

CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Legal Name: Conservation International-Regional Program Division

Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement): Consolidation of CEPF's Protected Areas and Conservation Corridor Portfolio in Mesoamerica

Implementation Partners for this Project:

- Mexico: FONDO MEXICANO, IDESMAC, ECOBIOSFERA, PRONATURA VERACRUZ. Main ally of CI -CONANP
- Guatemala: FUNDAECO, WCS, Defensores, ARNPG, CALMECAC, CALAS.
- Regional partners. TNC, Birdlife International, CATIE, Asociación Balam, Rainforest Alliance.

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): 1 December, 2005 – 31 December, 2009

Date of Report (month/year): April 6th, 2010.

II. OPENING REMARKS

Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.

This grant also supported the work of Coordination Unit (CU) in two phases 1) Regional with a position and financial management based in Costa Rica focused mainly in building regional alliance, capacity building in managing protected areas and corridors and regional-international initiative participation. Then, 2) there was an amendment to support CU in Mexico and Guatemala (technically and financially) with the opportunity to build alliances at national and state levels to work directly and improve creation, management and connectivity of Protected Areas (Pas) and Corridors within the six KBAs defined as priority for Mexico and Guatemala. The amendment of this grant provided to CU specifically. the opportunity to deliver key and important indicators of the Logical Framework which CI M&CA committed and provided the opportunity to work in Mexico in KBAs 1, 3, 5 addressing connectivity, land conservation of federal and community level management, new protected areas, capacity built, alliances strengthened among others. And for Guatemala, provided the opportunity to work and deliver key indicators at private and communal level strengthening actions supported by formed groups or alliances working in KBA 4 and 6. And the fact of working at a regional level with key partners addressing some other KBAs.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: *CEPF Mesoamerican ecosystem profiles, particularly for northern Mesoamerica, effectively and efficiently implemented by CEPF-funded partners and alliances, that possess strengthened capacity to meet profile strategic goals regarding protection and management of protected areas; conservation of critically endangered species and key biodiversity areas; and strengthening of conservation policies affecting protected areas, conservation corridors, and endangered species*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<p>Purpose-level: CEPF Mesoamerican ecosystem profiles, particularly for northern Mesoamerica, effectively and efficiently implemented by CEPF-funded partners and alliances, that possess strengthened capacity to meet profile strategic goals regarding protection and management of protected areas; conservation of critically endangered species and key biodiversity areas; and strengthening of conservation policies affecting protected areas, conservation corridors, and endangered species</p>	<p>This grant met strategic goal of SD 2 of Ecosystem profile for the region and achieved the following final results: Financial resources allocation \$1.7, management improved in 8 KBAs with a total of 963,505 ha, reduction of forest fires, recovered degraded land and maintaining wildlife population, significant management improved to critical area Laguna del Tigre. 27 Technical studies and new protected areas declared by 13,587 ha and baseline established with partner to protect another 468,750 ha within the region in 2010 and in the medium term.</p>
<p><i>1. Number of technical studies, plans and strategies prepared with PACC input for declaring new, expanded or upgraded protected areas and strengthening PA and corridor conservation</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 27 technical studies <p>New protected areas with a total area of 13,587 hectares were established, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guatemala (7,168 ha) • Mexico (6,419 ha) already officially declared by state or federal government certification. <p>An additional 468,750 hectares located in 14 sites achieved important milestones toward their future declaration as new protected areas, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 45,000 ha to be declared in Visis Caba, Guatemala • 6,334 hectares to be declared in Cruz Maltin, Guatemala • 330,021 ha Uxpanapa, Mexico proposed as a biosphere reserve • 27,488 ha expanded La Frailescana, Mexico • 40,000 ha expanded Volcán Tacaná, Mexico • 6,069 ha to be declared in Selva Lacandona, Mexico • 16,144 ha to be certified as communal lands for conservation, Mexico <p>Connectivity established: 4,396,305 ha</p>
<p><i>2. Number of capacity building and policy strengthening initiatives, partnerships and alliances developed or strengthened with PACC assistance to achieve CEPF outcomes</i></p>	<p>200 people strengthened capacity to manage natural resources. 12 local institutions for monitoring purposes trained. 9 conservation alliances</p>
<p><i>3: Number of country and regional gap analyses and ecoregional planning exercises for refining PA, KBA and corridor priorities completed that take into account CEPF priorities</i></p>	<p>3 country level gap analysis 3 regional exercises PA, KBA 1 ecoregional planning exercise.</p>
<p><i>4: Number of CEPF-funded LOIs, full proposals and projects receiving technical assistance from PACC Unit in close coordination with corridor and subregional office directors and BASC unit</i></p>	<p>19 funded projects which received planning, technical assistance, linking projects at local and regional level from PACCC-CU Units also with administrative and financial management support by local CI administration offices in Mexico and Guatemala.</p>

Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.

Performance indicators were pointed in last section, so we consider the impacts of this grant as follow:

1. New protected areas declared within a wide region.
2. Strengthened and established protected areas and connectivity in KBAs at national and at trans-boundary levels
3. Capacity built to local NGOs, institutions, members of local communities and local community based enterprises for tourism, forest fires prevention and protection, and improved management of natural areas.
4. Alliances built with local, national governments and local communities and local NGOs and academia sectors.
5. Actions plans developed and proposed for forest fires, protected areas at national and state level.
6. For SD2 of Ecosystem profile for this region; 25 LOIs and proposals were analyzed and rejected after previous analysis and 19 LOIS and proposals were granted and finished provided key and important results to achieve above indicators with the support, involvement, follow up, and evaluation of CI offices Guatemala and Mexico.
7. Support to Indigenous Peoples in terms to develop a new legal framework to influence CONAP in terms of review new alternatives for the SIGAP for Indigenous Peoples and Communal Lands in Guatemala.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

Positive impacts unexpected:

- Results of these projects with partners provided a good platform of work with partners and base line information and results to mitigate climate change in this region, which was a reflective comment on Mexico's presentation of final results in February 2010.
- Capacity improved to local NGOs by CU Mexico-Guatemala.
- Good alliances that beyond this investment up to December 2009, continue working to improve PA, corridors.
- The experience of work generated to CI and 17 partners in protected area and corridor consolidation with partners in a big region including 3 countries: Belize, Guatemala and Mexico.
- New legal frameworks presented to the Congress in Guatemala regarding Communal Lands and Indigenous Peoples protected areas.

Negative impacts unexpected:

- A few alliances did not work out, and a few partners expressed this feeling and opinion.
- Some people expressed that the alliances were created only for the opportunity of money.

Positive/negative:

- International investment of the region for biodiversity conservation and creation of new protected area diminished considerably after 2009.
- CEPF had a good asset by working during the past 5 years at regional level.
- CEPF was considered at the most progressive fund in the region, builder of alliances, coherence and smart choice to conserve in areas in which other donor are not funding.

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs: Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1: Key steps taken towards development and implementation of strategies for declaration of new, expanded, and upgraded protected areas and refinement of corridor conservation strategies for northern Mesoamerica	Steps taken: alliances formed supported, meetings developed, common goals agreed in declaration and expansion of protected areas and corridors for northern Mesoamerica.
<i>Indicator 1.1: Criteria for prioritizing candidate sites drafted and needed data gathered</i>	KBA definition and late refinement of KBAs. 8 KBAs identified and geographical, social and biodiversity data generated.
<i>Indicator 1.2: Candidate sites identified for protection through Zamorano species meeting, gap analyses and ecoregional planning, and input from BASC, regional monitoring project, CABS teams and partners identified.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Zamorano workshop the whole region identified Salvador, and Honduras as sites needed protection improving efforts at research and CR spp actions taken as well as site conservation actions and improved on management of natural resources. • 1gap analysis for Guatemala • 1 gap analysis for Honduras • 1 gap analysis for El Salvador. • Selva Zoque, Maya and Olmeca ecoregional planning supported • 1 planning exercise for expansion and declaring new PA developed for Guatemala. • 1 planning exercise for expansion and declaring new PA developed for Mexico. • KBAs identified by corridors: <i>Selva Zoque, Chiapas/Guatemala Highlands Corridor</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Selva Zoque 2. Reserva de Biosfera Sierra de las Minas, Motagua, Bocas del Polochic 3. Sierra Madre de Chiapas 4, Los Cuchumatanes <i>Selva Maya Corridor</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Selva Lacandona y Sierra del Lacandon 6. Parque Nacional Laguna del Tigre 7. El Gran Petén 8. Chiquibul/Montañas Mayas <p>And, Honduras, and El Salvador new KBAs and AZE sites.</p>
<i>Indicator 1.3: Needs assessment conducted of priority sites</i>	8 assessments conducted
<i>Indicator 1.4: LOIs submitted for each priority site with PACC assistance for preparing habitat conservation plans, creating new or expanded PAs and strengthening site protection through partners and alliances</i>	12 LOIs supported by CU which were submitted.
<i>Indicator 1.5: Full proposals developed with PACC assistance for each site</i>	12 full proposals developed with CU assistance and granted by CEPF under SD 2.
<i>Indicator 1.6: Grants implemented for each site with TA from PACC</i>	A total of 12 grants were implemented and finished in 8 KBAs.

Output 2: Action plans developed to build government and civil society capacity and influence policies in forest fire prevention and management, PA land tenure issues, and control of illegal harvest of flora and fauna in protected areas and priority corridors	
<i>Indicator 2.1: Priority sites, KBAs and specific themes identified for trinational capacity building and policy reform in Northern Mesoamerica on fire management, control of illegal harvest and tenure issues</i>	KBA 5 Selva Lacandona and Sierra del Lacandon build capacity to improve fire management, control. KBA 5 Cuchumatanes improved illegal harvest and land tenure issues. Policy reforms proposals addressed three states in Mexico: Oaxaca, Chiapas and Campeche. Policy reforms proposals addressed Guatemala as a Country. Policy reforms proposals addressed Belize as a country.
<i>Indicator 2.2: Partners identified and approached to assist in assessing needs in institutional capacity building and policy strengthening</i>	18 regional partners built capacities in natural resources management, policy strengthening and other key topics.
<i>Indicator 2.3: Needs assessments conducted regarding capacity building and policy reform on fire, land tenure, and timber and wildlife poaching and priorities identified for CEPF support</i>	Analysis of legal and public policy framework were assessed and analyzed for Belize, Guatemala and Mexico for tourism, forest fires basically.
<i>Indicator 2.4: LOIs prepared by partners with PACC assistance</i>	6 LOIs supported by CU which were submitted
<i>Indicator 2.5: Full proposals prepared with PACC assistance</i>	6 full proposals developed with CU assistance and granted by CEPF under SD 2.
<i>Indicator 2.6: Projects implemented by partners with PACC technical backstopping</i>	6 projects implemented.
Output 3: Alliances of private, NGO and community ecotourism operators, NGOs, and governments identify and share lessons learned and develop and begin implementation of joint initiatives linking sustainable ecotourism and improved protected area and corridor management	
<i>Indicator 3.1: Priority sites, KBAs and specific themes identified for trinational capacity building and policy reform in Northern Mesoamerica on tourism issues</i>	8 KBAs identified.
<i>Indicator 3.2: Partners identified and approached to assist in assessing needs in institutional capacity building and policy strengthening</i>	7 partners identified.
<i>Indicator 3.3: Needs assessments conducted regarding capacity building and policy reform on tourism issues</i>	5 assessments conducted in Belize, Guatemala and Mexico.
<i>Indicator 3.4: LOIs prepared by partners with PACC assistance</i>	4 LOIs
<i>Indicator 3.5: Full proposals prepared with PACC assistance</i>	4 full proposals prepared with PACC –CU assistance.
<i>Indicator 3.6: Projects implemented by partners with PACC technical backstopping</i>	4 projects developed by partners with support, linkage and collaboration of CU.
Output 4: All phases of CEPF grant making supported for proposals and grants related to protected areas and corridors	
<i>Indicator 4.1: Percentage of proposals evaluated by PACC unit within four weeks of submission</i>	90%
<i>Indicator 4.2: Number of key applicants receiving support with the design of projects to be submitted to CEPF</i>	19 key applicants received support with the design of projects.
<i>Indicator 4.3: Number of CEPF projects requesting</i>	19 (all of them)

<i>PACC unit support that are receiving it</i>	
<i>Indicator 4.4: Percentage of technical and financial reports submitted on time to CEPF</i>	90%
Output 5: Additional technical and financial resources leveraged to ensure sustainability of protected areas, corridors and endangered species conservation initiatives undertaken with CEPF support	10.6 MD
<i>Indicator 5.1: Number of additional funding sources leveraged in support of CEPF supported PA and corridor projects</i>	19

Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.

All of the outputs were realized in terms of completion of activities, we can said that CEPF on protected areas achieve 95 % on effectiveness work through partners that were 100 % involved on the achievements. For this project we understood the importance that still has the creation of protected areas but most important the management of the existing protected areas.

Were any outputs unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?

All outputs were developed and achieved key results.

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS
--

Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.

None of the projects need these kinds of assessments, but a few previous analyses were developed to go forward activities conducted by grants director and grants local coordinators. CI and CEPF prevented and protect safeguard policies.

VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT

Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF's future performance.

1. Build capacity in planning to local NGOs.
2. Lead and propose and consolidate alliances taking into account the willing of the partners and commitments.
3. Consolidate first a good structure to locally support, follow up and evaluate at policy, technical and financial management and capacity building to adequately involve all initiatives and partners.
4. All projects and initiatives funded under CEPF should clearly be linked to CI strategy, regional strategies such as ecosystem profiles, as well as key and leader partners per country to find common goals and easy agree and achieve excellent results and indicators.
5. Consider time to build alliances, support planning with partners since it takes longer than planned, because all processes jointly built require long periods of time.
6. CEPF – CI shouldn't advice local partners NGOs, Academia or research institutions or individuals to commit indicators or achievement which are in the hands of governments, example policy programs, official or formal declaration of protected areas, etc.
7. Take into consideration differences among countries when trying to improve management of PA, creation of PA and corridors consolidation. Differences strive particularly in legal framework, policy, leadership and decision making or level of attention and priorities.
8. Funding for PAs is still not enough in the region, we need to capitalize the other funding that were and are investing in the region and use the example of CEPF to coordinate, facilitate and leverage from other existing funding, otherwise money will be spend in a isolated way, CEPF lesson learned is that we have to understand what others are doing to complement their work and vice versa.

Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/failure)

The aspects that contributed to its successes is support a structure to locally support and follow up day to day grants processes, as well as using logical framework methodology, a manual and tools such GW software (final version not pilot versions) make the process become a success. In addition to this, the CEPF way of work (alliances and leverage) was a perfect formula to work on protected areas in which the investments have to be shared and leveraged.

Project Execution: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/failure)

VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING

Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.

Donor	Type of Funding*	Amount in USD	Notes
FMCN- USAID	A	40,000	2007 – 2009 CI Mexico KBA 5, 1.
Legacy Fund	B	700,000	2008 – 2010 CI Mexico and Guatemala KBA 3 and 4.
Peter J. Sharp Foundation	A	200,000	2009 – 2010 CI Mexico and Guatemala KBA 1,2,3,4,5,6,7.
USAID –LWA	A	200,000	2007 – 2008 CI Mexico KBA 5, 1, 3.
USAID-TFCA	C	600,000	2007-2008 CI Guatemala KBA 2, 4,
PACT	A	400,000	2007-2008-2009 in Belize

***Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:**

- A** *Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)*
- B** *Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF project)*
- C** *Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)*
- D** *Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)*

Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.

- Mitigation and adaption projects towards Climate Change for Chiapas and Sierra Madre de Chiapas is continuing addressing preliminary and redefined KBAs.
- Mitigation and adaptation projects on Climate Change for the Mayan Biosphere Reserve specially covering Laguna del Tigre and the Lacandon national parks.
- Conservation agreements in Paso CABallos, Uaxactun and Carmelita will allow CEPF investments to continue on the Mayan Biosphere Reserve.
- TFCA Debt Swap will provide sustainability in Guatemala for Sierra de las Minas, Lacandon, Laguna del Tigre and Cuchumatanes KBAs.

Partners

- FMCN continues its initiative in protection and management of forests towards climate change issues.
- WWF continues pursuing big initiatives linked to Ecosystem profile strategic directions in KBA 1, 3, 5.
- FONCET continues supporting conservation of biodiversity and rural development to KBA 3 and a carbon project for El Triunfo biosphere reserve.
- All proposals to improve policy in Mexico at state, municipal levels continue being supported by partners FMCN, CI, CEMDA, CONANP, etc.
- TNC continue supporting Selva Maya, Zoque and Olmeca in a regional level as well as forest fires management support to Guatemala and Belize
- Mirador Roundtable in MBR are still working on the policy influence regarding tourism in Guatemala
- CPI continues the policy influence on tourism policies for Guatemala at a national level.

VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CEPF and other sources of funding must continue supporting the work on conservation in protected areas in coherence with the new trends about climate change and freshwater topics. CEPF is the most effective resource of funding to address civil society concerns and conservation work.

VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF is committed to transparent operations and to helping civil society groups share experiences, lessons learned and results. One way we do this is by making programmatic project documents available on our Web site, www.cepf.net, and by marketing these in our newsletter and other communications.

These documents are accessed frequently by other CEPF grantees, potential partners, and the wider conservation community.

Please include your full contact details below:

Name: Carlos Rodríguez Olivet

Organization name: Conservation International Mexico and Central America Vice president.

Mailing address: 1 calle 17-96 zona 15 Vista Hermosa II Guatemala Ciudad

Tel: 502 23857056

Fax: 502 23857039

E-mail: crodriguez@conservation.org

Additional contact information of technical support for CI Mexico: Mónica G. Morales mmorales@conservation.org