

FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

I. BASIC DATA

Organization Name: Conservation International Foundation, Southern Mesoamerica Program.

Project Title: Preparing Southern Mesoamerica Program's Non Governmental Organizations for CEPF projects

Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement): March 15, 2002 – April 30, 2004

Date of Report (month/year): February 7, 2005

II. OPENING REMARKS

This project aimed at preparing civil society to efficiently use the logframe for application to CEFF's grants. Therefore, practical and on-site training was considered the key element of this project. Furthermore, the project also was intended to generate conservation outcomes maps that would lay down the options and plans to strategically select key projects on important biodiversity areas.

III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

Project Purpose: *Potential applicants are familiar with CEPF and are prepared to submit proposals to CEPF*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Purpose-level: <i>Potential applicants are familiar with CEPF and are prepared to submit proposals to CEPF.</i>	Over 100 applicants became familiar with CEPF's proposals mechanism. Almost 50 applicants successfully submitted LOI's and full-proposals to CEPF based on the training provided by the Coordinating Unit.

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

Over 50 applicants are successfully developing projects on critical areas of the 3 corridors, with a good balanced portfolio within the 4 programmatic lines of the CEPF overall-grant to Southern Mesoamerica. Some 49 projects are geographically-oriented on specific regions, while others are broader in scope and consider aspects as awareness and training.

Many more applicants also received training by CEPF's CU, although were not favored by grants due to different reasons. Finally, exchange visits amongst grantees promoted by the CU are key elements of a good interaction.

Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?

The unexpected result of producing an interactive CD of the Talamanca-Osa-Bocas Ecorregion was considered to have a positive impact for understanding the Ecorregional approach. This product is to be delivered very soon.

IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS

Project Outputs:

1. *Alliances, NGO's and other potential applicants are prepared to submit letters of interest and proposals.*
2. *Southern Mesoamerica Program produces updated outcome maps for the three sub corridors.*
3. *Potential applicants and Coordination Unit trained in logframe design*

Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
Output 1:	
<i>Key conservation alliances as the Indio Maíz-San Juan-La Selva, Talamanca/Osa/Bocas regional alliance, Osa Coalition, and other potential applicants trained in the CEPF application process.</i>	Coordinating Unit provided on-site and hands-on training to members of these alliances and working groups. Many of their individual members successfully applied to receive CEPF grants in the 3 corridors.
Output 2:	
<i>Maps produced with current status and 5 to 10 year outcomes.</i>	Maps were generated with the conservation outcomes and are the final guidance for the Southern Mesoamerica Program. Also, a sub product of the maps was the elaboration of a ecorregional map of the Talamanca-Osa-Bocas indicating the most important corridors and connectivities, a CD Room with important information and an Action Plan for the Ecorregion.
Output 3:	
<i>Participants from the Coordination Unit and potential applicants attend one week workshop in logframe design.</i>	This workshop was held in San Jose, and it constituted the basis for the CU to provide subsequent training to all the grantees.

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

Project achieved the intended outputs. Not only the CU was trained in logframe design, but also all of the grantees in the 3 corridors received hands-on direct training by members of the CU. To date, almost 50 grantees are successfully implementing key

projects of the 4 programmatic lines of the CEPF, and many more groups were trained in logframe, although for some reasons they did not received the grants.

Additionally, the conservation outcomes maps were generated indicating the direct area of influence by CEPF within the Southern Mesoamerica Program´s conservation plans.

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

Although not considered as an unrealized outcome, this grant provided support to the Ecorregional Plan in the delivery of a technical document, maps and an Action Plan for this joint effort under the Talamanca-Osa-Bocas Alliance. This Plan and its products were significant delayed due to limitations of proper-on-time reviews by members of this Alliance, specifically the Government´s representatives in Panama.

V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS

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

No comments on this section.

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.

Coordinating Unit Training: the establishment and training of the CU should had been done before the grant period opened. This is important as it avoids a lot of confusion among the CU, CEPF and grantees.

Coordination among stakeholders: When involving many different stakeholders to produce a result, there are significant delays in reviews that make very difficult to complete the product on time. This was the case with the general maps and also the Talamanca Ecorregional Map that needed to be included in the CD/Room of the Action Plan. Significant delays occurred by some of the participating agencies when reviewing the documents.

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

The training of the CU first provided a good lead to the rest of the work performed. Hence, once trained, the CU spearheaded the training of the very broad variety of

applicants, providing guidance and training to understand and submit their LOI and full-projects.

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

A direct relationship and contact between the CU and the grantees were very important to create the necessary synergy to have an efficient interaction when working with them. This direct relationship proved to create a more efficient relationship and therefore results were better achieved.

VII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

No comments.