using an accepted threshold such as \$10 tons of carbon equivalent reduced, and thresholds for gradual withdrawal of specific substances that reduce the ozone measures in terms of dollars spent per kg (\$ / kg) of each type of ODS reduced.

**Monitoring and Evaluation.** Monitoring is the periodic supervision of a process or the implementation of an activity that seeks to establish whether the contributions, work plans, other required actions and products are making progress as planned, in order to take timely actions to correct the deficiencies identified. Evaluation is the process by which the program inputs, activities and results are analyzed and judged explicitly against the standards or conditions of the baseline using performance indicators. This will enable managers and project planners to make decisions based on evidence of information on the level of project implementation, performance indicators, level of available funding, etc. based on the project logical framework.

Monitoring and evaluation include activities to measure the scope of the project such as identifying progress indicators, measurement procedure and determining the baseline. Projects need to implement monitoring and evaluation plans with adequate funding and appropriate personnel and include activities such as data collection methods, the description of sources, gathering baseline data and participation of key actors. Given the long-term nature of many GEF projects, projects are encouraged to include plans for long term monitoring to be sustainable once the project has ended.

**APPENDIX 3. FINANCIAL PLANNING – CO-FINANCING**

Cofinancing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (US\$ in thousands)		Government (US\$ in thousands)		Other* (US\$ in thousands)		Total (US\$ in thousands)		Total Disbursement (US\$ in thousands)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants										
Loans/Concessions l (compared to market rate)										
Credits										
Equity investments										
In-kind support										
Other (*)										
<b>Totals</b>										

\* Others refer to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral agencies of cooperation and development, NGOs, private sector and beneficiaries.

**Leverage resources**

Leverage resources are additional resources-beyond those committed at the time of the project approval- which are mobilized after the direct project results. Leverage resources can be financial or in kind, and these can come from other donors, NGOs, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since the beginning and indicate how these resources have contributed to the ultimate aim.

**APPENDIX 4 –MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING RESPONSE TABLE**

Evaluation title: \_\_\_\_\_

Finalization of the Evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_

Main recommendations and key issues	Management response/administration*			Monitoring**		
	Response	Key Actions	Date	Responsible Unit (s)	Status** *	Comments

\* Unit (s) assigned to be accountant to prepare a management response/administration should complete the columns under section of response handling/administration.

\*\* Unit (s) assigned to be accountant to prepare a management response/administration shall update the status of implementation.

\*\* \* Implementation Status: Completed, Partially Completed, Pending.

**APPENDIX 5: APPROVAL FORM TO BE COMPLETED BY UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF-RCU**

Revise and approved by:

***UNDP Country Office***

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Date:

***UNDP-GEF-RCU***

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Date:

## **APPENDIX 6. TERMS OF REFERENCE SPECIALIST ON ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PROJECTS**

### **Activities:**

1. Ensure that the assessment is carried out in an objective manner by providing an external perspective to the project immediate environment, but from the point of view of national and local levels.
2. Evaluating managerial and administrative aspects, including the various implementation arrangements used throughout the project life and the evaluation of actual costs for components and activities, the cost-effectiveness of the results, financial management (including payments), co-financing and incremental compliance costs.
3. Evaluation of the project operational frameworks and the effectiveness of the modality of project implementation, and recommendations for future projects.
4. Assist in the evaluation of project development and the achievement of outcomes and impacts.
5. Evaluate aspects of the project financial planning according to operational plans set at the beginning of each implementation year.
6. Review the audit opinions and monitor the execution of its recommendations regarding compliance with the rules and procedures of the UNDP and GEF administrative, financial and project reports.
7. Evaluating inter-sectorial relationships that have contributed to the implementation and effective achievement of project objectives.
8. Collect basic documentation, prepare meetings, identify key individuals, assist with planning, among others.
9. In conjunction with the evaluation *team leader* analyze the success of the project with respect to achieving its immediate objectives and impacts, identifying causes and motives.
10. Evaluation of management and financial aspects of the viability of sustainability of the four areas and system level (SINASIP) post-project interventions.

### **Consultant Profile:**

- At least 8 years of professional experience in the environmental field.
- At least 5 work experiences related to planning and implementation of projects aimed in the conservation of protected areas preferably in Paraguay.

- At least 3 work experiences that reflect the knowledge and assessment of administrative and financial systems of similar projects in terms of thematic, magnitude and complexity.
- At least 5 working experiences in the preparation of project evaluation reports. (Excluding environmental impact assessments), preferably in the area of environmental conservation.
- At least 3 work experiences that reflect the knowledge of the logical framework and/or results-based management.
- Fluent in Spanish, shown in the generation of various reports and/or publications.
- At least 3 working experiences with international organizations with knowledge of UNDP and GEF financial rules and regulations.
- Team work experience.

<b>Products</b>	<b>Payment</b>	<b>Date</b>
1. Work schedule and index proposal prepared in consensus with the <i>team leader</i> .	<b>20%</b>	Within 5 days of signing the contract
2. Evaluation report draft, including results of the mission in Paraguay and project documents analysis.	<b>40%</b>	Within 10 days of concluded the mission to Paraguay
3 Final Report, incorporating the comments of SEAM and UNDP (RCU and CO).	<b>40%</b>	Within 10 days of receiving the comments of SEAM and UNDP (RCU-CO)

## **APPENDIX 7. TERMS OF REFERENCE FOREST ECOSYSTEMS MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST**

The specialist in implementation will be the *team leader* and will coordinate activities with the specialist in technical and sustainability aspects. The *team leader* will be responsible for drafting the final report, and also focus on the following assessments:

1. Evaluate the project design and the objectives set, as well as achieved results and impacts. Products obtained will be assessed against the five criteria set forth in the ToR of the Final Evaluation (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, outcomes and sustainability)
2. Evaluate the elements of sustainability and ownership
3. Evaluate the implementation of monitoring and evaluation tools, and the quality of periodic reviews during the implementation, in order to establish good practices and lessons learned.
4. Evaluate the institutional strengthening and the capacity transference to public and private sectors achieved through the project, as well as *partnership* strategies to ensure compliance with co-financing commitments.
5. Evaluating inter-sectorial relations and institutional and social context that contributed or obstructed the effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.
6. Assess the relevance of the activities related to knowledge management.
7. Evaluate the relevance of gender perspective in the various activities of the project and level of impact.
8. Compile and edit the material produced by the evaluation team in Spanish

### **Required profile:**

- At least 10 years of professional experience in the environmental area and specifically in forest ecosystems.
- At least 3 work experiences as a team leader in project evaluation processes, preferably in the area of the GEF.
- At least 5 work experiences that reflect knowledge of the administrative management systems and similar project reports in terms of thematic, magnitude and complexity.
- At least 3 work experiences that reflect the knowledge of the logical framework and/or results-based management.
- At least 3 working experiences with international organizations, and preferably with the GEF/UNDP.

- Fluent in Spanish, shown in the generation of various reports and/or publications.
- English proficiency.
- Team work experience.

<b>Products</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Date</b>
4. Work schedule, and proposal of the final report index, incorporating national consultant inputs.	<b>20%</b>	Within 5 days of signing the contract
5. Evaluation report draft, including results of the mission in Paraguay and the analyses of project documents, incorporating the results of the national consultant.	<b>40%</b>	Within 10 days of concluding the mission
6. Final report that incorporates comments of SEAM, UNDP (RCU and CO).	<b>40%</b>	Within 10 days of receiving the comments of SEAM UNDP (RCU and CO)

## APPENDIX 8 FINAL REPORT STRUCTURE

### **Chapter 1. Executive Summary**

- Brief project description
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
- A table summarizing the scores on this assessment

### Chapter 2. Introduction

- Purpose of evaluation
- Key issues addressed
- Evaluation methodology
- Evaluation structure

### **Chapter 3. The project and its development context**

- Beginning and duration of the project
- Problems that the project seeks to address
- Immediate and development project objectives
- Actors
- Expected Results

### **Chapter 4. Results and conclusions**

In addition to the evaluation of effectiveness and efficiency described above a descriptive analysis must be submitted. All criteria marked with (\*) must be rated using the following category divisions: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Please see Appendix 2 for explanation of GEF terminology.

#### **4.1. Project Formulation**

The section should begin by describing the context of the problem that the project is dealing with. It must describe how efficient were the design and how the project was conceptualized to address the problem, making emphasis on consistency and logic of the project strategy and its logical framework. This section must answer questions such as *¿how well was the project formulated? Did the modifications made during its execution, resulted in better products and (potentially) greater impact?* This section should include the following:

- Conceptualization/design (\*): This section must evaluate the approach used in the design and deliver a proper appreciation of how the problem was conceptualized and whether the intervention strategy selected was the best option to address the barriers in the project area.

It must also include an evaluation of the logical framework and whether the various components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to the institutional, legal and regulatory project setting. It must also evaluate the indicators defined for guiding the implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons learned from other relevant projects (in the same focal area) were incorporated into the project design.

- **The national ownership**: It should evaluate if the initial project idea was originated in local development plans, national or sectorial and if the project meets the national interests in terms of the environment and development.
- **Participation of actors (\*)**: It should assess if there was information dissemination, consultation and participation of stakeholders in the project design.
- **Replicability**: Determine how the lessons and experiences from the project were or could be replicated or expanded in the design and implementation of other projects (this also relates to the practices carried out during implementation).
- **Other aspects**: Evaluate in the review of project formulation approach the comparative advantage of UNDP as the implementing agency for the project; the consideration of links between projects and other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate arrangements for the management in the design stage

#### **4.2 Project Implementation**

- **Implementation Approach (\*)**: Whether the project has been designed correctly, the next question to ask is: *has the project been well implemented?* Among others, it should evaluate the following aspects:

(ii) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and all changes made to it in response to changing conditions and/or feedback from the monitoring and evaluation activities.

(iii) Other factors that demonstrate existence of adaptive management, such as the systematic development of wide and realistic work plans and/or changes in management arrangements to improve implementation.

(iv) The establishment and use of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.

(v) The operational relations between institutions and other participants and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.

(vi) Technical capabilities associated with the project and its role in the development, management and achievement of the project.

- **Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) (\*)**: Include an assessment of whether there has been regular monitoring and adequate activities during implementation in order to establish whether the supplies, jobs, schedules, required actions and results have advanced as planned. If there has been formal evaluation assess if action has been taken regarding the results and conclusions from them. To evaluate this. It is proposed that evaluators used the following criteria:

i) Evaluate whether there has been an appropriate M&E system which has allowed monitoring the progress towards achieving the project outcomes and objectives. ii) Evaluate if proper M&E tools had been used such as adequate baseline, practical and clear indicators, data analyses, studies to evaluate the expected outcome for certain stages of the project (outputs or progress indicators). iii) Evaluate whether there were resources and capabilities to carry out adequate monitoring system and if the M&E was used for the management/adaptive administration of the project.

- **Participation of Actors (\*)**: This should include an evaluation of the mechanisms for the dissemination of information on project implementation and the degree of participation of actors in management, emphasizing the following aspects:

- (i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project
- (ii) The participation of local users and NGOs in project implementation and decision making. Analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this area.
- (iii) The establishment of alliances and partnerships between the project and local, national and international entities and the impact they have had on the project implementation  
The involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the degree of government support to the project

- **Financial Planning**: It must include an analyses of:

- (i) Actual project costs by objective, outputs and activities.
- (ii) The cost-effectiveness of the results. Was the project cost effective?
- (iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)
- (iv) The co-financing (see Appendix 3 for indications on the report of co-financing. This table should be completed and submitted in the document assessment).

- **Methods of execution and Implementation**: This should consider the effectiveness of UNDP counterpart and participation of the Project Coordination Unit in the selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart personnel and the definition of tasks and responsibilities. The quantity, quality and timeliness of earnings (supplies) for the project with respect to execution responsibilities. Enactment of legislation and budgetary provisions and the extent to which these may have affected the putting into practice and sustainability of the project. The quality and timeliness of the contributions of UNDP and the Government, if any, of other counterparts responsible for providing implementation of the resources to the project and the extent to which this has affected the project. This section should seek to answer the following questions: *Did the modality of implementation and execution of the project operate in an efficient and effective manner? Did an effective communication with critical actors for the response to the needs of the implementation occur? Were administrative costs reasonable?*

### **4.3 Results**

Achievement of products/results and objectives (\*): This final evaluation seeks to determine the success achieved on the goal and project result and if there has been any positive or negative impact. For this is important to determine the project successes and failures in achieving its purpose and results. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial condition), the evaluators, along with the project team must try to determine the use of special methodologies to properly set achievements, outcomes and impacts. This analysis should be carried out based on project-specific indicators. This section should also include an assessment of the following:

This section should also review the following aspects:

- **Sustainability**: Including an appreciation of how the project benefits continue, within or outside the project area after GEF assistance ends. Sustainability analysis of results should give special attention to the risks that may affect the continuity of results. Sustainability analysis should also explain in which way other contextual factors that are not project results will affect it sustainability. This analysis should be done based on the following four dimensions of sustainability. Furthermore, these dimensions should be labeled with the categories described in the foot page<sup>3</sup>:

- **Financial Resources**: Is there any financial risk that could affect the sustainability of the initiative? What is the probability that there are no financial resources to sustain the project results after GEF support has ended? (Resources can be of a variety of sources including: public and private sectors, resource-generating activities, and trends indicate that future funding would be adequate to sustain the project results).

- **Socio-Political**: Are there any social or political risks that may adversely affect the continuity of the project results? Is there a risk that the appropriation of the actors be insufficient to ensure the continuity of benefits and results? Do project key actors show interest in the continuation of benefits? Was the awareness of the public and actors to continue supporting the project objective in the long term achieved?

**Institutional setting and governance**: Does the institutional framework and governance exert a risk to the continuation of project benefits? It should also be considered whether the systems for accountability and transparency and the ability (expertise) are adequate and available to continue the initiative.

---

<sup>3</sup>Probable (P): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability

Moderately likely (MP): There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks affecting this dimension of sustainability

Improbable (I): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

- Environmental: Are there any environmental hazards or activities in the project area that may reduce the future flow of project environmental benefits? The final evaluation should assess whether some project activities can exert some kind of threat to the sustainability of project results. For example, the construction of a dam in a protected area could inundate a wide area and thus neutralize the biodiversity benefits achieved by the project.

- **Contribution to improve national staff/local skills.**

## **Chapter 5. Conclusions and recommendations**

This section should provide the main points or conclusions of the evaluation and provide specific recommendations. Recommendations should be specific to indicate who/whom are addressed. Please complete the relevant columns of the table in Appendix 4 with the main recommendations. This section must contain:

- Final comments or syntheses regarding relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results and sustainability of the project
- Final comments regarding the results and achievement of project objectives;
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project;
- Follow-up actions to enhance the initial project benefits;
- Proposals for future directions to strengthen the achievement of main objectives;

## **Chapter 6. Lessons Learned**

The evaluators will present lessons and recommendations on all aspects of the project that they consider relevant. Evaluators are asked to pay special attention to analyze the lessons making recommendations on issues related to factors that help or hinder the achievement of the objective and project results, the sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, and monitoring and evaluation. Here are some questions to consider:

- Is there anything worth mentioning that is special or critical that we learned during the project implementation this year that is important to share with other projects so they can avoid this error or use this opportunity”?
- What would you do differently if you’d start the project again?
- How does this project contribute to technology transference?
- In which ways did the project contribute to technology transference?
- To what extent has this project UNDP-GEF been relevant to national or local efforts to reduce poverty/democratic governance/strengthening capacities for crisis prevention and recovery/gender equality and empowerment of women? Please explain
- Did the project generate global environmental benefits along with contributing to the achievement of national priorities for environmental management and sustainable development?

## **Appendices to evaluation report**

- Terms of reference of the evaluation
- Agenda and itinerary
- List of interviewees
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Used questionnaires and summary of results
- Reviews from actors (only in case of any discrepancy with the findings and conclusions of the evaluation)
- Review and approval form of the RCU and the CO

## 7.2 Appendix 2: Agenda and itinerary

### FINAL EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT “PARAGUAY SILVESTRE” (PAR/97/G33) “Initiative for the protection of Wilderness Areas”

Work Schedule of Team Work – May 11 to 28 of 2011

Evaluating Team: Ronny Muñoz (Costa Rica) and Celeste Acevedo (Paraguay)

Date	Activity
05/11/2011	1) In Person and virtual interview of consultants with V. Gerard (UNDP)
05/12/2011	2) Work of consultants. Virtual meeting. Organization, preliminary planning, Analysis of the methodological approach, actors consult, etc.
05/13/2011	1) Meeting with Regional Office colleagues and V. Gerard 8.00 – 11.00 am 2) Work with consultants. Rest of the day.
05/14/2011	NONE
05/15/2011	NONE
05/16/2011	1) National and international consultant work. 2) Construction and revision of the interview agenda.
05/17/2011	1) Lecture and analyses of existing documents on behalf of both consultants.
05/18/2011	1) Transfer of the international consultant. 2) <b>I UNDP Meeting:</b> Introductory aspects. V. Gerard, C. Acevedo, R. Muñoz and L. Gómez. List of actors to be contacted. 3) <b>II SEAM Meeting:</b> Protocol Aspects. V. Gerard, C. Acevedo, R. Muñoz, L. Gómez, I. Basualdo, J. C. Aranda, I. List of actors to be contacted
05/19/2011	1) <b>III UNDP Meeting:</b> Interview, both free and scheduled with O. Ferreiro, R Muñoz and C. Acevedo. List of actors to be contacted. 2) Joint work of all the consultants for the adjustment of: Final schedule; b) tentative index of the document to be produced and c) methodology to be use. Elaboration of Product 1 established in TOR.
05/20/2011	1) <b>IV SEAM Meeting:</b> Interview, both free and scheduled with: Authorities and Park Rangers. Completion of the list of actors to be interviewed in San Rafael area. 2) <b>V UNDP Meeting:</b> Video interview with the UNDP-GED Regional Office of Coordination of Pierre-Yves GUEDEZ, consultants and V. Gerard. 3) Work of Consultants: gathered information analyses as preparation of field work
05/21/2011	1) Preparation of materials for field work 2) Joint work of consultants
05/21/2011	1) Interview with actors in the area for the National Park Reserve "San Rafael"

05/22/2011	1) Interview with actors in the area for the National Park Reserve "San Rafael"
05/23/2011	1) Consultation with actors, application and review of documents
05/24/2011	1) Consultation with actors, application and review of documents. Preliminary Analysis.
05/25/2011	1) Consultation with actors, application and review of documents. Preliminary Analysis.
05/26/2011	1) Consultation with actors, application and review of documents. Preliminary Analysis. 2) Preparation of preliminary results presentation and closing of the mission in Paraguay
05/27/2011	1) Presentation of preliminary results of the work done by consultants. 2) Closing Meeting with Pierre-Yves GUEDEZ.V. UNDP Regional and Gerard of UNDP Paraguay
05/28/2011	1) International consultant return trip
	1) Final Report Evaluation delivery.
	1) Comments on the Final Evaluation Report on behalf of the UNDP and SEAM
	1) Incorporation of comments to the Final Evaluation Report

### 7.3 Appendix 3: List of interviewees

<b>Relevant Actor</b>	<b>Position</b>
Alfredo Molinas	Former vice minister
Ana Maria Macedo	Red Paraguaya de Conservación Privada
Blanca Masulli	Former coordinator of environmental education of the project
Cristine Hostelter	Procosara Director
Enrique Bragayrac	Former Project advisor
Ernestina Camps	Project Consultant
Isabel Basualdo	Director of SEAM
Isaseo Espínola	Executive Director of San Rafael Environmental Promoters. Firefighter's committee. Former member of the Local Committee of San Rafael.
Ismael Arias Barreto	Park Ranger of AP Paso Bravo
José Cartes	Directive of the Foundation Guyra Paraguay
Juan Carlos Aranda	Director of Protected Areas of SEAM
Mario Torales	AP Park Ranger
Oscar Ferreiro	Former coordinator of the project Paraguay Silvestre
Oscar Rodas Insfrán	Directive of the Foundation Guyra Paraguay
Raúl Alonso Benitez	Park Ranger of AP San Rafael
Veronique Gerald	UNDP Project Official
Victor Benitez	Alter Vida Director
Victoria Aquino	Former Mayor of Alto Vera, area of San Rafael
Roque Bogado	Former Project Manager of the project PN San Rafael

## 7.4 Appendix 4: Summary of field visits

Visit to San Rafael protected area  
Sunday 22 and Monday 23 of May of 2011

The field visit was conducted in the context of the activities foreseen in the Mission of the Project final evaluation. The delegation consisted of Mr. Ronny Muñoz, International Consultant and Mission leader, Mrs. Celeste Acevedo, National Consultant, and Mr. Raul Alonso, Park Ranger, who acted as guide to the Mission in the field. The visited area was the Reserve for San Rafael National Park and its buffer zone. Mobility requirements were provided by the Secretariat of Environment and UNDP.

Interviews were conducted with key actors: 1) Christine Hostettler, PROCOSARA; 2) Isacio Espinola, NGOs, Environmental Advocates, 3) Ma. Victoria Aquino Laguna, Former Mayor of the Municipality of Alto Vera, 4) Park Rangers of the NGO Guyra Paraguay settled in the site called Kanguery.

The route considered visiting the following places: 1) South Area of the Buffer Zone of the Reserve for San Rafael National Park; 2) Property of Guyra Paraguay NGO, in the site called Kanguery; 3) Internal Reserve area paths, in transit through property of ownership of existing indigenous communities in the Reserve for National Park.

## 7.5 Appendix 5: List of revised documents

SEAM. 2010. Audit Report 2008-2010. Paraguayan Initiative Project for the Protection of Wilderness Areas PAR/98/G33. Paraguay: GEF/UNDP/SEAM

UNDP. 2010. Combined Delivery Report by Project (CDR) years 2006-2010. Paraguayan Initiative Project for the Protection of Wilderness Areas PAR/98/G33. Paraguay: GEF/UNDP/SEAM

SEAM. Sf. Inventory of durable goods. Paraguayan Initiative Project for the Protection of Wilderness Areas PAR/98/G33. Paraguay: GEF/UNDP/SEAM

SEAM. 2010. Catalogue of publications of the project Initiative for the Protection of Wilderness Areas of Paraguay. Paraguayan Initiative Project for the Protection of Wilderness Areas PAR/98/G33. Paraguay: GEF/UNDP/SEAM.

SEAM. 2005. Mid Term Evaluation. Project for the Protection of Wilderness Areas Paraguay: GEF/UNDP/SEAM.

SEAM. National Wildlife Areas. Strategic of 2010-2015. Paraguayan Initiative Project for the Protection of Wilderness Areas PAR/98/G33. Paraguay: GEF/UNDP/SEAM, 2009.

SEAM. 2009. National System of Wildlife Areas. Financial Sustainability Plan. Paraguayan Initiative Project for the Protection of Wilderness Areas PAR/98/G33. Paraguay: GEF/UNDP/SEAM.

SEAM. 2006. Sustantive Revision. Paraguayan Initiative Project for the Protection of Wilderness PAR/98/G33. Paraguay: GEF/UNDP/SEAM.

SEAM. 2009. Project Coordinator Reports. Paraguayan Initiative Project for the Protection of Wilderness PAR/98/G33. Paraguay: GEF/UNDP/SEAM.

UNDP. 2000. Project PAR/98/G33 “Initiative Project for the Protection of Wilderness of Paraguay” – Project Budget Program of the United Nations for the Development. 110pp.

UNDP. 2010. - Project Implementation Review (PIR) of UNDP supported GEF Financed Project – 1421 Paraguayan Wildlands Protection Initiative. United Nations Development Programme. Unpublished paper. 28pp.

UNDP. 2011. Terms of Reference for the final evaluation of the Project “Initiative for the protection of Wilderness Areas of Paraguay”. Unpublished Document. United Nations Development Programme 25pp.

UNDP. 2011. UNDP evaluation guidance for self-financed projects version for external evaluators. (Final draft, march 17th 2011). 39pp.

ABC. 2001. Call to Public Competition for the hiring of Principal Technical Advisor for the Project PAR/98/G33 “Initiative for the Protection of Wilderness Protected Areas of Paraguay”. June - 2001. Pp. 30

Talvela, K. & H. Torres. 2005. Mid Term Evaluation Report of the Project PAR/98/G33 “Initiative for the Protection of Wilderness Protected Areas of Paraguay”. 58pp. Unpublished Document.

UNDP. 2006. 02Substantive Revision of the Project PAR/98/G33 “Initiative for the Protection of Wilderness Protected Areas of Paraguay”. United Nations Development Programme 22pp + 16 appendices. Unpublished Document.

UNDP.2011c. Handbook on planning monitoring and evaluating for development result. United Nations Development Programme.

<http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/documents/english/pme-handbook.pdf>

## 7.6 Appendix 6: Instruments used

### Instrument 1: Questionnaire for semi-structured interview

#### Effectiveness

1. To what extent were the project results achieved?
2. In which way were caused positive and negative effects not considered in the project?
3. In what ways are emerging long-term project effects prevented?
4. In which way the limiting factors and

#### Sustainability

1. In which way can the benefits produced by the project in the future be maintained or increased?
2. How can risks that affect the sustainability of results occur?
3. In which way can the M&E System of the project support the future management of the project results?

#### Management

4. In which way did the changes made to the project contribute to achieving the objectives and results?
5. How did institutional arrangements affect the achievement of project results?
6. In which way did strategic partners complete the co-financing and other commitments made before and during the program execution?
7. In which way the M & E system favored and was implemented? Design, financing, operation (achievements and deficiencies) usage.

#### Relevance

1. How realistic were the intended results for the project?
2. Were project results consistent with the focal areas / program strategies and priorities of the country?

#### Effectiveness

1. Are the project results proportional to the expected results (such as described in the project document) and the problems that the project originally intended to address (e.g. original or modified project objectives)?
2. To what extent were project objectives achieved?
3. In which way did results allow the achievement of objectives?
4. Are the achieved results realistic for this type of project?

#### Replicability (Catalysis)

Which aspects of the project deserve to be replicated in future initiatives?

Which aspects of the project do not deserve to be replicated in future initiatives?

## Instrument 2: Matrix of actors to be consulted

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	Project Coordinator and Political Authorities	SEAM Director	SEAM Managers Park Rangers	UNDP Paraguay Project Official	Directors of the APs	Local Governments	Non-Governmental Organizations
<b>Effectiveness</b>							
To what extent were the project results achieved?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
In what way were caused positive and negative effects not considered in the project?	X	X	X	X	X		
In what ways are emerging long-term project effects prevented?	X	X	X	X	X		
How other limiting factors did support or had an impact on achieving results?	X	X	X	X	X		
<b>Sustainability</b>							
In which way can the benefits produced by the project in the future be maintained or increased?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
How can risks that affect the sustainability of results occur?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
In which way can the M&E System of the project support the future management of the project results?	X	X	X	X			
<b>Management</b>							

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	Project Coordinator and Political Authorities	SEAM Director	SEAM Managers Park Rangers	UNDP Paraguay Project Official	Directors of the APs	Local Governments	Non-Governmental Organizations
<b>Effectiveness</b>							
In which way did the changes made to the project contribute to achieving the objectives and obtained results?	X	X	X	X	X		
In which way did institutional arrangements affect the achievement of project results?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
In what extent did strategic partners complete the co-financing and other agreed commitments made before and during the program execution?	X	X	X	X			
How was the M & E system implemented? Design, financing, operation (achievements and deficiencies) usage.	X	X	X	X	X		
<b>Relevance</b>							
How realistic were the intended results for the project?	X	X	X	X	X		
Were the project results consistent with the focal areas / program strategies and priorities of the country?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Effectiveness</b>							
Are the project results proportional to the expected results (such as described in the project document) and the problems that the project originally intended to address (e.g. original or modified project objectives)?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	Project Coordinator and Politic Authorities	Director of SEAM	Managers of SEAM Park Rangers	Project Official of the UNDP Paraguay	Directors of the ASP's	Local Governments	Non Gubernamental Organizations
<b>Effectiveness</b>							
To what extent were project objectives achieved?	X	X	X	X	X		
In which way did results allow the achievement of objectives?	X	X	X	X	X		
Are the achieved results realistic for this type of project?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Replicability (Catalysis)</b>							
Which aspects of the project deserve to be replicated in future initiatives?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Which aspects of the project do not deserve to be replicated in future initiatives?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

**Instrument 2: Systematization sheet**

**SHEET APPLIED TO SURVEYS**

**Project PAR/98/G33 “Initiative for the Protection of Wilderness Areas of Paraguay”.  
Final Evaluation**

<b>Interview No.</b>	
<b>Date</b>	

**Interviewee**

**LESSONS LEARNED.**

**OPTIONS.**

**RESULTS.**

**NEEDS.**

**FLEXIBILITIES BUILT AS RESULT OF THE NEEDS.**

**WHAT NOT TO REPLICATE.**

**SUSTAINABILITY.**

## 7.7 APPENDIX 7: Observed Changes in the Project Design.

Results	PRODOC <sup>29</sup>	EMT <sup>30</sup>	Revision 2003/EMT 2005 <sup>31</sup>	Revision 2006 <sup>32</sup>
1	A participatory framework is developed, monitored, and effective and conservation and management plans and regulations are framed and operational	Establish a participatory planning system for the administration and management of selected protected areas selected environmental primary care (ECOCLUBES)	Development of a participatory management framework, implemented as pilot, active and developing management plans for conservation and operational regulations within a legal framework.	The 4 priority APs are legally and operationally consolidated (R 1 and 2), and with the broad management participation of stakeholders so that management objectives can be achieved.
2	The operations of the priority Protected Areas are built and improved	Strengthen operations of protected areas in the four sites;	The operation of the Protected Areas identified as the project objectives is built and improved.	
3	The focus of the DPNVS/MAG institutional capacities, communities and actors of the project areas are strengthened	Training in biodiversity management methods for people working in conservation;	Strengthening the institutional capacity of central and community-based groups in project areas.	Individual and institutional capacities of key actors have been strengthened for the management of the 4 APs, and support of local, regional, national and political actors for APs have been mobilized following an awareness campaign.

<sup>29</sup> Indicators on the Logical Framework of the Project Document (PRODOC)

<sup>30</sup> Mention on the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE), as PRODOC results

<sup>31</sup> In which the MTE is based to value results

<sup>32</sup> Agreed upon Sustantive Review

4	Demonstrations on sustainable use of natural resources completed and scattered results	Overcoming obstacles to the sustainable use of biodiversity components;	Have completed demonstrations of sustainable use of wildlife resources and disseminated results.	The coverage and conservation capacity of the 4 APs have been improved through replicable models of sustainable use of the buffer zone and permitted use areas, and better connectivity between fragments of nearby natural habitats (R 4y6).
6	Conservation values are taught through raising awareness and protection of natural resources	Manage habitats in critical condition in corridors and buffer zones.	Mechanisms for planning and conservation management are designed to integrate conservation and development activities in critical habitats outside parks.	
5	Conservation planning and established management mechanisms to integrate conservation and development activities in critical habitats outside parks.	Develop awareness campaigns to major stakeholders; and	The conservation values are taught through awareness and advocacy.	
New 1				National System of Wilderness Protected Areas strengthened to generate sustainable mechanisms of the 4 APs as a conservation model.
New 2				The management experience of the 4 prioritized, capitalized and systematized APs to facilitate replication with other areas (knowledge management).

Source: Own Elaboration

## 7.8 APPENDIX 8. SINASI LEGAL INSTRUMENTS.

Regulatory RESOLUTIONS, emitted by the Secretariat of Environment for the protection, administration and management of Wilderness Protected Areas since 2000 to date (12/2010)

Resolution No.	Date	MANAGEMENT: Dr. JUAN FRANCISCO FACETTI - YEAR 2000/2001
32	11/10/2000	"By which the Management Committee of the Reserve area for San Rafael National Park, Department of Itapúa is recognized".
47	11/30/2000	Administrative Summary to the firm cueros Del Norte, for Alleged Violation of Wildlife Law No. 96/92
54	12/28/2000	"By which the Period of Collection and Hunt is set, the collection, possession, transport and commercialization of live animals of species of amphibians, reptiles, invertebrates, native wild birds and mammals are authorized".
58	12/28/2000	"By which the Administrative Mechanisms for the Distribution of Commercial Quotas of live animals from wild species are established."
59	12/28/2000	"By which the Requirements to be met by Collection Centers of live animals from wild species are established."
74	01/08/2001	"By which Assignment Resolutions of wildlife for Commercialization Quotas are revoked, and requirements for the operation of the collection centers of live animals established."
196	04/19/2001	"By which the working team is formed to coordinate in conjunction with the Secretariat of Planning in the refurbishment of Ybycui National Park "
<b>MANAGEMENT: Dr. EDMUNDO ROLON OSNHAGI - YEAR 2001/2002</b>		
200	08/24/2001	"By which the Management Category, the Zoning and Uses and Activities are allocated and regulated".
374	10/01/2001	"By approving the justification for the Creation of the Private Reserve called Morombi".
469	10/26/2001	"By which Coordinators for the Elaboration of the Contingency Plan in the Biosphere Cerrado del Río Apa are designated" .
24	01/15/2002	"By which the Management Plan for Defensores del Chaco National Park is approved".
25	01/15/2002	"By which the Management Committee of Defensores del Chaco National Park is recognized".
<b>MANAGEMENT: MENANDRO GRISETTI, ENGINEER - YEAR 2003</b>		
262	05/09/2003	"By which the Technical Justification for the Creation of the Private Reserve called Ypeti is approved".
829	08/27/2003	"By which is recognized the Management Committee of Ybycui National Park is recognized".
<b>MANAGEMENT: Mr. ANTONIO LOPEZ ZAYAS – 2004</b>		
104	06/02/2004	"By which the Conservation and Rational and Sustainable Use of Wildlife of Paraguay is regulated".
230	03/19/2004	"By which the Agapy Group is authorized to perform services such as Environmental Guidelines within Ybycui National Park".
269	03/25/2004	"By which authorization is given to officials of the Secretariat of Environment to manage the savings account No 1,536,951/2 of the project Ybycui Park ".
<b>MANAGEMENT: ALFREDO MOLINAS, AGRONOMIST – 2004</b>		
14	01/09/2004	"By which the Perception of Income for Public Use in Ybycui National Park is established".
148	02/19/2004	"By which authorization is given to Park Rangers of Ybycui National Park to Collect and Issue Receipts for the Secretariat of Environment and its Subsequent Deposit in the Account No. 818558/8, enabled in Banco Nacional de Fomento."
280	03/29/2004	"By which the Article 1 of Resolution No. 148/04, dated February 19, 2004, is partially modified. By which authorization is given to park rangers of Ybycui National Park to collect and issue receipts for the Secretariat of Environment and its Subsequent Deposit in the Account No. 818558 /8, enabled in Banco Nacional de Fomento."
149	06/08/2004	"By which Nature is defined. Objectives and Responsibilities of Management Committees of the Wilderness Areas under public domain".
265	07/07/2004	"By which the Management Committee of Paso Bravo National Park is recognized as an instance of coordination of actions within its boundaries and buffer zones".
301	07/14/2004	"By which the elaboration of the Management Plan of Médanos del Chaco Park is entrusted and the beginning of its measurement tasks and SEAM dependent units are designated responsible for carrying out such actions as are necessary for the effect".

398	08/03/2004	"By which the Act of Intervention Model is approved to be used by the Management of Protected Areas depending of the DGPCB".
497	08/23/2004	"By which the Technical Justification for the Establishment of the Private Reserve Ñu Guazú is approved".
498	08/23/2004	"By which the Justification for the Private Reserve called Toro Mocho is approved ".
740	09/22/2004	"By which is established that all documents of EIA in relation to Protected Areas, their Buffer Zones and wildlife, go through the Biodiversity Division".
744	09/27/2004	"By which authorization is given to the Temporary Transfer of Documents of Cultural Heritage of the Scientific Monument Moisés Santiago Bertoni to the National Library for its treatment".
1022	10/20/2004	"By which is declared of Institutional Interest the Consolidation of the Area of Natural Habitat of the Ayoreo-Totobiegosode".
1136	11/03/2004	"By which the Design and Implementation of Mechanisms that allow the Organization and Integration of the National Council of Wilderness Protected Areas is commended to Menando Grisetti, Forestry Engineer and a period of 60 days is established for the Presentation of a Report of the Proceedings"
1214	11/15/2004	"By which the Management Committee of Médanos del Chaco National Park is recognized as an instance of Coordination of actions within its boundaries and buffer zone".
1624	12/20/2004	"By which the Director of the Directorate of Protected Areas under the General Directorate of Protection and Biodiversity Conservation is designated as representative of the Secretariat of Environment before the "Hombre y la Biosfera" committee
1628	12/21/2004	"By which the Consolidation Project of the Cross-border Conservation Area (tbpa) between Paraguay and Bolivia is declared of Institutional Interest, prepared by the Institute of Environmental Law and Economics".
1692	12/31/2004	"By which the Functions and Supervision of Park Rangers in Wilderness Protected Areas under the public domain are defined comprising the National System of Wilderness Protected Areas".
<b>MANAGEMENT: ALFREDO MOLINAS MALDONADO, AGRONOMIST – YEAR 2005</b>		
43	01/18/2005	"By which the Director of the Directorate of Protected Areas, under the General Directorate of Protection and Biodiversity Conservation is designated, as Counterpart and Coordinator of the Secretariat of the Environment before Itaipu Binacional
91	02/02/2005	"By which Mr. Fausto Ernesto Boveda is named Internal Chief of Park Rangers, to serve in Caaguazú National Park, in replace of Mr. Raul Alonso".
725	04/04/2005	"By which the Technical Justification for the Creation of the Private Reserve called "Tapyta" is approved.
576	04/18/2008	"By which the Sheet to be used for the National Registry of Wilderness Protected Areas of Paraguay" is approved
581	04/20/2005	"By which the Management Committee of the Biosphere Reserve of the Chaco is recognized, as a coordination instance for the management and sustainable development".
781	05/12/2005	"By which the Regulations for Public Use of Protected Areas under the public rule are established".
945	06/10/2005	"By which the Technical Committee of the Secretariat of Environment is formed to assess and report on the verification of environmental and administrative management in the wilderness protected area of Médanos del Chaco".
972	06/13/2005	"By which Mr. Juan Carlos Aranda Perez is designated as Chief of the Management and Planning Department, under the Directorate of Protected Areas of the General Directorate of Protection and Biodiversity Conservation of the Secretariat of Environment".
1063	06/29/2005	"By which the art. 2 Resolution No. 581 dated April 20, 2005 is extended "which is recognized by the Management Committee of the Biosphere Reserve of the Chaco, as coordinating body for environmental management and sustainable development".
1198	07/18/2005	"By which the Signaling Manual of the National System of Wilderness Protected Areas of Paraguay and the Guide for Signaling in wilderness protected areas is approved".
1237	07/22/2005	"By which Mr. Bernardino Cañiza is designated as coordinator and partner of the Secretariat of Environment before Itaipu Binacional, for restoration work on the Scientific Monument Moses Bertoni".
1587	10/05/2005	"By which, Mario Luis Martinez is appointed as Chief of Park Rangers of Ñacunday National Park replacing Mr. Adelio Garcete Agüero.
1827	11/01/2005	"By which the Restoration Modality, the Work Schedule and beginning of work restoration and conservation of bibliographic file belonging to the Scientific Monument Moisés Bertoni is authorized"
1998	11/29/2005	By which the list of threatened wildlife species of Paraguay is approved.
2001	12/01/2005	"By which the Management Committee of Caazapá National Park is recognized as coordinating body for environmental management and sustainable development".

2130	12/16/2005	"By which the Technical Justification for the Establishment of the Private Natural Reserve called "Cerrados del Tagatiya" is approved.
126	01/30/2006	"By which article 1 of Resolution No. 151 dated September 14, 2005 is expanded."By which the art 1 of Resolution No. 582 dated April 21, 2005 is expanded ". By which species and quantities of fish are authorized to be transported by foreign anglers in the city of Ayolas".

524	03/17/2006	"By which the list of threatened wildlife species of Paraguay is approved."
<b>MANAGEMENT: ALFREDO MOLINAS MALDONADO, AGRONOMIST - AÑO 2006</b>		
005	01/0/2007	"By which the Declaration of Private Reserve Proposal is declared of institutional interest by the Paraguayan Federation of Scouting".
746	04/17/2006	"By which the technical justification for the Establishment of the Private Reserve "Palmar Quemado" is approved."
926	05/02/2006	By which the Management Plan of the Médanos del Chaco National Park is approved".
1004	05/16/2006	"By which Mr. Philip Lovera is designated as Department Chief of operations and maintenance, under the Directorate of Protected Areas of the General Directorate of Protection and Biodiversity Conservation.
1017	05/16/2006	"By which functions are relocated and reassigned to park rangers of the Secretariat of the Environment.
1376	07/10/2006	"By which the technical justification for the creation of the Private Reserve called "Estrella" is approved.
1580	08/09/2006	"By which the Management Committee of Caazapá National Park is recognized as coordinating body for environmental management and sustainable development".
1604	08/09/2006	"By which the Management Plan of the Private Reserve called Tapyta, located in the district of San Juan Nepomuceno, department of Caazapá is approved".
1853	08/19/2006	"By which the Management Plan of Paso Bravo National Park is approved".
1822	09/13/2006	"By which the Management Plan of the Private Reserve called "Ypeti" located in the district of Abaí, department of Caazapá is approved".
1834	09/18/2006	"By which the basic structure of management of the projects of exotic native plant nurseries is established".
2002	10/09/2006	"By which the Art 2 of Resolution No. 1944-1906, dated October 2, 2006 is partially corrected "by which is set the fishing ban period".
2045	10/23/2006	"By which the Management Committee of the Managed Resources Reserve Ñu Guazú is recognized as a forum for coordination of actions within its limits and for the compliance of the management plan Managed Resources Reserve Ñu Guazú"
2242	11/15/2006	"By which the list of threatened wildlife species of Paraguay is approved".
2266	11/23/2006	"By which the new Board of Directors of the Management Committee Paso Bravo National Park is recognized".
2436	11/29/2006	"By which officials of the Secretariat of Environment are designated under the new organizational structure of the "Initiative for the Protection of Wildlife Areas of Paraguay" PAR98/Gg33 project.
2437	11/29/2006	"By which the new organizational structure of the "Initiative for the Protection of Wildlife Areas of Paraguay" PAR98/Gg33 project is approved.
2484	12/11/2006	"By which the basic structure for managing projects of serpentariums is established".
<b>MANAGEMENT: CARLOS A. LOPEZ DOSE, ARCHITECT 2007</b>		
242	03/22/2007	"By which the work team is appointed to participate in the Coordination Plan for the Consolidation of Tinfunque National Park".
288	04/04/2007	"By which the Technical Justification for the Establishment of the Private Natural Reserve called "Tagatiya mi" is approved ".
959	07/04/2007	"By which the Management Plan of "Yacyreta Nature Reserve", located on the island Yacyreta, Department of Neembucú is approved"
1038	07/23/2007	"By which the Resolution No. 957/07, dated July 4, 2007 is partially corrected "by which the Management Plan of the Yacyreta Natural Reserve ", located on the island Yacyreta, Department of Neembucú is approved.
1997	11/19/2007	"By which the Technical Justification for the Establishment of Private Natural Reserve Estancia Salazar is approved"
1.998	11/19/2007	"By which the Technical Justification for the Establishment of Private Natural Reserve Lote 1 is approved"
2051	11/30/2007	"By which the Technical Justification for the Establishment of the Private Natural Reserve of Ayoreo heritage "Punie Paësoi", Department of Boquerón is approved".

2095	11/30/2007	"By which the Technical Justification for the Establishment of the Private Natural Reserve Tabucaí is approved".
2097	11/30/2007	"By which the Technical Justification for the Creation of the Natural Reserve Yaguarete Porá is approved"
2097	11/30/2007	"By which the Technical Justification for the Creation of the Natural Reserve Mahaishi is approved"
<b>MANAGEMENT: CARLOS A. LOPEZ DOSE, ARCHITECT 2008</b>		
28	01/08/2008	"By which the management plan of the Private Reserve Ñu Guazú, located in the district of Gral. Garay, department of Boquerón is approved".
312	02/25/2008	"Declare of institutional interest the declaration proposal of the Private Natural Reserve Chaco Pantanal presented by the Association Guyra Paraguay, as well as the co-management for strengthening Río Negro National Park"
597	05/08/2008	"By which the proposal of Ganadera Romerito S.A, Ganadera 3G S.A. and Mr. Agustín Vallory Dávalos, for the regularization of declared lands as reserve for Río Negro National Park, by Decree N° 1478/04 is recognized".
629	05/19/2008	"By which the Secretariat of Environment technical team is formed for the elaboration of the Management Plan of Asunción Bay".
828	06/20/2008	"By which the Technical Justification for the creation of the Private Nature Reserve called Villa Josefina, department of San Pedro is approved".
871	07/02/2008	"By which the projects Kururu and Kaguare are approved and given sustainable quotas and the number of some animals living in Paraguay, as pilot projects".
1060	07/23/2008	"By which is declared of institutional environmental interest the social and environmental tasks so that the Cerro Kavajú and its zone of influence be declared as the first wilderness protected area within the Governorate of Cordillera".

Regulatory resolutions issued by local Governments for the protection, operation and management of Wilderness Protected Areas, to date (12/04/2009)

<b>Municipality of Mariscal Estigarribia, Department of Boquerón</b>		
<b>Management:</b>		
		<b>Declaring Médanos del Chaco National Park and Tte. Agripino Enciso National Park of environmental and tourist interest</b>
		<b>Declaring Campo Iris Natural Reserve of regional interest for sustainable tourism</b>
<b>Government of Boquerón</b>		
<b>Management:</b>		
		<b>Declaring the Biosphere Reserve of the Chaco of regional interest</b>

Source: SEAM (2010)

8. APPENDIX 9. Situation of management plans, operating, monitoring, and public use among others. (SEAM, 2010)

National System of Wilderness Protected Areas of Paraguay - SINASIP											
Criteria: Situation of management plans, operating, monitoring, and public use among others.											
	DENOMINATION	Handling Plan	Operational Plan	Public Use Plan	Monitoring Plan	Research Plan	Ecological Evaluation	Judicial Measure	DRP	Management Committee	
1	National Zone of Cerro Lambaré Reserve	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....		
2	Scientific Monument Moisés Bertoni	.....	Yes	.....	.....	.....	Yes	Yes	Yes		
3	Tinfunqué National Park	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	Yes	.....	.....		
4	Kuri'y National Reserve	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....		
5	Salto del Guairá National Reserve	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....		
6	Caazapá National Park	.....	Yes	.....	.....	.....	YES	Yes	.....	Yes	
7	Ybycuí National Park	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes	Yes	.....	.....	No <sup>2</sup>	Yes	.....	Yes	
8	Defensores del Chaco National Park	Yes <sup>3</sup>	Yes	Yes <sup>4</sup>	.....	.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
9	Cerro Corá National Park	Yes(+)	Yes	Yes	.....	.....	.....	Yes	.....		
10	Teniente Agripino National Park	.....	Yes	.....	Yes <sup>5</sup>	.....	Yes	.....	Yes	Yes	
11	Lago Ypacarai National Park	No <sup>6</sup>	Yes	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....		
12	Resource Reserve Managed Yvytyrusú	.....	Yes	.....	.....	.....	Yes	.....	.....	Yes	
13	Lago Ypoá National Park	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	Yes	.....		
14	Macizo Acahay Natural Monument	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....		
15	Reserve for San Rafael Park	Yes(/)	Yes	.....	Yes	.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
16	Yabebyry Wildlife Refuge	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....		
17	Ñacunday Wildlife Refuge	.....	Yes	.....	.....	.....	.....	Delimited..	.....		
18	Cerro Chororí Natural Monument	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....		

<sup>1</sup> Failure to update and redefine ecotourism and community work.

<sup>2</sup> Only have biological inventories, outdated.

<sup>3</sup> Need to update

<sup>4</sup> Was developed for Cerro Leon (USAID / DeSdelchaco Parks in Danger Project/TNC) but never implemented

<sup>5</sup> Part of the PN Médanos del Chaco as complex

<sup>6</sup> Initiated with state governorates and municipalities and others, but only up to chapter IV, in cooperation with Germany, but was left by reversal of technical cooperation to Watershed Management

	DENOMINATION	Handling Plan	Operational Plan	Public Use Plan	Monitoring Plan	Research Plan	Ecological Evaluation	Judicial Measure	DRP	Management Committee
19	Cerro Kói Natural Monument	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
20	Serranía de San Luis National Park	Yes <sup>7</sup>	Yes	.....	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
21	Bella Vista National Park	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
22	Paso Bravo National Park	Yes	Yes	.....	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
23	Cerro Cabrera/Timane Natural Reserve	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	Yes	.....	
24	Cerro Chovorecá Reserve for National Park	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
25	Capiibary Ecological Reserve	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	Delimit	.....	
26	Río Negro National Park	Yes(/)	Yes	.....	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
27	Médanos del Chaco National Park	Yes	Yes	.....	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
28	Bahía de Asunción Ecological Reserve	YES <sup>8</sup>	No	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
29	Cerro Dos Oro Protected Landscape	.....	No	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
30	Carrizal Island	.....	No	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	

Source: SEAM (2010).

9. APPENDIX 10. Situation of infrastructure, personnel and Sub-system equipment under public domain (SEAM, 2010)

National System of Wilderness Protected Areas - SINASIP										
Situation of infrastructure ,personnel and subsystem equipment under public domain										
	DENOMINATION	Housing Park Ranger	Housing Administration	Control posts	Interpretation Centers	Recreational Zones	Self-guided trails	Signaling	Maintenance Plan	Handling Plans
1	National Zone of Reserve Cerro Lambaré	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	Yes	Yes	.....	.....
2	Scientific Monument Moisés Bertoni	.....	Yes	.....	Yes <sup>1</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	.....	
3	Tinfunqué National Park	.....	.....	.....	No	No	No	No	.....	
4	Kuri'y National Reserve	.....	.....	.....	No	No	No	No	.....	
5	Saltos del Guairá National Reserve	.....	.....	.....	No	No	No	No	.....	
6	Caazapá National Park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	.....	YES (+)
7	Ybycuí National Park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>2</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	.....	YES (+)
8	Defensores del Chaco National Park	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	.....	YES (+)
9	Cerro Corá National Park	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	.....	YES (/)
10	Teniente Agripino Enciso National Park	Yes	Yes	Yes <sup>3</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	.....	
11	Lago Ypacarai National Park	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	Yes	.....	
12	Yvytyrusú Reserve of Managed Resources	.....	Yes	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
13	Lago Ypoá National Park	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
14	Macizo Acahay Natural Monument	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
15	Reserve for San Rafael Park	.....	Yes <sup>4</sup>	.....	.....	.....	.....	Yes	.....	YES (/)
16	Yabebyry Wildlife Refuge	.....		.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
17	Ñacunday National Park	.....	Yes <sup>5</sup>	.....	.....	.....	Yes		.....	
18	Cerro Chororí Natural Monument	.....	.....							
19	Cerro Kói Natural Monument	.....	.....							

<sup>1</sup> Restored Museum/ Bertoni's House  
<sup>2</sup> Also Museum/Iron Foundry La Rosada/restored  
<sup>3</sup> Abandoned, Siracua sector.  
<sup>4</sup> Rented Paraguay Silvestre, 2008  
<sup>5</sup> Rented by Park Rangers

	DENOMINATION	Housing Park Ranger	Housing Administration	Control Posts	Interpretation Centers	Recreational Zones	Self-guided trails	Signaling	Maintenance Plan	Handling Plans
20	Serranía de San Luis National Park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	.....	
21	Bella Vista National Park	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
22	Paso Bravo National Park	Yes <sup>6</sup>	Yes	Yes	.....	Yes	Yes	Yes	.....	YES
23	Cerro Cabrera/Timane National Park	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
24	Reserve for National Park Cerro Chovorecá	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
25	Capiibary Ecological Reserve	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
26	Río Negro National Park	Yes <sup>7</sup>	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	Yes	.....	YES (/)
27	Médanos del Chaco National Park	No <sup>8</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	.....	.....	YES
28	Bahía de Asunción Ecological Reserve	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	YES (/)
29	Cerro Dos Oro Protected Landscape	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
30	Carrizal Island	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	

YES (/) In Process/socialization/approval

AA/SEAM YES (+) Outdated/without revision/

YES Current

<sup>6</sup> Currently under construction, Paraguay Silvestre Project, same as administration and control posts

<sup>7</sup> Rented by Paraguay Silvestre, 2008

<sup>8</sup> Shares with PNTAEnciso/administrative complex

## **10. Appendix 11: General Description of Protected Areas included in the project<sup>33</sup> Médanos del Chaco National Park**

Area Type: National Parks

Standard: Created by Decree No 2.726/2004 (06/30/2004)

Area: 514,000 hectares

Location: Departments of Boquerón and Alto Paraguay

Region: Western or Chaco

Ecosystem: Dry

### Description:

It was created to protect a mixture of dry forests and bushes. Conjunction not found in any other sites of the Republic. It keeps a representative sample of the Dry Chaco landscape, including soil transition from arid to humid.

The park protects the lives of large mammals such as Peccaries of Chaco, the Tapires from Brazil and Jaguars. The variety of wildlife that inhabits the site is very rich, it also includes species of Guanaco, Puma, Geoffrey cat, Ocelot, Jaguarundi, Skunk, Tamandua, different species of Peccary, Armadillo, and Night monkey, among other animals.

As for the list of birds, we can cite the King Vulture, the Ostrich, the Amazon, Charata and Javirú. Although there is limited inventory of birds, an area of unique assembly species is evidenced. Cascabel, the Wide Mouth Cayman, Teju Guazú and turtles are abundant reptiles.

This protected area is located in a low rainfall area. It is highly vulnerable to intervention. Threats can increase in long-term, since the natural systems in populated areas are degraded, causing changes in ecological boundaries.

There is a chance that this area be placed under great conservation activity before the damage is done, protecting a representative sample of unique ecosystems of the Dry Chaco. The operationalization and strengthening of the Park will cover an ecological section of Dry Chaco to more humid areas, the only of its kind globally speaking.

## **"Paso Bravo" National Park**

Area Type: National Parks

Standard: Created in 1998 by Executive Order

Area: 93,612 hectares

Location: Department of Design

Region: East

Description:

It is surrounded by five ranches and four rural settlements. In its buffer zone hosts 1,300 families mainly devoted to extensive livestock and agriculture. The average temperature is 24 ° C and its climate is tropical with dry winter rain. It rains an annual average of 1,300 millimeters, especially in the months of October and March.

The Cerrado is characterized by nutrient-poor soil but rich in iron, in which small trees grow twisted trunks and thick leaves, scattered amid creeping vegetation, which is mixed with gallery forests and forest islands.

Pastures or low fields, due to their subtropical and humid condition, are rich in grass species, among which are the aguara ruguái and espartillo, as well as lower dry-looking trees, tortuous sized and woody cover.

Diversifying the plant physiognomy, forest belts in gallery appear accompanying the courses of the streams Quien Sabe, Paso Bravo and Blandengue, and Apa River, where ingá, jatái and palo blanco trees stand out. Forest islands are also observed, predominate the yvyra hu, the ybyra pyta, red inciens, kirandy, clover, urundey-mi, orchids of great beauty.

The fauna of Paso Bravo National Park is rich and varied in species. It hosts 48% of wild mammals known in the country. Apa River Basin registers 103 varieties of fish and there are at least 428 species of birds.

Several wild animals in the region are in danger of extinction, like the puma, the jaguar and the aguara guasu, due to the fragmentation of their habitats, as these species require large areas to ensure their survival.

Among the reptiles, boa constrictors or mbo'y ro'y and the yakare ovéro are considered threatened and are listed in the book Threatened Fauna of Paraguay.

Extensive and intense fires that occur annually and result in the destruction of the habitat of these animals, as well as hunting, are primarily responsible for the extinction process.

Among birds, the ynambu kagua is one of the highly endangered species in the area, and the ñandu, the gua'a pyta or red parrot and the talkative parrot. The latter two species would have no chance of survival if urgent actions are not taken to prohibit the illegal traffic of juvenile specimens intended as pets.

flora and fauna conservation is affected by forestry incompatible practices of hunting and gathering with the preservation of species, such as arsons, reduced surface area of protection and illegal trade.

Since the 90's, forests bear the alarming loss of commercial species by illegal selective extraction. Among them: urundey-mi, taji, red incense, clover and kirandy. This extraction accelerates the degree of devastation from 1998 year in which the Area of Reserve for Paso Bravo National Park was declared in the region.

Currently, selective logging, although illegal, creates the largest source of raw material for the production of parquet flooring in the area, where about 150 small sawmills operate daily processing wood.

These incompatible practices with forest conservation produce modifications in the floristic composition of the ecosystem, increase predation of birds and their nests, and reduce potential nesting sites.

The main park entrance is through the road linking the towns of Sargento Felix Lopez and San Carlos del Apa, passing through the settlement "29 de Junio" of the Rural Welfare Institute.

The condition of this route is pretty good most of the year as large sections of its total length is pave. However, some parts go through clay soils and are difficult to tour, especially in rainy weather. The bridges are in fair condition, but they need maintenance and repair.

### **National Park Reserve "Serranía San Rafael"**

Area Type: Managed resource reserve

Standard: National Park in 1992 and then in March 2002, elevated to the Resource Reserve Category

Area: 73,000 hectares

Location: South of the Department of Caazapá and north of Itapúa

Region: East

Description:

The lands of this region are extremely fertile. The soil has a range of colors ranging from light red to black through red-gray, the reddish-brown, red and dark gray.

Natural resources (rivers, fauna and flora) are not only protagonists in the reserve, but also the indigenous communities that coexist with nature, such as the Mbya Guarani, colonies of agricultural farmers and large farms.

The presence of descendants of immigrants of different nationalities gives a special character to the region for cultural events and celebrations, traditional food, clothing, architecture. Currently there are 34 indigenous communities that are in the reserve influential area, 20 within the limits and 14 in the buffer zone.

Alto Parana Atlantic Forest is one of the most exuberant eco-regions from the biological point of view. Its humid forests make up a clearly defined endemic center for many groups of flora and fauna that cannot be found anywhere else in the world.

Unfortunately, the Alto Parana Atlantic Forest has become one site of constant conflict due to its preservation needs and incompatible practices with its preservation such as mechanized agriculture and forest overexploitation.

With regard to flora, so far 282 species have been identified in the reserve. There are medicinal plants that represent 52% of the total of medicinal flora considered to be threatened nationwide. With respect to wildlife is possible to affirm that is one of the most important areas for the preservation of Neotropical birds, with a total of 329 species of birds registered.

Amphibians and reptiles are also numerous, as well as fish. Wild Mammals are represented by 61 species. Among them: tapir, wild boar, tiger, puma, capybara, armadillos, foxes and hares.

The loss of habitat, water pollution and especially, hunting, made their populations considerably reduced.

### **National Park Rio Negro**

Area Type: National Parks

Standard: It is in the process of being legally established

Area: 30,000 hectares

Location: Department of Alto Paraguay

Region: Western or Chaco

Description:

The place has been declared a RAMSAR site (based on the International Convention for the Protection of Wetlands), is globally unique because it will retain the transition between Chaco and Pantanal ecosystems. It is an important area for migrating birds during the boreal winter and it is equally important for the conservation of threatened mammals, such as the Maned Wolf and the Deer.

The forest coverage of this park includes species such as quebracho blanco, samuhú and cacti. Common shrubs are the primrose and bougainvillea. Other found species are mistol, palo santo, labón, locust bean and guayacán. The transition area is dominated by species such as quebracho colorado, yvyra ita, palo blanco and labón.

The Pantanal area is part of a major stop migration route/site for about 32 species of migratory birds.

The strengthening of the park is necessary to study the conversion of land use within the remnant wild areas. Threats to biodiversity have been historically few, but the anthropic pressures in the region are changing more rapidly than in other eco-regions, with the development of livestock and manioc crops. This development is occurring in a particular way, with limitations on conservation values. This is accompanied by the hunt for subsistence and commercial hunting, particularly of jacaré. In addition, hunting of jaguars and pumas is widespread and may, in the long run, determine the disappearance of these species.