



Global Environment Facility

1818 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20433 USA
Tel: 202.473-0508
Fax: 202.522.3240/3245
Internet: www.theGEF.org

September 5, 2008

Dear Council Member,

The World Bank as the Implementing Agency for the project entitled *Mexico: Consolidation of the Protected Area System (SINAP II) - Fourth Tranche*: has submitted the attached proposed project document for CEO endorsement prior to final Agency approval of the project document in accordance with the World Bank procedures.

The Secretariat has reviewed the project document. It is consistent with the project concept approved by the Council in November 2000 and the proposed project remains consistent with the Instrument and GEF policies and procedures. The attached explanation prepared by the World Bank satisfactorily details how Council's comments and those of the STAP have been addressed.

If by September 26, 2008, I have not received requests from at least four Council Members to have the proposed project reviewed at a Council meeting because in the Member's view the project is not consistent with the Instrument or GEF policies and procedures, I will complete the Secretariat's assessment with a view to endorsing the proposed project document.

We have today posted the proposed project document on the GEF website at www.TheGEF.org. If you do not have access to the Web, you may request the local field office of UNDP or the World Bank to download the document for you. Alternatively, you may request a copy of the document from the Secretariat. If you make such a request, please confirm for us your current mailing address.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Monique Barbut", is written over a printed name and title.

Monique Barbut
Chief Executive Officer and Chairperson

Attachment: Project Document

cc: Alternates, GEF Agencies, STAP, Trustee

OFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 5, 2008

TO: Ms. Monique Barbut, CEO/Chairman, GEF

FROM: Steve Gorman, GEF Executive Coordinator, The World Bank

EXTENSION: x35865

SUBJECT: **MEXICO: Consolidation of the Protected Area System (SINAP II)
Fourth Tranche - Submission for Final CEO Endorsement**

1. Please find attached the documentation for the fourth tranche release for the Mexico SINAP II Project for CEO Endorsement. The procedure followed to request the release of this fourth tranche replicates the one already agreed and followed for the release of the third tranche. We would appreciate receiving your endorsement of this fourth tranche, so that we may finalize the Bank Board submission.
2. Approval of all tranches of the project was delegated by the GEF Council to the GEF CEO, as described in Annex 14 of the originally approved Project Document. From the recipient's side, the fourth tranche, in the amount of \$5.44 million, has been re-endorsed by the Government as the highest priority for their GEF-4 biodiversity program. The World Bank is also requesting approval of the associated Implementing Agency fee of \$544,000.
3. **Background:** The original SINAP II Project Document was approved by the GEF Council for Work Program entry at the November 2000 Council Meeting, and a commitment was made to finance the SINAP II project under an innovative multi-tranched structure with a total final grant amount of \$31.1 million. CEO Endorsement for the first US\$16.1 million was issued on January 7, 2002. It was agreed that subsequent tranche approvals would be delegated by the Council to the GEF CEO, and would then be presented for World Bank Board approval under streamlined procedures developed specifically for tranched GEF projects. The initial tranche of US\$16.1 million included US\$7.5 million endowment funds to cover the basic conservation of four protected areas. According to the Project Appraisal Document (Annex 14, page 104) further expansion of the Natural Protected Areas Fund (FANP) endowment to cover eight additional protected areas would follow streamlined procedures. A second tranche of US\$2.21 million, to support basic conservation in Sierra de Álamos in the state of Sonora in Mexico, was disbursed on July 1, 2004, while a third tranche of US\$7.35 million was disbursed on October 26, 2007 to endow four protected areas.
4. **Contribution of SINAP to the overall Government's conservation strategy:** The SINAP II project has become a flagship conservation initiative for the Government of Mexico. Far beyond an isolated project supporting only a few protected areas, the SINAP II project has facilitated a process of prioritization of areas for protection; the construction of a broad network of civil society, private sector, and governmental

actors working together to conserve Mexico's most critical areas; and the demonstration of an extremely successful long-term model for sustainable financing of conservation. As such, the contribution of SINAP II to the Environmental Sustainability pillar of the 2004 Mexico Country Partnership Strategy has been far greater than what might be expected of a single project. In addition, the present administration supports the strategy followed under SINAP II, and proposes to expand its application. The increase in real area under protection and in staff and budget is one of the priorities of the present administration.

5. **Global Benefits:** The protected areas included in the SINAP II project were selected because of their global biodiversity value, as well as the degree of threat they face. The fourth tranche of SINAP II will provide long-term financing to three additional Biosphere Reserves, each of which shelters unique and endangered biodiversity. Benefits generated by the protection of these areas will include the long-term preservation of globally important biodiversity in:

- the La Sepultura Biosphere Reserve in the state of Chiapas, which is of highest importance due to its ecosystem services, important tracts of cloud forest, rain forest and deciduous forest, as well as being located in an areas of highest biodiversity and endemism;
- the El Ocote Biosphere Reserve in the state of Chiapas, which is located in the confluence of the Neartic and Neotropical areas, represents the largest connected area of tropical humid forest in Mesoamerica with high ecosystem diversity due to its topography that allows for a wide range of microclimates;
- the Mapimí Biosphere Reserve in the states of Coahuila, Durango and Chihuahua, which protects the main portion of the Chihuahuan desert, which has been recognized as one of the most species rich in the world.

SINAP II also serves as an example of a successful, replicable model for a strategy for the long-term financing of global biodiversity conservation. The FANP is a private fund managed by the well-respected Mexican Fund for the Conservation of Nature (FMCN). Its design includes private sector control over fund management; financing of clearly-established national conservation priorities, as determined by the government; co-financing from a wide range of partners; and a focus on the long-term recurrent costs of protected areas. This design has made the FANP a model for biodiversity conservation funds worldwide.

6. **Assessment of progress made:** As agreed, tranche release is based on meeting five conditions: the preparation of a logical framework with indicators; evidence of the deposit of matching counterpart funds in a 1:1 ratio; approval of a social assessment for each protected area; if appropriate, Indigenous Peoples Development Plans for the relevant protected areas, and endowment contributions by SEMARNAT to the Protected Areas Trust Fund to cover taxes during project implementation. Each of these trigger conditions has been met, as discussed in the Supplemental GEF Grant Document and summarized below:

- Logical frameworks with indicators for each of the three protected areas have been completed and are included in Annex A to this memo.
 - A total of \$10.15 million in matching funds (nearly doubling the requested ratio of 1:1) have been received and deposited, and the Bank has reviewed all the documentation showing the deposits. The deposited funds are endowment funds, and the interest will be channeled to priority protected areas as established by the original PAD. The funds were provided by both SEMARNAT, a state government and by private conservation foundations. The supplemental GEF Grant Document includes a summary of the sources and amounts of the matching funds for the fourth tranche, as well as those for earlier tranches. Additional information (including copies of the bank statements showing deposits amounting to US\$10.15 million accompanied by the agreements signed by the donors) are held in our project files and available upon request.
 - The executive summaries of the completed social assessment for “La Sepultura,” “El Ocote,” and “Mapimí” are included and provide an appropriate design of remedial actions, which are also defined in the logical framework. The social assessments have been reviewed and cleared by the project’s social specialist, and meet the World Bank’s safeguard requirements.
 - Social assessment identified that 80% of population in “El Ocote” is of indigenous descent, therefore the whole social strategy for this area has been prepared as an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP). In the case of “La Sepultura”, there is only a small community of indigenous migrants concentrated in Villahermosa; an IPP has been prepared for this community. There is no indigenous population in “Mapimí”. The IPP have been reviewed and cleared by the project’s social specialist, and meet the World Bank’s safeguard requirements.
 - The documentation showing endowment contributions by the Mexican Government (SEMARNAT) to the project has been reviewed by the Bank and is held in our project files. SEMARNAT has deposited a total of US\$2.3 million in endowment funds to cover taxes during project implementation for the third tranche.
7. Information on the above requirements, as well as the Independent Evaluation and Bank Mid-Term Review of the project, conducted in 2005, have been included as attachments to this memo:

Independent Evaluation of SINAP II Project

A summary of key findings of the independent evaluation in English, as well as a full executive summary in Spanish, have been included. The full 220+ page independent evaluation in Spanish is available for review upon request.

Bank Evaluation of SINAP II Project

A short summary of key points in English, as well as the full Aide Memoire and annexes from the 2005 Bank Mid-Term Review of the project, have been included.

Documents for Fourth Tranche*Social Assessments for 4 Protected Areas and IPP*

English-language summaries of the social assessments and IPP of the three protected areas included in the Fourth Tranche have been included. The full social assessments are available in Spanish upon request.

Logical Frameworks for the three Protected Areas

The logical frameworks for the protected areas have been included, in English, in the attachments.

Summary of Cofinancing Deposits and Letters of Deposit of Cofinancing Sources

A summary of the deposits of the \$10.15 million in cash co-financing, as well as letters from the foundations, state and federal government, which have provided the co-financing, have been attached. Full bank statements confirming the deposits are available upon request in the project files.

8. Based on the information presented above and detailed in the Annexes, we would greatly appreciate receiving your endorsement for this fourth tranche in the amount of US\$5.44 million and the associated fee of \$544,000. We will then proceed with submission to the Bank Board approval and subsequent disbursement to the SINAP endowment.

Many thanks.

Attachments

cc: Messrs./Mmes. GEF PROGRAM COORDINATION (GEFSEC); L. Tlaiye, A. Moreira, K. Ashida, D. Aryal, M. Isaac (LCSEN); G. Saltiel, J. Albert (LCSSD); S. Gorman, R. Khanna, S. Wedderburn, L. Shaw-Barry (ENVGC); ENVGC ISC, IRIS4



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project
THE GEF TRUST FUND

Submission Date: June 5, 2008
Re-submission Date: September 3, 2008

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

GEFSEC PROJECT ID:

GEF AGENCY PROJECT ID:

COUNTRY(IES): Mexico

PROJECT TITLE: Consolidation of the Protected Areas System (SINAP II) Fourth Tranche

GEF AGENCY(IES): World Bank,

OTHER EXECUTING PARTNER(S): n/a

GEF FOCAL AREA(S): Biodiversity,

GEF-4 STRATEGIC PROGRAM(S): SP1 – Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level

NAME OF PARENT PROGRAM/UMBRELLA PROJECT: N/A

Expected Calendar	
Milestones	Dates
Work Program (for FSP)	Nov 2000
GEF Agency Approval	Sept 2008
Implementation Start	Oct 2008
Mid-term Review (if planned)	N/A
Implementation Completion	June 30, 2010

A. PROJECT FRAMEWORK (Expand table as necessary)

Project Objective :								
Project Components	Indicate whether Investment, TA, or STA**	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	GEF Financing*		Co-financing*		Total (\$)
				(\$)	%	(\$)	%	
1. Expansion of the Fund for Natural Protected Areas ¹	Investment	Capital resources for protected areas increased	Fund for Natural Protected Areas established with US\$ 66.5 million endowment.	5,440,000	50%	5,440,000	50%	10,880,000
4. Project management				n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total Project Costs				5,440,000		5,440,000		10,880,000

* List the \$ by project components. The percentage is the share of GEF and Co-financing respectively to the total amount for the component.

** TA = Technical Assistance; STA = Scientific & technical analysis.

1 – The key outcomes for each PA are detailed in the attached logical frameworks

B. FINANCING PLAN SUMMARY FOR THE PROJECT (\$)

	Project Preparation*	Project	Agency Fee	Total at CEO Endorsement	For the record: Total at PIF
GEF	n/a	5,440,000		5,440,000	n/a
Co-financing	n/a	5,440,000		5,440,000	n/a
Total	n/a	10,880,000		10,880,000	n/a

* Please include the previously approved PDFs and PPG, if any. Indicate the amount already approved as footnote here and if the GEF funding is from GEF-3. Provide the status of implementation and use of fund for the project preparation grant in Annex D.

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING, INCLUDING co-financing for project preparation for both the PDFs and PPG. (expand the table line items as necessary)

Name of co-financier (source)	Classification	Type	Amount (\$)	%*
SEMARNAT	Nat'l Gov't	Grant	2,300,000	23%
Summit Foundation	Foundation	Grant	600,000	6%
State of Mexico	Local Gov't	Grant	250,000	2%

Global Conservation Fund (Conservation International)	NGO	Grant	1,000,000	10%
Packard Foundation	Foundation	Grant	1,290,000 ¹	59%
	(select)	(select)		
Total Co-financing			5,440,000	100%

* Percentage of each co-financier's contribution at CEO endorsement to total co-financing

1 - The total contribution from Packard Foundation was US\$ 6 million, representing an additional US\$ 4.7 million from the requested cofinancing funds

D. GEF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY FOCAL AREA(S), AGENCY(IES) OR COUNTRY(IES) N/A

GEF Agency	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)			
			Project Preparation	Project	Agency Fee	Total
(select)	(select)					
(select)	(select)					
(select)	(select)					
(select)	(select)					
(select)	(select)					
(select)	(select)					
Total GEF Resources						

* **NO** need to provide information for this table if it is a single focal area, single country and single GEF Agency project.

E. PROJECT MANAGEMENT BUDGET/COST¹

Cost Items	Total Estimated person weeks	GEF (\$)	Other sources (\$)	Project total (\$)
Local consultants*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
International consultants*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Office facilities, equipment, vehicles and communications**		n/a	n/a	n/a
Travel**		n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	n/a	n/a		n/a

* Provide detailed information regarding the consultants in Annex C.

** Provide detailed information and justification for these line items. n/a

¹ This is a supplemental grant to the protected areas Trust Fund. The project management budget has been included in the original grant.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Estimated person weeks	GEF(\$)	Other sources (\$)	Project total (\$)
Local consultants*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
International consultants*	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Total	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

* **PROVIDE DETAILED INFORMATION REGARDING THE CONSULTANTS IN ANNEX C.**

G. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN: All indicators in the PA Logical Frameworks are aligned to the program level results. Every year, the project sends an M&E report to the World Bank. For detailed information, please find attached the 2007 M&E Report.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE THE PROJECT RATIONALE AND THE EXPECTED MEASURABLE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS:

The Project's objective is to promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Mexico through the consolidation of the National System Protected Areas (SINAP) by: (a) conserving globally important biodiversity in selected areas of SINAP through an endowment fund; (b) promoting the economic, social and environmental

sustainability of productive activities in selected protected areas; (c) promoting social co-responsibility for conservation; and (d) in general, promoting the inclusion of biodiversity conservation and sustainable criteria in development projects and other practices affecting selected protected areas. This project extends the protected areas program initiated with GEF funding in 1992 and restructured as an endowment fund for 10 protected areas in 1997 (Project SINAP I), by adding 12 new protected areas to the program. The protected areas included in the SINAP II project were selected because of their global biodiversity value, as well as the degree of threat they face. The fourth tranche of SINAP II will provide long-term financing to three additional Biosphere Reserves, each of which shelters unique and endangered biodiversity. Benefits generated by the protection of these areas will include the long-term preservation of globally important biodiversity. The expected global environment benefits to be achieved with the inclusion of these three PAs are: reduced land degradation/desertification; critical ecosystem integrity and regulation functions preserved, restored and improved; freshwater ecosystems maintained and protected; reduced land-use conflicts and pasture pressure due to better land use planning. These benefits will be measured with the tracking tool system and the indicators defined in the logical frameworks for each area (see Annex 2).

- B. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH NATIONAL PRIORITIES/PLANS:** The present administration supports the strategy followed under SINAP II, and proposes to expand its application. The increase in real area under protection and in protected area staff and budget is one of the priorities of the present administration. The project is consistent with national and government policies. The National Development Plan (2007-2012) is structured in five main chapters and the fourth refers to Environmental Sustainability. This chapter includes a biodiversity topic, with a strategy towards areas with conservation schemes, use and sustainable management of the national territory. One conservation scheme supported by this National Plan is the National Protected Area System. The Commission of Natural Protected Areas (CONANP) recently published its National Program (2007-2012) with three main objectives: 1) Biodiversity conservation, 2) Protection, management and restoration of ecosystems, and 3) Sustainable activities in accordance with conservation objectives. This project contributes to achieve these strategic objectives established by CONANP and the National Development Plan.
- C. DESCRIBE THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH [GEF STRATEGIES](#) AND STRATEGIC PROGRAMS:** The proposed project is consistent with the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority SP-1: Sustainable financing of protected area systems at the national level. Consolidating the National System for Protected Areas by focusing on the conservation of key protected areas is a critical component of the GEF Strategy on Biodiversity. A consolidated and sustainable protected area system will help conserve a large proportion of Mexico's rich and unique biodiversity and to maintain ecological and evolutionary processes of unique global importance. The global objective of this project is to consolidate the conservation of globally significant biodiversity in protected areas in Mexico, guaranteeing conservation and maintenance of global biodiversity benefits over the long term.
- D. OUTLINE THE COORDINATION WITH OTHER RELATED INITIATIVES:** The proposed project fits well within the World Bank's lending. Consistent with its commitment to mainstream the environment, the Bank's portfolio in Mexico emphasizes a balance between direct support to the environment sector, and the integration of biodiversity considerations into development activities not primarily designed to address environmental concerns. The project is closely coordinated with Mexico-Mesoamerican Biological Corridor project and the PROCYMAF Community Forestry project, to provide an important enabling element for effective management of biodiversity in Mexico.
- E. DESCRIBE THE [INCREMENTAL REASONING](#) OF THE PROJECT:** This grant will benefit the PA with an annual average income of USD\$ 97,087, which increases substantially the government budget. In the last three years this budget has varied between USD\$ 67,960 – 136,990. The grant will increase on an average 52% the income to the PA. Therefore, without this grant the level of achievement on their conservation objectives goals would decrease on a similar percentage. The targets established on the logical frameworks of each PA could not be achieved on a five year basis without the grant. For example, La Sepultura Biosphere Reserve is planning to increase 20% the habitat quality in its vegetation cover over a five year period (2009 – 2013). Without the grant (nearly 50% increase on the PA budget) this goal would take ten years to complete.
- F. INDICATE RISKS, INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE RISKS, THAT MIGHT PREVENT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE(S) FROM BEING ACHIEVED AND OUTLINE RISK MANAGEMENT MEASURES :** The logical frameworks of each PA

include assumptions which can rearrange the strategy due to consequences of climate change. In other words this instrument can be updated through adaptive management and therefore respond adequately to potential risks related to impacts of climate change.


G. EXPLAIN HOW COST-EFFECTIVENESS IS REFLECTED IN THE PROJECT DESIGN: As detailed in the PAD, alternatives considered and rejected include an explicit discussion of cost-effectiveness and why the selected financing plan is the most cost-effective. The design team considered funding the mainstreaming activities from the permanent endowment but decided instead to propose financing via normal project disbursements. Various alternatives and scenarios for the structure of the endowment matching funds have been analyzed. A scenario in which other donors would match GEF money dollar-for-dollar in basic conservation activities was rejected as unfeasible, given that few if any other donors are as willing as GEF to support basic conservation operation activities. The option to request \$22.5 million in GEF endowment funds and dedicate that portion of the endowment to basic conservation in the first tier of 12 "urgent priority" areas was selected as the most favorable in terms of investment markets and coherence of the future fundraising strategy as well as program clarity and continuity. The \$22.5 in matching funds will be used to extend basic conservation support to more areas (adding an area to the program in order of priority as there are sufficient funds to support it) and to go beyond basics in any of the areas, giving special priority to conservation programs that test and demonstrate new instruments and approaches, or programs that help PAs build financial sustainability at the local level.

PART III: INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION AND SUPPORT

A. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENT: The endowment funds will be managed by the Mexican Fund for the Conservation of Nature (FMCN), which is a private organization. The FMCN will channel the interest accrued to the protected areas, where the National Commission for Protected Areas (CONANP) is responsible for applying these funds to the conservation priorities in each protected area according to specific logical frameworks

PART IV: EXPLAIN THE ALIGNMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF: n/a

PART V: AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO Endorsement.	
 Steve Gorman Executive Coordinator, The World Bank	Jo Albert, Sr. GEF Regional Coordinator, LCR The World Bank
Date: September 3, 2008	Tel. and email:(202) 473-3458 Jalbert@worldbank.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

See tables annex A1, A2 and A3 with logical frameworks of each of the three protected areas included in tranche IV.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF)

GEF Secretariat Review

Comments	Team Responses
1. The endorsement letter dated April 30 2008, written in Spanish is attached. GEF now requires all endorsement letter submitted in English. Please kindly provide a translation (informal one is fine) for our record.	Translation of the endorsement letter attached in Annex 1.
2. No information is provided on the fit to specific GEF strategic objective and program. The project fits well with the SP1 on sustainable financing of PA system, however, further information is required under section C of the GEF template on Request for CEO endorsement approval.	The proposed project is consistent with the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority SP-1: Sustainable financing of protected area systems at the national level. Consolidating the National System for Protected Areas by focusing on the conservation of key protected areas is a critical component of the GEF Strategy on Biodiversity. A consolidated and sustainable protected area system will help conserve a large proportion of Mexico's rich and unique biodiversity and to maintain ecological and evolutionary processes of unique global importance. The global objective of this project is to consolidate the conservation of globally significant biodiversity in protected areas in Mexico, guaranteeing conservation and maintenance of global biodiversity benefits over the long term.
3. In addition to the general description that has been provided at this point, please summarize the GEB of the three protected areas that this tranche will focus on and how they are being measured.	The expected global environment benefits to be achieved with the inclusion of these three PAs are: reduced land degradation/desertification; critical ecosystem integrity and regulation functions preserved, restored and improved; freshwater ecosystems maintained and protected; reduced land-use conflicts and pasture pressure due to better land use planning. These benefits will be measured with the tracking tool system and the indicators defined in the logical frameworks for each area (see Annex 2).
4. Regarding the project framework (section A), we expect that in addition to the expansion of PA fund in monetary term, it also summarize some of the key outcomes of the three targeted PAs that would be covered by this tranche. Please provide necessary information.	The requested information is detailed in the logical frameworks for each protected area (see Annex 2)
5. Please provide information on the fit to the latest relevant national strategy, plan and policy related to this project initiative.	The project is consistent with national and government policies. The National Development Plan (2007-2012) is structured in five main chapters and the fourth refers to Environmental Sustainability. This chapter includes a biodiversity topic, with a strategy towards areas with conservation schemes, use and sustainable management of the national territory. One conservation scheme supported by this National Plan is the National Protected Area System. The Commission of Natural Protected Areas (CONANP) recently published its National Program (2007-2012) with three main objectives: 1) Biodiversity conservation, 2) Protection, management and restoration of ecosystems, and 3) Sustainable activities in accordance with conservation objectives. This project contributes to achieve these strategic objectives established by CONANP and the National Development Plan.
6. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related	The proposed project fits well within the World Bank's lending. Consistent with its commitment to mainstream the environment, the Bank's portfolio

<p>initiatives in the country or in the region? Please provide relevant information under section D.</p>	<p>in Mexico emphasizes a balance between direct support to the environment sector, and the integration of biodiversity considerations into development activities not primarily designed to address environmental concerns. The project is closely coordinated with Mexico-Mesoamerican Biological Corridor project and the PROCYMAF Community Forestry project, to provide an important enabling element for effective management of biodiversity in Mexico</p>
<p>7. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated in project design? Please summarize and provide relevant information under section G, not only referring to the PAD.</p>	<p>As detailed in the PAD, alternatives considered and rejected include an explicit discussion of cost-effectiveness and why the selected financing plan is the most cost-effective. The design team considered funding the mainstreaming activities from the permanent endowment but decided instead to propose financing via normal project disbursements. Various alternatives and scenarios for the structure of the endowment matching funds have been analyzed. A scenario in which other donors would match GEF money dollar-for-dollar in basic conservation activities was rejected as unfeasible, given that few if any other donors are as willing as GEF to support basic conservation operation activities. The option to request \$22.5 million in GEF endowment funds and dedicate that portion of the endowment to basic conservation in the first tier of 12 "urgent priority" areas was selected as the most favorable in terms of investment markets and coherence of the future fundraising strategy as well as program clarity and continuity. The \$22.5 in matching funds will be used to extend basic conservation support to more areas (adding an area to the program in order of priority as there are sufficient funds to support it) and to go beyond basics in any of the areas, giving special priority to conservation programs that test and demonstrate new instruments and approaches, or programs that help PAs build financial sustainability at the local level.</p>
<p>8. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and includes sufficient risk mitigation measures? Please provide relevant information under section F, including risks related to climate change.</p>	<p>The logical frameworks of each PA include assumptions which can rearrange the strategy due to consequences of climate change. In other words this instrument can be updated through adaptive management and therefore respond adequately to potential risks related to impacts of climate change.</p>
<p>9. Is the value-added of GEF involvement in the project clearly demonstrated through incremental reasoning? This question is related to section E of the GEF template. Rather than only referring to the relevant section of the PAD, please summarize them under the section and provide necessary information.</p>	<p>This grant will benefit the PA with an annual average income of USD\$ 97,087, which increases substantially the government budget. In the last three years this budget has varied between USD\$ 67,960 – 136,990. The grant will increase on an average 52% the income to the PA. Therefore, without this grant the level of achievement on their conservation objectives goals would decrease on a similar percentage. The targets established on the logical frameworks of each PA could not be achieved on a five year basis without the grant. For example, La Sepultura Biosphere Reserve is planning to increase 20% the habitat quality in its vegetation cover over a five year period (2009 – 2013). Without the grant (nearly 50% increase on the PA budget) this goal would take ten years to complete.</p>
<p>10. How would the proposed project outcomes and global environmental benefits be affected if GEF does not invest? Please provide necessary information.</p>	<p>The targets established on the logical frameworks of each PA could not be achieved on a five year basis without the GEF grant. For example, La Sepultura Biosphere Reserve is planning to increase 20% the habitat quality in its vegetation cover over a five year period (2009 – 2013). Without the grant (nearly 50% increase on the PA budget) this goal would take ten years to complete.</p>
<p>11. No cofinancing letters are attached. For every tranche in the past, we received copies of the letter in addition</p>	<p>Please find attached the copies of the cofinancing letters and summary of cofinancing in Annex 3</p>

to proof of deposit. Please kindly provide the copies as it is a requirement.	
12. Please provide necessary summary information under section G on the M&E plan, in light of the new GE M&E policy.	All indicators in the PA Logical Frameworks are aligned to the program level results. Every year, the project sends an M&E report to the World Bank. For detailed information, please find attached the 2007 M&E Report (Annex 4).
13. Please also provide tracking tools for all the three PAs.	Please find attached tracking tools for each protected area (Annex 5).
14. Logical framework is provided for all three new PAs that this tranche will be focused on. Baseline information for quite a number of indicators are yet to be provided. GEF requires these information by the time of CEO endorsement. Please provide necessary information.	Please find baseline information in the logical frameworks for the three PAs (Annex 2)
15. The PM did not find an attachment of the summary of the Independent Evaluation and Bank evaluation although it has been noted on the cover memo. Please kindly provide these information.	Please find attached a copy of the independent evaluation (Annex 6).
16. Please also ensure that these project level indicators and targets fit with the program level results framework and adequately monitored at the program level. Please provide necessary information that this has been done.	All indicators in the PA Logical Frameworks are aligned to the program level results. Every year, the project sends an M&E report to the World Bank, which is complemented by periodical field visits and supervision missions.

RESPONSE TO OBSERVATIONS MADE ON JULY 16, 2008

Comments	Team Responses
<p>1. Please provide summary of the aggregated measurable GEB among the three PAs that the project is focusing on at this tranche, i.e. total hectare coverage, species conservation etc to have a holistic understanding about the scope of the project.</p> <p>Regarding the project framework (section A), we expect that in addition to the expansion of PA fund in monetary term, it also summarize some of the key outcomes of the three targeted PAs that would be covered by this tranche. Please provide aggregated information on outcomes and outputs among the 3 targeted PAs in the project framework</p>	<p>Mexico has a total of 164 protected areas at the federal level, which are considered of national importance. They cover 23,098,391 ha. Through a priority-setting exercise conducted by experts and described in Annex 13 of the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) a group of 34 protected areas were considered of global importance based on eight criteria and a thorough analysis. These 34 protected areas cover an area of 9,443,625 (40% of the total) and include the most representative ecosystems in the country. Mexico is one of the countries with both highest biodiversity and ecosystem diversity in the world. The 34 protected areas are thus considered of key global importance.</p> <p>While Mexico has ensured that the 34 protected areas have personnel and a fiscal budget, basic operation requires additional funds to conserve the natural resources harbored by these sites. The GEF funds and the co-financing already obtained for 26 of the 34 protected areas ensure their basic operation and conservation. The funds for three protected areas included in the fourth tranche will increase to 29 the protected areas which have their basic operation covered.</p>

<p>and/or GEB section as appropriate. In addition, the PM referred again on the submission of the earlier tranche to see how these information has been provided and recognized that supplemental GEF grant agreement document was attached (including some summary and logframes of the Pas) at the previous tranches.</p>	<p>The three protected areas included in the fourth tranche will complete the 12 protected areas covered in the four tranches by GEF. They cover 610,925 ha of the 3,412,660 ha total area of the 12 protected areas. The three protected areas are biosphere reserves recognized for their national and global importance. They contain a wide array of unique ecosystems, such as the Chihuahuan desert and transition ecosystems between Central and North-America. They are particularly important for their vegetation types, species richness, and number of endangered species they contain (see table included in Annex 7).</p> <p>The project funds and the investment by CONANP in the three protected areas will ensure that deforestation rates within these protected areas slows down, that the species that dwell in these areas are maintained as indicated by the registry of indicator species defined per area, and that the area under sustainable practices and number of people involved in these practices increases (as defined per area in each logical framework). Preliminary data on areas already supported with GEF funds indicate that deforestation is significantly lower inside the protected areas and most protected areas analyzed show decreasing deforestation through time.</p>
<p>2. Copies of the cofinancing letters are provided. The PM recognized that these cofinances are dedicated to specific sub-funds within the Mexico PA fund, such as Monarch Butterfly Fund, Bahía de los Ángeles fund, Gulf of California marine fund. Please kindly clarify that these funds are indeed cofinancing the GEF's finance to the three targeted PAs under this tranche.</p>	<p>As explained in Annex 13 of the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) the consolidation of the Protected Areas System requires focusing on obtaining benefits for the protected area system as a whole and not on any isolated protected area. Through a thorough priority-setting exercise a group of experts identified eight criteria, which were applied to 114 protected areas. This exercise is summarized in Annex 13 of the PAD. As a result of this exercise, 34 protected areas were identified as priority from a global benefit perspective.</p> <p>As explained in Annex 14 of the PAD the one-to-one matching endowment funds will either cover basic conservation or other complementary activities in the group of 34 priority areas identified through the exercise described in Annex 13 of the PAD. Hence the cofinance involves matching funds in some of the 34 priority areas. It is the result of the fundraising plan described in Annex 14 of the PAD.</p>
<p>3 Additional information and documents are provided, including the TTs and evaluation reports. However, information provided on the M&E plan is not sufficient. In addition to the annual reporting, please indicate all monitoring and evaluation actions planned for the project, including monitoring missions, evaluation activities (ICR, etc) based on GEF and WB guidelines for M&E.</p>	<p>M&E of the project involves the following actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) based on the 5-year logframes the personnel in each protected area defines annual goals for each indicator. Advances in each indicator toward the annual goals are measured every semester through written reports that are reviewed by the central coordination unit of the project; b) field visits are conducted according to a program defined by the central coordination unit and the National Commission for Protected Areas (CONANP) to ensure that advances in the field correspond to the reports and to update logframes every five years; c) the World Bank conducts supervision missions at least two times per year, which include field visits to the protected areas; d) indicators at the project level are measured yearly and reported to the World Bank every March; e) the independent evaluation and mid-term review involved experts in monitoring and included a review of M&E activities; f) GEF tracking tools were updated for the mid term review; g) an independent evaluation is planned for 2009 in preparation for

the ICR and the June 30, 2010 closing date.

The monitoring methodology is based on indicators that measure impact on stakeholders and biodiversity at the project and site level, as well as management performance. Feedback in writing is provided to the protected area teams every semester by the project staff and by the World Bank during supervision missions. In addition, CONANP measures periodically the performance of the protected area personnel.

RESPONSE TO OBSERVATIONS MADE ON JULY 25, 2008

Comments	Team Responses
<p>1. Adequate explanation has been provided. However, the PM recognize that the total cofinance noted on Annex C notes \$5.44 million (with \$1.29 million contribution from Packard Foundation), while the Request for CEO Endorsement Approval document notes a total cofinancing of \$10.15 million (with \$6 million contribution from Packard). Please revise the document to ensure coherence and GEF appreciates the larger cofinance for the project.</p>	<p>As explained in Annex B of the supplemental grant document (see note on the second column of table under paragraph 6) the total contribution from Packard Foundation in December 2007 was US\$ 6 million (see bank deposit statement). Only US\$ 1.29 million of these US\$ 6 million were required to complete the required 1:1 match to complete the US\$5.44 million at that point. Hence, the project raised an additional US\$ 4.7 million (US\$ 6 million minus US\$1.29 million) to the required US\$5.44 million.</p>

RESPONSE TO OBSERVATIONS MADE ON AUGUST 22, 2008

Comments	Team Responses
<p>1. After an internal financial review of the CEO endorsement package, the GEFSEC recognized that there should not be any agency fee included in the tranches, based on the information in the cover note from Nov 2000 WP. It states "It is anticipated that there would be a future additional request for \$15 million in GEF. This additional assistance would be made without additional fee to the World Bank as Implementing Agency."</p> <p>Please revise and resubmit the CEO endorsement request form without the 10% Agency Fee. Please also inform the Mexico OFP accordingly about this change.</p>	<p>Done.</p>

ANNEX C: CONSULTANTS TO BE HIRED FOR THE PROJECT

<i>Position Titles</i>	<i>\$/ person week</i>	<i>Estimated person weeks</i>	<i>Tasks to be performed</i>
For Project Management			
Local			
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
International			
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
For Technical Assistance			
Local			
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
International			
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

ANNEX D: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

- A. EXPLAIN IF THE PPG OBJECTIVE HAS BEEN ACHIEVED THROUGH THE PPG ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN.**
N/A
- B. DESCRIBE IF ANY FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION.** N/A
- C. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:**

<i>Project Preparation Activities Approved</i>	<i>Implementation Status</i>	<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>				<i>Co- financing (\$)</i>
		<i>Amount Approved</i>	<i>Amount Spent To- date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>	<i>Uncommitted Amount*</i>	
n/a	(Select)					
n/a	(Select)					
n/a	(Select)					
n/a	(Select)					
n/a	(Select)					
n/a	(Select)					
n/a	(Select)					
n/a	(Select)					
Total						

* Uncommitted amount should be returned to the GEF Trust Fund. Please indicate expected date of refund transaction to Trustee.

Document of
The World Bank

Report No.:

SUPPLEMENTAL PROJECT DOCUMENT
PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL GRANT FROM THE
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY TRUST FUND

IN THE AMOUNT OF USD 5.44 MILLION

TO THE

UNITED MEXICAN STATES

AND

NACIONAL FINANCIERA, S.N.C.

AND

FONDO MEXICANO PARA LA CONSERVACION DE LA NATURALEZA A.C.

FOR THE

CONSOLIDATION OF THE PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM (SINAP II)
PROJECT

May 5, 2008

Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development
Latin America and the Caribbean Region

CURRENCY EQUIVALENTS

(Exchange Rate Effective May 5, 2008)

US\$ 1 - MXN 10.40

FISCAL YEAR

July 1-June 30

ACRONYMS

ANP	<i>Área Natural Protegida</i> (Natural Protected Area)
NPA	Biosphere Reserve
CI	Conservation International
CONABIO	<i>Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la Biodiversidad</i> (Mexican National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity)
CONAFOR	Comisión Nacional Forestal (National Forestry Commission)
CONANP	<i>Consejo Nacional Mexicano de Áreas Naturales Protegidas</i> (Mexican National Council for Natural Protected Areas)
CONAPESCA	Comisión Nacional de Acuacultura y Pesca (National Aquaculture and Fishing Commission)
CRIP-INP	<i>Centro Regional de Investigación Pesquera – Instituto Nacional de la Pesca</i> (Regional Fishing Research Center – National Fishing Institute)
DGVS	<i>Dirección General de Vida Silvestre</i> (General Directorate for Wildlife)
ECOSUR	<i>El Colegio de la Frontera Sur</i> (School of the Southern Border)
FANP	<i>Fondo para Áreas Naturales Protegidas</i> (Natural Protected Areas Fund)
FIRCO	<i>Fideicomiso de Riesgo Compartido</i> (Shared Risk Trust Fund)
FMCN	<i>Fondo Mexicano para la Conservación de la Naturaleza</i> (Mexican Fund for the Conservation of Nature)
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
ICB	International Consultant Bidding
IDESMAC	<i>Instituto para el Desarrollo Sostenible en Mesoamerica</i> (Institute for Sustainable Development in Mesoamerica)
IHNyE	<i>Instituto de Historia Natural y Ecología</i> (Institute for Natural History and Ecology)
INIFAP	<i>Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Forestales, Agrícolas y Pecuarias</i> (National Institute for Forest, Agriculture, and Livestock Research)
NCB	National Consultant Bidding
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PA	Protected Area
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PET	<i>Programa de Empleo Temporal</i> (Temporary Employment Program)
PFP	<i>Policía Federal Preventiva</i> (Preventative Federal Police)
PGJ	<i>Procuraduría General de Justicia</i> (Attorney General of Justice)
POA	<i>Plan Operativo Anual</i> (Annual Operating Plan)
PRODESA	<i>Programa de Desarrollo Regional Sustentable</i> (Regional Sustainable Development Program)
PROFEPA	<i>Procuraduría Federal del Medio Ambiente</i> (Federal Attorney for the Environment)

SAGARPA	<i>Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y Alimentación</i> (Secretariat of Agriculture, Rural Development, Fishing and Food)
SE	<i>Secretaría de Economía</i> (Secretariat of Economy)
SEDENA	<i>Secretaría de Defensa Nacional</i> (Secretariat of National Defense)
SEDESOL	<i>Secretaría de Desarrollo Social</i> (Ministry of Social Development)
SEMAR	<i>Secretaría de la Armada de México</i> (Secretariat of the Mexican Navy)
SEMERNAT	<i>Secretaría del Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales</i> (Secretariat for the Environment and Natural Resources)
SEPESCA	Secretaría de Pesca
SINAP	<i>Sistema Nacional de Areas Protegidas</i> (Mexican National Protected Areas System)
ZOFEMAT	<i>Zona Federal Marítimo Terrestre</i> (Federal Marine Terrestrial Zone)

Vice President: Pamela Cox Sector Director: Laura Tuck Country Director: Axel van Trotsenburg Sector Manager: Laura Tlaiye Sector Leader: Gustavo Saltiel Task Team Leader: Adriana Moreira
--

MEXICO

Supplemental GEF Grant – Consolidation of the Protected Areas System Project SINAP II

Background:

1. This report refers to a supplemental GEF grant to the United Mexican States and Nacional Financiera S.N.C. and Fondo Mexicano para la Conservación de la Naturaleza (FMCN) for US\$5.44 million, to provide additional funding for the Mexico: Consolidation of the Protected Areas System Project (SINAP II). The SINAP II Project was approved by the Board on February 7, 2002. The corresponding Grant Agreement was signed on February 13, 2002, and became effective on April 25, 2002. The Project is expected to close by June 30, 2010.

2. The Project's objective is to promote the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in Mexico through the consolidation of the National System Protected Areas (SINAP) by: (a) conserving globally important biodiversity in selected areas of SINAP through an endowment fund; (b) promoting the economic, social and environmental sustainability of productive activities in selected protected areas; (c) promoting social co-responsibility for conservation; and (d) in general, promoting the inclusion of biodiversity conservation and sustainable criteria in development projects and other practices affecting selected protected areas. This project extends the protected areas program initiated with GEF funding in 1992 and restructured as an endowment fund for 10 protected areas in 1997 (Project SINAP I), by adding 12 new protected areas to the program. There have been no substantial changes to the project's original objectives and design since Board approval.

3. The total GEF grant amounts to US\$31.1, while the total cost of the project is US\$60.12 million. The disbursement of the first tranche (US\$16.1 million) took place on May 10, 2002 and included US\$7.5 million in endowment funds to cover the basic conservation of four selected protected areas. A second tranche of US\$2.21 million in endowment funds, to support basic conservation in Sierra de Álamos in the state of Sonora in Mexico, was disbursed on July 1, 2004. The third tranche with a corresponding disbursement of US\$7.35 million took place on October 26, 2007 to support four protected areas: La Encrucijada in the state of Chiapas, Banco Chinchorro in Quintana Roo, El Pinacate in Sonora, and Sierra La Laguna in Baja California Sur. The proposed supplemental GEF grant would be used to further capitalize the endowment of the protected areas fund under FMCN ("Fondo para Areas Naturales Protegidas" - FANP) for the following protected areas: *La Sepultura* and *El Ocote* in Chiapas and *Mapimí* in the states of Chihuahua, Coahuila and Durango. All three Reserves are considered to be areas of high biological and ecological importance and are facing important threats to the conservation and sustainable use of their natural resources, therefore they are considered of high priority for protection. These areas have been pre-selected according to the criteria established in the Project Document (PAD of January 10, 2002, Annex 14, page 99). More details on the ecology of the three protected areas and the threats they face can be found in Annex C.

4. Per the policy adopted by the Board in March 2002, this supplemental grant includes additional information on the following: (i) summary of evidence for compliance with established conditions for the supplemental grant; (ii) the estimated project costs, procurement and disbursement arrangements, (iii) the social assessment and social strategy, (iv) the FANP endowment, (v) the environmental analysis; (vi) revised logical framework; (vii) changes to the

matching funds; and (viii) additional information on the Social Assessment and Operational Strategy design for *La Sepultura* and *El Ocote* in the state of Chiapas and *Mapimí* in the states of Coahuila, Durango and Chihuahua.

Summary of evidence for compliance with established conditions for supplemental grant:

5. Compliance of the supplemental GEF grant with applicable Bank safeguard and fiduciary policies were ensured by applying the procedures established in the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) and Legal Agreement, particularly in the annexes on procurement, disbursement and environmental analysis. The conditions required the submission of the following documentation:

- Reserve-specific logical framework with protected area-specific indicators.
- Evidence of matching contributions to the endowment.
- Adequate social assessment for the entering protected areas.
- Adequate evaluation of indigenous peoples' issues and appropriate design of Indigenous Peoples Development Plans, as needed.
- Endowment contributions by SEMARNAT (*Secretariat for the Environment and Natural Resources: Secretaría del Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales*) to FANP, in order to cover taxes during project implementation.

6. These conditions have been met and are summarized below and detailed in the attached annexes:

- a) The logical frameworks with the indicators for the *La Sepultura*, *El Ocote*, and *Mapimí* protected areas are included in Annex A.
- b) Evidence of matching contributions to the endowment: Annex B includes a table that summarizes the matching funds to date. Copies of bank account statements showing deposits amounting to US\$ 10.15 million accompanied by the agreements signed by the donors are available in project files.
- c) The social assessments and social strategies for *La Sepultura*, *El Ocote*, and *Mapimí* are available in project files; executive summaries are included in Annex C. The appropriate designs of remedial actions are defined in the logical framework in Annex A.
- d) Social assessment identified that 80% of population in NPA El Ocote is of indigenous descent, therefore the whole social strategy for this area has been prepared as an Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPP). In the case of NPA La Sepultura, there is only a small community of indigenous migrants concentrated in Villahermosa; an IPP has been prepared for this community. There is no indigenous population in NPA Mapimí. Social strategy in Annex C comprises a summary of IPP for El Ocote and Villahermosa IPP in La Sepultura. Both IPP were fully discussed and agreed with indigenous populations and locally disclosed. Full IPP are available in project files and will be sent to the Infoshop for further disclosure.
- e) The endowment contributions by SEMARNAT (Secretariat for the Environment and Natural Resources: Secretaría del Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales) to FANP are shown in the bank account statements described in Annex B. SEMARNAT has deposited

a total of US\$2.3 million in endowment funds to cover taxes during project implementation.

References to the PAD Annexes:

7. The procedures described in the Project Appraisal Document, particularly in the annexes on procurement, disbursement, and environmental analysis were followed, and no significant modifications are required in Annex 3, 6, 11, 14 and 15, since the expansion of the FANP was part of the original project design and is included in the Project Appraisal Document in the following fashion:

Annex 3: "Estimated Project Costs": the funds requested by the supplemental grant are included in the US\$ 15 million under the GEF column in the third table found on page 49. The matching funds described in Annex B of this report are included under the "GOM" and "Private" columns of the same table.

Annex 6: "Procurement and Disbursement Arrangements": the supplemental grant will be part of the endowment capital. Its generated income will finance the area implementation Annual Operating Plans (POAs). The \$5.44 million supplemental grant by GEF and the corresponding \$5.44 million matching funds should be added to the "Other" column under "4. Endowment Fund."

Annex 11: "Social Assessment and Social Strategy": as stated above, the social assessments for the *La Sepultura*, *El Ocote*, and *Mapimí* protected areas have been submitted and cleared by the World Bank. Their summaries are included in Annex C. The social strategy that will be followed in *La Sepultura*, *El Ocote*, and *Mapimí* is the one described in Annex 11 for the original four protected areas, since it is a general strategy designed for the 12 new protected areas to be supported by the endowment income.

Annex 14: Annex 14: "Further Expansion of the FANP Endowment": this Annex incorporates the supplemental grants for the remaining three protected areas, including *La Sepultura*, *El Ocote*, and *Mapimí* as part of the expansion of the endowment. The average costs per area are the ones described in this Annex and have suffered no changes.

Annex 15: "Environmental Analysis": the procedures described in this annex will be followed, in case any of the activities included in the annual operating plans of the *La Sepultura*, *El Ocote*, and *Mapimí* protected areas require an environmental impact assessment, in accordance with the procedures set forth in the FMCN/FANP Operational Manual and the CONANP Operational Manual.

Annex A1. Logical framework with the indicators of the NPA “La Sepultura” in Chiapas.

Strategy	Indicators			Verification Sources	Assumptions
	Indicator(s)	Baseline	Target		
OBJECTIVE					
Maintain the biodiversity and the ecosystem services of the Reserve through its protection, conservation and management in collaboration with residents, users and key partners.	Rate of change of vegetation cover.	Core Zone: 10 ha/year. Buffer Zone: 300 ha/year.	2009: CZ: 10 ha/year. BZ: 270 ha/year.	GIS analysis reports, fire statistical reports and Databases.	No extraordinary meteorological conditions or earthquakes. Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the reserve. Social stability and will from the communities.
			2010: CZ: 5 ha/year. BZ: 240 ha/year.		
			2011: CZ: 2.5 ha/year. BZ: 190 ha/year.		
			2012: CZ: 1.3 ha/year. BZ: 167 ha/year.		
			2013: CZ: 1.3 ha/year. BZ: 167 ha/year.		
	Habitat quality.	70% of the vegetation cover with good habitat quality.	2009: 70% of the vegetation cover with good habitat quality.	Habitat quality studies and reports.	
			2010: 75% of the vegetation cover with good habitat quality.		
			2011: 80% of the vegetation cover with good habitat quality.		
			2012: 85% of the vegetation cover with good habitat quality.		
			2013: 90% of the vegetation cover with good habitat quality.		
	Quantity and quality of water.	Water quality acceptable (6 to 30 DBO) Annual mean volume of 70 million square meters. DBO data	2009: Water quality acceptable (6 to 30 DBO) Annual mean volume of 70 million square meters.	Quantity and quality of water report.	

		<p>according to the National Commission of Water (CNA) and hidrometrológica stations.</p> <p>2010: Water quality acceptable (6 to 30 DBO) Annual mean volume of 70 million square meters.</p> <p>2011: Water quality acceptable (6 to 30 DBO) Annual mean volume of 76 million square meters.</p> <p>2012: Water quality acceptable (6 to 30 DBO) Annual mean volume of 83 million square meters.</p> <p>2013: Water quality acceptable (6 to 30 DBO) Annual mean volume of 88 million square meters.</p>	
Abundance of five indicator and/or key species.	<p><i>Passerina rositae</i> 83% abundant (5 observations per site) <i>Phantera onca</i> 80% (1 observation per site) <i>Puma concolor</i> 80% (1 observation per site) <i>Tapirus bairdii</i> 80% (1 observation per site) <i>Chamaedora quezalteca</i>, 0.5 individuals per square meter</p>	<p>2009: Maintain baseline species abundance.</p> <p>2010: Maintain baseline species abundance.</p> <p>2011: Maintain baseline species abundance.</p> <p>2012: Maintain baseline species abundance.</p> <p>2013: Maintain baseline species abundance.</p>	Annual Monitoring Report

		in wild populations.		
	Erosion Index	100 Tons per ha per year.	2009: 100 Tons per ha per year. 2010: 97 Tons per ha per year. 2011: 95 Tons per ha per year. 2012: 93 Tons per ha per year. 2013: 90 Tons per ha per year.	Erosion monitoring report.

RESULTS

MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION STRATEGY

R1. Illegal environmental acts are reduced with the execution of the vigilance and protection programme in coordination with residents and institutions.	Number of illegal acts by type and severity.	15 illegal acts per year	2009: 15 annual illegal acts.	Database analysis.	No extraordinary meteorological conditions or earthquakes. Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the reserve. Social stability and will from the communities. Mechanisms to enforce norms and regulations.
			2010: 10 annual illegal acts.		
			2011: 8 annual illegal acts.		
			2012: 5 annual illegal acts.		
			2013: 5 annual illegal acts.		
	Number of illegal acts reported / followed.	50% of illegal acts reported and followed.	2009: 50%	Database analysis.	
			2010: 60%		
			2011: 70%		
			2012: 80%		
			2013: 90%		
	Number of tours and area under vigilance.	12 annual tours covering 5,000 has.	2009: 12 annual tours in 5,000 has.	Database analysis.	
			2010: 12 annual tours in 5,000 has.		
2011: 100 annual tours in 40,000 has.					
2012: 140 annual tours in 60,000 has.					
2013: 160 annual tours in 80,000 has.					
R2. Negative impact from fires in the Reserve ecosystems are reduced through the implementation of an integrated fire management programme.	Number of fires.	35 fires per year.	2009: 35 fires per year.	Database analysis.	
			2010: 35 fires per year.		
			2011: 30 fires per year.		
			2012: 25 fires per year.		

			2013: 20 fires per year.		organisms with incidence in the reserve. Social stability and will from the communities.
Affected area (ha) per fire.	286 ha per fire.		2009: 286 ha per fire. 2010: 250 ha per fire. 2011: 200 ha per fire. 2012: 150 ha per fire. 2013: 100 ha per fire.	Database analysis and technical reports from the dry season.	
Area with fire regime retained.	10,000 ha		2009: 10,000 ha. 2010: 50,000 ha. 2011: 100,000 ha 2012: 130,000 ha 2013: 149,000 ha.	Database analysis and technical reports from the dry season.	
Area under fire management.	1000 Ha		2009: 1000 ha. 2010: 1000 ha. 2011: 2000 ha 2012: 2000 ha 2013: 3000 ha.	Database analysis and technical reports from the dry season.	
Number of communities with a Community Fire Management Programme.	4 communities		2009: 4 communities. 2010: 6 communities. 2011: 8 communities. 2012: 10 communities. 2013: 12 communities.	Technical reports of the Fire Management Programmes.	
R3. The communities of the PA have urban developmental plans at a municipal level with environmental criteria.	Number of municipalities that include environmental criteria in their urban developmental plans	1 municipality	2009: 1 municipality, Arriaga. 2010: 2 municipalities, Arriaga and Tonalá. 2011: 3 municipalities Arriaga, Tonalá and Villaflores. 2012: 4 municipalities, Arriaga, Tonalá, Villaflores and Cintalapa.	Agreements of community or municipal assemblies.	Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the reserve. Social stability and will from the communities.

			2013: 4 municipalities, Arriaga, Tonalá, Villaflores and Cintalapa.		
	Number of communities with a basic management programme for solid waste residues.	0 communities.	2009: 0 communities. 2010: 2 communities. 2011: 4 communities. 2012: 6 communities. 2013: 8 communities., Los Angeles, Tierra y Libertad (de Villaflores), Tierra y Libertad (Jiquipilas), Tiltepec, Rosendo Salazar, Col. Agrícola 20 de Nov., Las Palmas and Raymundo Flores.	Agreements of community or municipal assemblies and technical reports.	
R4. A research and monitoring programme is applied to the management decision making within the PA.	Number of research projects that stick to the Management Programme of the PA and support decision making.	27 research projects.	2009: 1 research project. 2010: 3 research projects. 2011: 5 research projects. 2012: 6 research projects. 2013: 7 research projects.	Annual report.	No extraordinary meteorological conditions or earthquakes. Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the reserve. Social stability and will from the communities.
	Number of collaboration agreements with research institutes.	0 agreements.	2009: 2 agreements. 2010: 4 agreements. 2011: 6 agreements. 2012: 6 agreements. 2013: 6 agreements.	Signed agreement.	
R5. Damaged critical zones are restored with social participation and aid from institutions from the environmental sector.	Area under a restoration process (includes areas abandoned or recovered).	150 has	2009: 50 has 2010: 100 has 2011: 150 has 2012: 200 has 2013: 250 has	Technical report.	There are no extraordinary meteorological conditions or earthquakes. There is political and institutional will with incidence in
	Number of restoration works.	2000 works (8 works per Ha).	2009: 200 restoration works. 2010: 400 restoration works.	Technical report.	

			2011: 800 restoration works. 2012: 1200 restoration works. 2013: 1600 restoration works.		the reserve. There is social stability and will from the communities.
Number of exotic species (controlled and/or eradicated).	2 species (Tilapia sp. and <i>Hiarrenya ruffa</i>).		2009: 2 species. 2010: 2 species. 2011: 2 species. 2012: 2 species. 2013: 2 species.	Technical report.	
SOCIAL STRATEGY					
R6. PA producers adopt sustainable agricultural and livestock techniques with support from institutions.	Area under sustainable management.	1700 ha.	2009: 500 ha	Technical report.	No extraordinary meteorological conditions or earthquakes. Political and institutional (SAGARPA, SC, FONAES, and SEDESOL) will from organisms with incidence in the reserve. Social stability and will from the communities.
			2010: 1,000 ha		
			2011: 1,500 ha		
			2012: 2,000 ha		
	Number of producers involved in sustainable activities.	588 producers	2009: 250 producers.	Technical report.	
			2010: 500 producers.		
			2011: 750 producers.		
			2012: 1,000 producers.		
	Number of sustainable techniques (systems of production) adopted.	5 systems of production.	2009: Maintain 5 systems of production.	Technical report PET and PRODERS.	
			2010: Maintain 5 systems of production.		
			2011: Maintain 5 systems of production.		
			2012: Maintain 5 systems of production.		
2013: Maintain 5 systems of production.					
R7. Local communities from the PA have other sustainable activities (productive alternatives) or conservation schemes.	Area with sustainable alternatives (includes payment for ecosystem services).	10,420 ha.	2009: 500 ha.	Technical report CONAFOR, PET and PRODERS.	
			2010: 1,000 ha.		
			2011: 1,500 ha.		
			2012: 2,000 ha.		
	Number of people	919 people involved.	2009: 60 people involved.	Technical report CONAFOR, PET	

	involved.		2010: 210 people involved. 2011: 360 people involved. 2012: 510 people involved. 2013: 660 people involved.	and PRODERS.	CONCAFE, and Municipalities) will from organisms with incidence in the reserve. There is social stability and will from the communities.	
	Number of sustainable activities (productive alternatives) adopted.	5 sustainable activities.	2009: 5 sustainable activities. 2010: 5 sustainable activities. 2011: 5 sustainable activities. 2012: 5 sustainable activities. 2013: 5 sustainable activities.	Technical report CONAFOR, PET and PRODERS.		
R8. Population awareness level of the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem benefits that the PA generates.	% of population of the PA and its influence area that recognises the importance of the ecosystem services of the reserve.	5530 form a total of 11, 061 habitants (49%).	2009: 50% according to baseline.	Evaluation results and annual report.		No extraordinary meteorological conditions or earthquakes. Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the reserve. Social stability and will from the communities.
			2010: 6083 habitants, 55% according to baseline.			
			2011: 6636 habitants, 60% according to baseline.			
			2012: 7189 habitants, 65% according to baseline.			
			2013: 7742 habitants, 70% according to baseline.			
	% of visitors of the PA that recognises the importance of the ecosystem services of the reserve.	3750 of a total of 12,500 visitors (30%).	2009: 30% according to baseline. 2010: 35% according to baseline. 2011: 40% according to baseline. 2012: 45% according to baseline. 2013: 50% according to baseline.	Evaluation results and annual report.		
R9. Increase in social participation in conservation activities.	Number of meetings of advisory council with	4 meetings.	2009: 4 meetings.	Meeting reports.	No extraordinary meteorological conditions or	
			2010: 4 meetings.			
			2011: 4 meetings.			
			2012: 4 meetings.			

minimum quorum.		2013: 4 meetings.		earthquakes. Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the reserve. Social stability and will from the communities.
Number of active fora.	7: CMDRS of Villaflores, Villacorzo and Cintalapa; CDDRS coast and Frailesca, Comité de Cuenca Lagartero and Zanatenco.	2009: 7 fora.	Meeting reports.	
		2010: 8 fora.		
		2011: 9 fora.		
		2012: 9 fora.		
		2013: 9 fora.		
Number of inhabitants participating in conservation and management practices within the PA.	1507 people participating.	2009: 310 people above baseline.	Meeting reports. Technical report CONAFOR, PET and PRODERS.	
		2010: 610 people above baseline.		
		2011: 910 people above baseline.		
		2012: 1210 people above baseline.		
		2013: 1510 people above baseline.		

Annex A2. Logical framework with the indicators of the protected area “El Ocote” ” in Chiapas

Strategy	Indicators			Verification Sources	Assumptions
	Indicator(s)	Baseline	Target		
Objective: Maintain karstic tropical ecosystems as well as the continuity of natural processes and cycles of the Biosphere Reserve Selva El Ocote.	Between 2009 and 2013 deforestation within the reserve does not exceed the ha/year surface of the baseline generated in 2000.	Between 1995-2000 annual deforestation rate within the reserve was 2.54 %.	2009. The deforestation rate is maintained.	Satellite images. Vegetation and land use study reports.	No extreme meteorological phenomena. Environmental issues are kept in the national political agenda.
			2010. The deforestation rate is maintained.		
2011. The deforestation rate is maintained.					
2012. The deforestation rate is maintained.					
2013. The deforestation rate is maintained.					
Underground waters of the Reserve do not exceed the established standards of contaminants NOM-001-ECOL-1996, which set the maximum allowable contaminant limit of residual water discharge into national waters.	All sites surveyed (eight) for underground water quality are within the official limit (NOM-001-ECOL-1996).	2009. Underground water quality is kept as per NOM-001-ECOL-1996 standards for all sites surveyed.	Water quality yearly reports		
		2010. Underground water quality is kept as per NOM-001-ECOL-1996 standards for all sites surveyed.			
		2011. Underground water quality is kept as per NOM-001-ECOL-1996 standards for all sites surveyed.			

		2012. Underground water quality is kept as per NOM-001-ECOL-1996 standards for all sites surveyed.	
		2013. Underground water quality is kept as per NOM-001-ECOL-1996 standards for all sites surveyed.	
Frequency of observation of key species with yearly presence records in the core zones of the Reserve.	Four species with presence in the reserve: <i>Pantera onca</i> , <i>Spizetus ornatus</i> , <i>Boa constrictor</i> and <i>Hylorchilus navai</i> .	<p>2009. An increase on the observation frequency for the four species with presence in the reserve.</p> <p>2010. An increase on the observation frequency for the four species with presence in the reserve.</p> <p>2011. An increase on the observation frequency for the four species with presence in the reserve.</p> <p>2012. An increase on the observation frequency for the four species with presence in the reserve.</p> <p>2013. An increase on the observation frequency for the four species with presence in the reserve.</p>	Yearly reports on the monitoring projects of key species.
Increase of	500 ha in 2008.	2009. 600 has.	Yearly reports on

	sustainable managed areas from 500 ha to 1,000 ha		2010. 700 has. 2011. 800 has. 2012. 900 has. 2013. 1,000 has.	sustainable development projects.
	Increase of the area under ecological restoration in the evergreen and subevergreen medium altitude rainforest of the Reserve from 2,800 to 3,300 ha	2,800 ha in 2008.	2009. 2900 has. 2010. 3000 has. 2011. 3100 has. 2012. 3200 has 2013. 3300 has.	Yearly reports on ecological restoration projects.

Results

Management and conservation strategies

R1. Availability of basic support information for the Reserve management.	Number of research projects carried out.	5 research projects carried out in 2008.	2009: 1 project	Availability of research documents	Interest shown by academic institutions in the development of applied research projects.
			2010: 1 project		
			2011: 1 database of research projects.		
			2012: Update of the database of research projects.		
			2012: Update of the database of research projects.		
R2. Mitigation of the negative impact of illicit acts on natural resources.	Area of the PA under surveillance.	25,000 ha in 2008.	2009: 25,000 has.	Field reports. Inspection minutes taken by PROFEPA.	Cooperation and efficiency on applying regulations. Political will from corresponding institutions in order to enforce the law.
			2010: 25,000 has.		
			2011: 35,000 has.		
			2012: 45,000 has.		
			2013: Surveillance over 45,000 ha is kept.		
	Number of illicit acts reported by the PA and followed by PROFEPA.	15% of illicit acts in 2008.	2009: 15% of illicit acts followed		
			2010: 20% of illicit acts followed		
2011: 20% of illicit acts followed					

			<p>2012: 30% of illicit acts followed</p> <p>2013: 35% of illicit acts followed</p>		
R3. Mitigation of the negative impact of fire on the karstic tropical ecosystem.	Area affected by fires.	4,000 ha in 2008.	2009: 4,000 ha	Field reports. Damage assesment documentation. Satellite images.	No extreme meteorological phenomena. Political will from institutions of the productive and social sectors in order to include environmental issues into their programmes.
			2010: 4,000 ha		
			2011: 4,000 ha		
			2012: 4,000 ha		
	2013: 3,000 ha				
	Number of fires affecting more than 100 ha	8 fires in 2008.	2009: 8 fires		
2010: 8 fires					
2011: 7 fires					
2012: 7 fires					
R4. Areas deteriorated by forest fires and anthropogenic activities go through a restauration process.	Restored area	2,800 ha in 2008.	2009: 100 ha and follow-up of the 2,800 ha	Satellite images. Yearly reports on the projects.	Will from communities so as to participate in restoration projects. Availability of germplasm. Favourable weather conditions for seedling.
			2010: 100 ha and follow-up of the 2,900 ha		
			2011: 100 ha and follow-up of the 3,000 ha		
			2012: 100 ha and follow-up of the 3,100 ha		
			2013: 100 ha and follow-up of the 3,200 ha		
Social strategy					
R5. Both locals and users value the natural and cultural richness of the PA.	Number of people involved in conservation activities of the PA in a conscious and responsible manner.	25% out of 8,000 people living in the Reserve (INEGI 1995) and 3,500 users in 2008.	2009: 25% of inhabitants and users of the Reserve	Survey documentation. Field reports.	Interest shown by local leaders in participating in conservation activities. SEP remains open to coloboration. Local and regional media are willing to spread the word on the importance of the Reserve.
			2010: 30% of inhabitants and users of the Reserve		
			2011: 30% of inhabitants and users of the Reserve		
			2012: 35% of inhabitants and users of the Reserve		

			2013: 35% of inhabitants and users of the Reserve		
	Number of people aware of the natural and cultural relevance of the PA.	30% out of 8,000 people living in the Reserve and 3,500 users are aware of the benefits of the environmental services of the Reserve in 2008.	2009: 35% of inhabitants and users of the Reserve		
			2010: 35% of inhabitants and users of the Reserve		
			2011: 40% of inhabitants and users of the Reserve		
			2012: 45% of inhabitants and users of the Reserve		
			2013: 50% of inhabitants and users of the Reserve		
R6. Locals carry out their productive activities in accordance with sustainable management models.	Number of productive projects carried out under sustainable management.	3 successful productive projects (conservation coffee, sustainable tourism, and agrosilvopasture systems) in 2008	2009: 3 successful productive projects (conservation coffee, sustainable tourism and agrosilvopasture systems) - Follow-up 2010: 4 ongoing productive projects (conservation coffee, sustainable tourism, agrosilvopasture systems, and organic apiculture)	Technical dossiers. Producer and surface under management census documentation. Map of surface under management.	Political will from institutions of the productive and social sectors in order to include environmental issues into their programmes.

			<p>2011. Follow-up of the 4 successful productive projects in 2010 (conservation coffee, sustainable tourism, agrosilvopasture systems, and organic apiculture)</p>	
			<p>2012: Follow-up of the 4 successful productive projects in 2011 (conservation coffee, sustainable tourism, agrosilvopasture systems, and organic apiculture) and undertaking of another productive project (management of non-timber-yielding forest resources)</p>	
			<p>2013: 5 successful productive projects (conservation coffee, sustainable tourism, agrosilvopasture systems, organic apiculture, and management of non-timber-yielding forest resources)</p>	

	Area of the PA under sustainable management	500 ha in 2008.	<p>2009: 100 ha and follow-up of the 500 ha in 2008.</p> <p>2010: 100 ha and follow-up of the 600 ha in previous years.</p> <p>2011: 100 ha and follow-up of the 700 ha in previous years.</p> <p>2012: 100 ha and follow-up of the 800 ha in previous years.</p> <p>2013: 100 ha and follow-up of the 900 ha in previous years.</p>		
<p>R7. Strengthening of social participation in the planning and execution of the PA management and conservation actions.</p>	Number of fora of project planning and management.	2 fora (Council of sustainable municipal rural development in Coita and Citalapa) in 2008.	<p>2009: Participation of the 2 fora in 2008 is retained.</p> <p>2010: 1 forum (Advising Council or Group of Allies of the PA) and both sustainable municipal rural development fora.</p> <p>2011: Participation of the 3 fora in previous years is retained.</p> <p>2012: Strengthening of the participation in the 3 fora of previous years.</p> <p>2013: Strengthening of the participation in the 3 fora of previous years.</p>	<p>Collaboration agreements. Work minutes.</p>	<p>Social stability remains both locally and regionally. Government credibility at all levels.</p>
	Number of organisations collaborating with the PA.	11 organisations participating in the PA's conservation	<p>2009: Follow-up of the participation of the 11</p>		

		<p>projects in 2008.</p>	<p>organisations in 2008.</p>	
			<p>2010: Follow-up of the participation of the 11 organisations in previous years.</p>	
			<p>2010: A new organisation participates in the conservation of the PA. Follow-up of the participation of the 11 organisations in previous years.</p>	
			<p>2012: Follow-up of the participation of the 12 organisations.</p>	
			<p>2013: Follow-up of the participation of the 12 organisations.</p>	

Annex A3. Logical framework with the indicators of the NPA “Mapimi” in the states of Durango, Chihuahua and Coahuila.

Strategy	Indicators			Verification Sources	Assumptions
	Indicator(s)	Baseline	Target		
OBJECTIVE					
Conserve the biodiversity and hidrological function of the Biosphere Reserve of Mapimi with the participation and benefit of locals and users in coordination with other key partners.	Rate of change of vegetation cover.	100 ha per year (2008).	2009: The change rate generated on baseline is maintained.	Satellite images. Vegetation and land use study reports. GIS analysis reports and Databases.	No extraordinary meteorologic al conditions or earthquakes. Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the reserve.
			2010: 10% decrease in the change rate.		
			2011: 10% decrease in the change rate.		
			2012: 15% decrease in the change rate.		
	Frequency of observation of indicator species (turtle, lizards, eagle, cacti, and birds).	1989: 1.8 turtles per square km.	2009: Increase frequency of observation for the five species with presence in the reserve.	Indicator species protocols. Yearly reports on the monitoring projects of key species.	Social stability and will from the communities.
			2010: Increase frequency of observation for the five species with presence in the reserve.		
			2011: Increase frequency of observation for the five species with presence in the reserve.		
			2012: Increase frequency of observation for the five species with presence in the reserve.		
	Water balance (relation	Annual water availability of	2009: water balance is maintained.	Yearly reports on the	

	between gain and loss of water volume in the PA).	3.0 mm ³ in 2008.	2010: water balance is maintained. 2011: water balance is maintained. 2012: water balance is maintained. 2013: water balance is maintained.	monitoring projects of water balance. Signed agreement with CONAGUA.	
RESULTS					
MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION STRATEGY					
R1. A system for grassland management to reduce overgrazing in the PA is executed in coordination with residents and institutions.	Number of heads of livestock per ha (rate of stocking) for each property in the PA.	2006: 8,000 cattle in the PA with a carrying capacity for 4,000.	2009: Rate of stocking reduced to 50% according to the carrying capacity for property 1.	Collaboration agreements with owners of properties within the PA. Technical reports. Certificates from technical councils.	No extraordinary meteorological conditions or earthquakes. Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the reserve. Social stability and will from the communities.
			2010: Rate of stocking reduced to 50% according to the carrying capacity for property 2.		
2011: Rate of stocking reduced to 50% according to the carrying capacity for property 3.					
2012: Rate of stocking reduced to 50% according to the carrying capacity for property 4.					
2013: Rate of stocking reduced to 50% according to the carrying capacity for property 5.					
2013: Rate of stocking reduced to 50% according to the carrying capacity for property 5.					
Status of graze fields (biomass, soil compactation, vegetation structure, hydrological function, etc).		Four sites for monitoring the condition of grasslands in Guadalupe in 2005 show that two have a negative tendency and two positive.	2009: Better graze field condition for property 1.	Technical reports for soil and vegetation condition for the properties.	
			2010: Better graze field condition for property 2.		
			2011: Better graze field condition for property 3.		
			2012: Better graze field condition for property 4.		

			2013: Better graze field condition for property 5.		
	Erosion rate (tons of soil lost/ha/year) for each property.	Erosion rate in 2004: 27/ton/ha/year; 2005: 26 /ton/ha/year; 2006: 20 /ton/ha/year and 2007: 23 /ton/ha/year.	2009: Erosion rate below 27tons/ha/year. 2010: Erosion rate below 27tons/ha/year. 2011: Erosion rate below 27tons/ha/year. 2012: Erosion rate below 27tons/ha/year. 2013: Erosion rate below 27tons/ha/year.	Erosion technical reports.	
	Number of properties certificated (applying grassland conservation techniques).	One grazing property in the PA (Guadalupe) with a Management Programme for Grass Field Conservation.	2009: 1 grazing property certified per year. 2010: 1 grazing property certified per year. 2011: 1 grazing property certified per year. 2012: 1 grazing property certified per year. 2013: 1 grazing property certified per year.	Collaboration agreements with owners of properties within the PA. Technical reports. Certificates from technical councils.	
R2. There is an interinstitutional coordination system for planning, inspection and vigilance of works and human activities in the PA and influence zone.	Number illegal acts detected and denounced to proper authorities.	One annual illegal act related to flora extraction.	2009: 10% reduction in illegal acts. 2010: 20% reduction in illegal acts. 2011: 30% reduction in illegal acts. 2012: 40% reduction in illegal acts. 2013: 50% reduction in illegal acts.	Collaboration agreements with PROFEPA in the states of Coahuila, Chihuahua and Durango. Annual report and denouncements to PROFEPA of illegal acts in the PA.	Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the reserve. Social stability and will from the communities.
	Area under vigilance (ha).	2007: 295,000 ha under vigilance in the PA and influence zone.	2009: Maintain the area (baseline) under vigilance. 2010: Maintain the area (baseline) under	Collaboration agreements with PROFEPA in the states of	

			<p>vigilance.</p> <p>2011: Maintain the area (baseline) under vigilance.</p> <p>2012: Maintain the area (baseline) under vigilance.</p> <p>2013: Maintain the area (baseline) under vigilance.</p>	Coahuila, Chihuahua and Durango. Annual report and denouncements to PROFEPA of illegal acts in the PA.	
R3. The plagues and diseases in the PA are managed and controlled with the participation of locals.	Area affected / controlled for plagues and diseases in flora.	500 ha	<p>2009: 10% of the PA under control, management and prevention for plagues and diseases.</p> <p>2010: 20% of the PA under control, management and prevention for plagues and diseases.</p> <p>2011: 30% of the PA under control, management and prevention for plagues and diseases.</p> <p>2012: 40% of the PA under control, management and prevention for plagues and diseases.</p> <p>2013: 50% of the PA under control, management and prevention for plagues and diseases.</p>	Technical report of plagues and diseases in the PA.	<p>No extraordinary meteorological conditions or earthquakes.</p> <p>Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the reserve.</p>
R4. A system for management, control, and prevention for exotics species is operational.	Number of properties that participate in control, eradication and prevention of exotic species.	1 property	<p>2009: 1 properties participating in control, eradication and prevention of exotic species.</p> <p>2010: 1 properties participating in control, eradication and prevention of exotic species.</p> <p>2011: 1 properties participating in control, eradication and prevention of exotic species.</p>	Technical report (maps and Databases) of exotic species in the PA.	<p>No extraordinary meteorological conditions or earthquakes.</p> <p>Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the reserve.</p>

			<p>2012: 1 properties participating in control, eradication and prevention of exotic species.</p> <p>2013: 1 properties participating in control, eradication and prevention of exotic species.</p>		
	Area affected / controlled for exotic species.	100, 000 ha	<p>2009: 10% of the area under control, eradication and prevention of exotic species.</p> <p>2010: 20% of the area under control, eradication and prevention of exotic species.</p> <p>2011: 30% of the area under control, eradication and prevention of exotic species.</p> <p>2012: 40% of the area under control, eradication and prevention of exotic species.</p> <p>2013: 50% of the area under control, eradication and prevention of exotic species.</p>	Technical report (maps and Databases) of exotic species in the PA.	
R5. Research and monitoring developed in the PA operates as a tool for making management decisions with the participation of locals and users.	Number of research projects for taking management decisions.	From 1977 to 2005, only 1 % of research projects focused as tools for management decisions in the PA.	<p>2009: 2 research projects.</p> <p>2010: 2 research projects.</p> <p>2011: 2 research projects.</p> <p>2012: 2 research projects.</p> <p>2013: 2 research projects.</p>	Technical report of research projects in the PA. Databases. Publications. Signed agreements with academic institutions.	Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the reserve.
ESTRATEGIA SOCIAL					
R6. Solid wastes are managed in the PA in coordination with institutions and participation of	Number of communities that manage solid wastes.	0 communities.	<p>2009: 1community.</p> <p>2010: 2 communities.</p> <p>2011: 3 communities.</p> <p>2012: 4 communities.</p>	Signed agreements with states and municipalities for the	Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the

locals.			2013: 5 communities.	management of solid wastes. Technical reports.	reserve. Social stability and will from the communities.
R7. Negative impacts on the PA are reduced through verified and controlled recreational activities and its visitors know its value and respect the local population.	Number of visitors that follow the Public Use Programme.	2000 annual visitors. 100% of visitors with recreational activities in Public Use Zones.	2009: 100% visitors follow the Public Use Programme.	Technical report. Visitors database. Technical evaluation of impacts on PA by visitors.	Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the reserve.
			2010: 100% visitors follow the Public Use Programme.		
			2011: 100% visitors follow the Public Use Programme.		
			2012: 100% visitors follow the Public Use Programme.		
			2013: 100% visitors follow the Public Use Programme.		
	Number of recreational sites regulated.	Cero sites regulated.	2009: Two recreational sites regulated.	Technical evaluation of impacts on PA by visitors in recreational sites.	
			2010: Two recreational sites regulated.		
			2011: Two recreational sites regulated.		
			2012: Two recreational sites regulated.		
			2013: Two recreational sites regulated.		
R8. Residents and users recognize and value environmental goods and services, and participate in conservation activities.	Number of locals (inhabitants) that participate in conservation activities and programmes.	2006: 111 people participated in conservation activities from a total of 353.	2009: 120 people participate in conservation activities and programmes.	Assistance to conservation events. Annual report. Databases.	Political and institutional will from organisms with incidence in the reserve. Social stability and will from the communities.
			2010: 130 people participate in conservation activities and programmes.		
			2011: 140 people participate in conservation activities and programmes.		

			<p>2012: 150 people participate in conservation activities and programmes.</p> <p>2012: 160 people participate in conservation activities and programmes.</p>	
		2002: 130 teachers and only 30% apply the environmental techniques.	<p>2009: 40% of teachers apply the environmental educational and dissemination programme and its techniques.</p> <p>2010: 50% of teachers apply the environmental educational and dissemination programme and its techniques.</p> <p>2011: 60% of teachers apply the environmental educational and dissemination programme and its techniques.</p> <p>2012: 70% of teachers apply the environmental educational and dissemination programme and its techniques.</p> <p>2013: 80% of teachers apply the environmental educational and dissemination programme and its techniques.</p>	Assistance to conservation events. Annual report of the environmental educational and dissemination programme. Databases.
	Number of teachers that follow the environmental educational and dissemination programme and apply its techniques.			

Annex B. Total matching funds to the project “Consolidation of the Protected Areas System Project” with grant agreement number TF050311 (SINAP 2)

1. The following table shows the matching funds to the “Restructured Project of Protected Areas in Mexico “ (SINAP 1), where GEF requested a commitment of US\$ 5 million (FMCN stands for Fondo Mexicano para la Conservación de la Naturaleza):

Project	Amount	Status
El Triunfo Conservation Fund (Packard Foundation)	US\$ 1.0 million	Deposited in FMCN (January 16, 2001)
Strategic support for two priority watersheds: El Triunfo and Manantlán (Gonzalo Río Arronte Foundation)	US\$ 3.0 million	Disbursement in accordance with GEF deposits: US\$ 1.5 million deposited on May 16, 2002; US\$ 0.5 million deposited on December 11, 2002; and US\$ 0.5 million on December 11, 2003
San Pedro River Initiative (Ford Foundation)	US\$ 0.5 million	Deposited in FMCN (September 15, 2000)
San Pedro River Initiative (Packard Foundation via NFWF)	US\$ 0.5 million	Deposited in FMCN (September 26, 2002)
Total	US\$ 5.0 million	

2. The following table shows the funds obtained to match the first deposit to SINAP 2 (US\$ 7.5 million):

Project (donor)	Amount	Status
The Monarch Butterfly Conservation Fund (Packard Foundation)	US\$ 5.0 million	Deposited in FMCN (September 15, 2000)
The Monarch Butterfly Conservation Fund (The Environmental Ministry)	US\$ 1.0 million	Deposited in FMCN (November 7, 2000)
Contribution to the first GEF endowment for the ten protected areas	US\$ 1.5 million	Deposited in FMCN (November 7, 2000)
Total	US\$ 7.5 million	

3. The following table shows the funds obtained to match the start-up funds (US\$1.9 million) in SINAP 2, which were part of the first SINAP 2 deposit by GEF:

Project	Amount	Status
Banco Chinchorro-Xcalak Conservation Fund (Summit Foundation)	US\$ 0.20 million	Deposited: US\$ 0.20 million (April 16, 2001)
San Pedro River Initiative (Summit Foundation)	US\$ 0.20 million	Deposited in FMCN (November 1, 2000)
Espíritu Santo Conservation Fund (Packard Foundation)	US\$ 1.50 million	Deposited in FMCN (September 23, 2002)
Total	US\$ 1.90 million	

4. The following table shows the funds obtained to match the second deposit (tranche) to GEF for SINAP 2 (US\$2.21 million):

Project	Amount	Status*
1. Banco Chinchorro-Xcalak Conservation Fund (Summit and Homeland Foundation)	US\$ 0.10 million	Deposited in FMCN (June 3, 2002 and June 18, 2002)
2. San Pedro River Initiative (NFWF)	US\$ 0.10 million	Deposited in FMCN (part of a US\$ 0.6 mi deposit (September 26, 2002)
3. San Pedro River Initiative (Wick Communications)	US\$ 0.01 million	Deposited in FMCN (January 9, 2001)
4. Monarch Butterfly Conservation Fund (State of Mexico)	US\$ 0.25 million	Deposited in FMCN in pesos (March 12, 2002)
5. Monarch Butterfly Conservation Fund (State of Michoacán)	US\$ 0.25 million	Deposited in FMCN in pesos (November 29, 2002)
6. Match to SINAP 2 (SEMARNAT)	US\$ 1.50 million	US\$ 0.5 million deposited in pesos in FMCN on December 27, 2001, US\$ 0.2 million deposited in FMCN on April 14, 2002, US\$ 0.55 million deposited in FMCN on October 25, 2002 and US\$ 0.25 million deposited in FMCN on December 11, 2002
Total	US\$ 2.21 million	

5. The following table shows the funds obtained to match the third deposit (tranche) requested in March 2006 to GEF for SINAP 2 (US\$7.35 million):

Project	Amount	Status
1. Banco Chinchorro-Xcalak Conservation Fund (Summit Foundation)	US\$ 0.30 million	US\$ 0.05 deposited in FMCN on February 20, 2003; US\$ 0.05 deposited in FMCN on June 9, 2004; \$0.2 million deposited in FMCN on February 10, 2005 by the Summit Foundation
2. Bahía de los Angeles Conservation Fund (Packard and Marisla Foundations)	US\$ 0.38 million	US\$ 0.13 million deposited in FMCN by Marisla Foundation on December 30, 2003; US\$ 0.25 million deposited in FMCN by Packard Foundation on April 27, 2004
3. Match to SINAP 2 (SEMARNAT)	US\$ 2.17 million	US\$ 0.71 million deposited in FMCN on December 29, 2003; US\$ 0.18 million deposited in FMCN on October 1, 2004; US\$ 0.35 million deposited in FMCN on October 22, 2004;

		and US\$ 0.18 million deposited in FMCN on November 9, 2004; US\$ 0.60 million on December 21, 2005; and US\$ 0.15 on February 9, 2006
4. Fire Prevention and Restoration Fund (FMCN)	US\$ 4.5 million	US\$ 4.5 million assigned by FMCN and deposited in exclusive account on March 1, 2005
Total	US\$ 7.35million	

6. Additional deposits from 2006 to 2008 to match the fourth and last deposit requested to GEF for SINAP 2 in 2008 (US\$ 5.44 mi):

Project	Amount	Status*
1. Match to SINAP 2 (SEMARNAT)	US\$ 2.30 million	Deposited on March 17, 2006 (US\$ 0.17 million), March 27, 2006 (US\$ 0.28 million), June 30, 2006 (US\$0.85 million), June 1, 2007 (US\$1 million)
2. Banco Chinchorro-Xcalak Conservation Fund (Summit Foundation)	US\$ 0.60 million	Deposited on June 7, 2006 (US\$ 0.2 million), on March 15, 2007 (US\$ 0.2 million), and on February 29, 2008 (US\$0.2 million)
3. Monarch Butterfly Fund (State of Mexico)	US\$ 0.25 million	Deposited on March 28, 2007
4. Bahía de los Angeles Conservation Fund (Global Conservation Fund)	US\$ 1.00 million	Deposited on August 28, 2007
5. Gulf of California Marine Endowment (Packard Foundation)	US\$ 1.29 million (a total of US\$ 6 million were deposited but only US\$ 1.29 million are required to complete the match)	Deposited on December 6, 2007
Total	US\$ 5.44 million	

*Copies of bank statements available in project files.

Annex C: Social Strategy

Preparation of the social strategy for this tranche follows the methodology established in the Project Appraisal Document (Annex 11). The main objectives of the social strategy are:

- To address social issues that might be affecting natural resources conservation, while avoiding or mitigating social impacts, through sustainable development activities consistent with the project's conservation strategy.
- To build partnerships with the private sector and mainstreaming conservation into public sector programs to optimize conservation efforts and sustainability in PA.
- To ensure social participation and commitment to conservation by consolidating the project's participation system including direct community involvement in *Consejos Asesores* and strengthening community-based organizations.

The design of the strategy takes into account the results of the social assessment completed during preparation of this fourth tranche and consultation carried out with community organizations, indigenous communities, *ejidatarios*, *comuneros*, academics and research institutions, as well as NGOs. Social strategy comprises the following action lines:

a. Indigenous peoples' plans. IPDP¹ are to be prepared in NPA where social assessment has identified indigenous population linked to NPA to ensure that their rights are protected and that they participate and benefit from the activities developed under SINAP. Accordingly, Indigenous Peoples Plans (IPDPs) have been prepared for La Sepultura and El Ocote.

b. Sustainable development action plans. Sustainable development action plans (SDAPs) will be implemented to mitigate possible social impacts due to restrictions in the access and/or use of natural resources. SDAPs are jointly identified and agreed with communities defining alternative activities to substitute damaging practices; it comprises grants to executing sustainable subprojects including training and technical assistance.

c. Participation Strategy. Participation strategy will ensure stakeholders' involvement in the planning and execution of conservation strategy mainly through the Advisory Council. It will also include the establishment of alliances and partnerships with civil society organizations, NGOs, and the private sector to support conservation efforts and sustainable alternatives. It will also seek mainstreaming conservation criteria in public sector programs to be executed within PA.

d. Communication. A communication campaign for each NPA will promote public awareness about biodiversity values; commitment to conservation practices; and dissemination of good practices. This campaign will target general public within the reach of NPA and stakeholder within NPA to support conservation efforts.

Social strategy is included in the logical frameworks in Annex A and its activities are included in annual operational programs and budgets for each NPA.

¹ IPDP instead of IPP because this project was prepared in 2005 before the change in Indigenous Peoples Policy

1. NPA “La Sepultura”

Social Assessment and Social Strategy

Background

La Sepultura, located in the state of Chiapas, was declared a Biosphere Reserve (NPA) in 1995 over a surface of 167, 309 hectares, comprising five core areas (13,759 Has) at the heights of the Sierra Madre. The buffer zone covers an area of 153,550 hectares most of which has been transformed to farming and stock breeding. The expansion of the agricultural frontier is the main threat on the NPA. To address this threat, the conservation strategy has identified eight micro-regions targeting with specific actions agreed with local inhabitants in: (i) Los Amates-Pando, (ii) El Tablón; (iii) Hojas Moradas; (iv) Macuilapa; (v) Las Arenas; (vi) El Lagartero; (vii) Zanatenco-Tiltepec; (viii) Ocuilapa (Tonala). These microregions are spread over five municipalities (Villacorzo, Villaflores, Cintalapa, Arriaga and Tonalá)

Social situation

This region has been populated for centuries. However, the original indigenous population mostly disappeared during colonial times. By the XIX century the majority of its inhabitants were “*mestizo*”² and their lands converted in big haciendas and cattle ranches. Currently, there are 186 communities within the reserve perimeter with an estimated population of 9125 inhabitants. Moreover, 124 communities with 25,182 inhabitants living outside the NPA have lands within the NPA. Population concentrates in two major communities: Hojas Moradas (31.9 percent of the total) and El Tablon with 24.7 percent, which has the largest population within the reserve. In the last ten years a group of indigenous migrants, mainly Tzotziles, Zoques and Tseltales arrived to the NPA seeking lands and have established in the area; away from their main communities they have been assimilating and adopting the “*mestizo*” local culture.

The NPA lands are split between *ejidos*³, 52 percent and small owners, 43 percent; only 5 percent are national lands belonging to the reserve. Ejidos lands comprise: 45 ejidos, legally recognized and 31 ejidos in the process to gain legal status; this area also includes “*avencidados*” who are farmers authorized to live in the ejidos but are not land owners. Small owners live outside the reserve but use its land for cattle rearing. National lands are occupied by 65 families, called for that reason “*nacionaleros*” who seeking to regularize their situation and by 1500 persons who received five hectares each from a trust fund created by the state government to buy lands.

The breeding of cows is the most important activity followed by subsistence agriculture of maize, beans and vegetables; these activities concentrate at micro-regions Los Amates, El Tablón, Hojas Moradas y Macuilapan; however coffee growing has been gaining importance at the heights parts of these areas. The extraction of woods and palms (*camedor*) is another source of income for these micro-regions and also for Zanatenco y Ocuilapa. There is a mix of these activities in each micro-region according with the traditions and needs of the population.

Main Organizations

² **Mestizo** is a [Spanish](#) term that was formerly used in the [Spanish Empire](#) to designate people of mixed European ([Spaniard](#)) and [Amerindian](#) ancestry living in the region of [Latin America](#). (From [www.wikipedia.org](#))

³ The **ejido** (from *latin exitum*) is a property system that combines common ownership of lands with individual exploitation by each member in the ejido called ejidatario. This use of community land was a common practice during the time of [Aztec](#) rule in [Mexico](#). (From [www.wikipedia.org](#))

Local organizations in the region evolved until recently under a paternalistic system linked to electoral purposes. The movement of landless population to obtain lands was the most important social movement in the last decade. However, once the process was completed, it lost force. Now organizations grow around productive activities, therefore the most important organizations are linked to cattle-rearing and agriculture including: Local cattle-rear associations, Ejido Unions, Uniones de Ejidos, Consejo de Vigilancia del Comité de Cuenca Zanatenco, Sociedad Cooperativa “Unión de productores de la Sierra de Villaflores”, Organizaciones agrarias (SOCAMA, CNC, CEC, OCEZ-CENPA y OPI), Sociedades de Producción Rural.

Academia and research institutions that also play an important role in the region include: Chiapas University, Chapingo University local campus, ECOSUR, INIFAP, and biology faculties from other state universities such as Veracruz University and UNAM. Some national and international conservation NGOs are also active in the region.

Municipal governments and some federal institutions mainly linked to agriculture, forestry and natural resources management are also involved in the NPA (FIRCO, CNA, SAGARPA, PROFEPA, SEMARNAT, CONAFOR, and Mesoamerican Biological Corridor). MASECA (the maize flour producer), and other private firms linked to the processing of local products are also relevant for the reserve because influence local production.

Conservation issues

Because the majority of the reserve lands are either ejidos or small properties, conservation of its natural resources and biodiversity represented a challenge for CONANP. The establishment of the reserve created initially a negative reaction from local population; it took a constant education process to gain their support over the importance of the biodiversity richness and the need to conserve. The approach of “working with the people” has been the basis for a change in their attitude. Now there the majority of the population recognizes the importance to conserve the NPA and have agreed to change the most damaging practices.

The introduction of alternative production systems such as “conservation coffee,” palm cultivation and the development of ecotourism, and environmental services, as part of conservation strategy, have gained the collaboration of the communities it is a new source of income rather than a restriction.

Consultation carried out during social assessment preparations indicates that the local population recognizes the benefits of conservation and it actively participates in programs such as fire prevention, reforestation and voluntary forestry guards.

Social Strategy

The proposed social strategy is based on the social assessment carried out, including consultation carried out with local population within the NPA, its buffer zone and key stakeholders including local government and federal institutions as well as NGOs and research institutions.

a. Indigenous Peoples Plan

Since the XIX century original indigenous peoples in the region had disappeared giving place to a “mestizo” population. However, in the last decade, a small group of indigenous population, Tseltal, Tzotzil and Zoque coming from other poor areas in Chiapas arrived to the reserve under an offer by the state’s Agrarian Reform Secretariat, to create a trust-fund to buy them land. This indigenous population, less than 500, has integrated into existing ejidos to receive lands and has adopted the mestizo culture of the majority (19,982 persons).

However, an Indigenous People Plan (IPP) has been prepared for Villaflores where the majority of indigenous population, Tzotzil, concentrates. They were consulted to prepare this IPP that includes, in addition to sustainable activities described next, their participation in programs such as OPORTUNIDADES and PROCAMPO. This IPP, agreed with indigenous population, is available in the Infoshop and in project files.

b. Sustainable Development Action Plan

The Sustainable Development Action Plan integrates the various actions designed and implemented jointly with the communities to gradually substitute damaging practices for sustainable alternatives, thus avoiding or mitigating impacts. This action plan comprises two main areas, taking into account socio-economic and cultural conditions and productive practices as well as natural conditions advantages, as explained in next table.

Grijalva Basin	Pacific Basin
Productive diversification	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Forestry production (wood and non wood species) ▪ Coffee production ▪ Maize and been commercial production ▪ Sustainable cow rearing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sustainable cattle rearing ▪ Maize for self- consumption ▪ Palm cultivation (instead of extraction)

The establishment of alternative practices that take into account communities' capacities and their priorities has gained support to conserve and avoid social impacts.

c. Participation

The NPA Directorate has been very active reactivating the Advise Council (AC) that is the maximum assembly forum to discuss and take decisions about the reserve. In 2007 the AC was re-structured with the participation of all ejidos and small owners' organizations to make it more operational around the established micro-regions and critical activities linked to local population priorities and conservation strategy. A sub council will be established in each micro-region comprising participatory commissions around the following activities:

- Management of forestry products (wood and non wood resources)
- Sustainable agriculture
- Combined conservation and cattle rearing
- Community forestry
- Conservation coffee
- Ecotourism
- Carbon capture and environmental services
- Integrated fire management.
- Soil and water conservation
- Environment education and training.

d. Communication

Communication program in La Sepultura intends to inform and build consensus around the importance of the reserve and its conservation among stakeholders. This program includes thematic events, round tables, information and experiences exchange and school children programs and special training for teachers.

The establishment of field schools to train local producers and the offering of economic incentives to introduce innovative practices, have been very successful because they directly involve land owners and ejidatarios. There are also radio programs and the distribution of posters and educational materials.

Annex C2. “El Ocote”

Social Assessment and Social Strategy

Background

El Ocote was initially declared natural protected area in 2000. It became a biosphere reserve (NPA) in 2006 over an area of 101, 288 hectares and was incorporated into the Man and Biosphere Program of UNESCO. The reserve was established over an area comprising several indigenous communities, mainly Zoque, as well as mestizo population, both living in poverty. Of the 101,288 hectares comprising the reserve, only 36,674 hectares are national lands while 2,736 hectares are illegally occupied; 26,845 hectares are “ejidos” and 35,010 hectares are small property. This situation is taken into account in the conservation strategy of the NPA, which aims at:

- Promoting sustainable development under equity principles;
- Strengthening community organization and promoting their participation in the planning and management of the NPA; and
- Developing productive alternative to ensure the sustainable use of natural resources.

Social situation

El Ocote has a population of 14,612 inhabitants scattered in small communities with only a few families each; 36 of such communities are located within the limits of the NPA while 28 are established at its buffer zone; only a few communities have more than 500 inhabitants namely: Benito Juarez, Adolfo Lopez Mateos, Luis Echeverria, Manuel Velasco and Las Pimientas. Although the original Zoque People that used to occupy this area disappeared almost completely during colonial times, indigenous migrants of Tzontzil descent, who arrived during the 1960s, comprise 54 percent of the population, 16% of them speaks only their own language while 84% are bilingual.

These indigenous communities (64 in total) are below the poverty-line and 90 percent of them are categorized as highly marginalized; they live in extreme poverty, suffering from malnourishment and health problems and lacking basic services. Access to education is limited and most of the children do not complete basic education; only 1.8 percent declares to have completed it and have additional studies. The majority of the population, 89 percent lives of subsistence agriculture producing mainly maize for self-consumption; houses have only one or two rooms in poor conditions; 40 percent do not have clean water although the majority has electricity. The southeast communities are connected to the state capital Tuxtla Gutierrez, by a main road but the north zone has only access by river and paths therefore are recurrently isolated during the rain season.

Main Organizations

Community organizations are weak and lack representation; ejidos authorities are the main type of organizations. Some municipalities have local representatives but usually lack the resources to play a relevant role. Among the federal programs education and health are the most important and teachers are well recognized by the communities. There are several NGOs and research institutions also operating in the reserve. The most important institution is CONANP through its NPA Directorate.

Conservation issues

The predominance of non sustainable agriculture practices and grazing have had a negative impact on the natural resources of the fragile tropical forest soils of the reserve; this impacts has been aggravated by the

construction of the road Tuxtla Gutierrez-Cosolacaque that crosses the NPA. This situation and the recurrent fires, some of them provoked, are the main threats to the reserve. Local population is aware of the environment degradation that is causing fertility loss and consequently affecting their harvests and income and is willingly participating in alternative activities.

Conservation strategy focuses on the protection of two core areas and four critical areas under pressure in the buffer zone through the development of alternative activities replacing damaging practices and an adequate use of natural resources taking into account indigenous peoples practices and priorities.

Social Strategy

Social strategy of El Ocote main purpose is to involve local communities in conservation strategy and their direct participation in the execution of sustainable alternatives. This social strategy has at its core the protection of indigenous peoples' rights and ensures that they benefit from and participate in sustainable development practices compatible with their culture and traditions.

a. Indigenous Peoples Development Plan

Because the majority of the population in El Ocote is of indigenous descent the Indigenous Peoples Plan (IPDP) comprises all communities within the NPA. Preparation of the IPDP took into account existing studies and programs and consultation carried out with indigenous communities during social assessment. Specifically this IPP promotes:

- The right of indigenous peoples over their land and natural resources;
- Their participate in conservation planning
- Participation in sustainable development activities compatible with their culture;
- Respect to their cultural background and tradition in all activities within the NPA.
- Poverty reduction and improvement of life conditions of indigenous communities.

To execute this IPDP, the reserve has bilingual staff knowledgeable of indigenous peoples' culture and traditions.

b. Sustainable Development Action Plan

To address conservation issues, the social strategy comprises a Sustainable Development Action Plan to develop sustainable activities to replace damaging practices in agreement with local communities. This process allows achieving conservation goals while avoiding negative impacts from restrictions in the access to natural resources in core areas and deteriorated areas. This plan combining the protection and sustainable use of natural resources includes:

- Diminishing deforestation and natural resources degradation;
- Controlling soil erosion and degradation;
- Ensuring protection of water sources;
- Increase productivity and diversify agriculture;
- Substitute extensive cattle-rearing by intensive more sustainable alternatives; and
- Promoting ecotourism in order to reduce poverty and improve conditions of local communities.

This plan is intended to protect core areas, reduce the growth of the agriculture frontier and avoid further changes in land use. The plan offers investment and training to carry out sustainable activities agreed with the communities according to their priorities and capacity. Participation, education and self-awareness are the principles guiding this plan. Main activities of this plan focus on Ejido Emiliano Zapata based on agreements with the community to incorporate optional sustainable practices.

c. Participation

In accordance with the inclusive strategy proposed in the Natural Protected Areas Plan 2007-2012 the social strategy comprises specific actions intended to ensure participation of local communities. To this aim, social assessment included identification, categorization and consultation of communities and other organizations operating at the NPA. Participation promotion has as its main objective the reactivation and strengthening of the Advisor Council, to be the main tool for participatory management of the NPA; the Advisory Council will operate over a network of local councils established in each community and will also integrate representatives of the three levels of government. Participation strategy comprises:

- Consolidating and strengthening community organizations in environment awareness through community-based initiatives and environment education;
- Promoting sustainable development alternatives taking into account community priorities and capacity
- Ensuring that indigenous peoples participate and benefit from conservation and sustainable development actions;
- Coordination of the different government institutions involved in conservation and sustainable development.

d. Communication

The communication is an instrument through which the social strategy intends to promote participation and awareness about the importance of conservation of the NPA for local and surrounding communities and population. Specifically, this strategy is intended to engage population in environmental education activities, conservation planning and management of the NPA, as well as to disseminate good practices and outcomes.

It comprises education programs for school children and training on environment for school teachers and education events for the various stakeholders in the region. Field schools have been established to facilitate training of local producers in sustainability and conservation practices.

Annex C3. NPA “Mapimí”

Social Assessment and Social Strategy

Background

The Mapimí NPA (*Piedra en lo Alto*) is located at the Chihuahua desert that has been classified as a World Priority Region (RTP-52) for its biodiversity richness; in 2000 it was categorized as Biosphere Reserve over an area of 342,388 hectares occupying 54 percent of the Chihuahua desert in three states Chihuahua, Durango and Coahuila. It has two core areas of 28,532 hectares and a buffer zone of 313,855 hectares.

Social Conditions

The Reserve is located in the confluence of three states: Durango, Coahuila and Chihuahua in an area originally occupied by big haciendas and mining companies developed at the beginning of the XX century. Currently, it comprises 11 ejidos and 4 small properties created during an agrarian reform process that took place in the 1960's to provide with land to former hacienda workers and miners. The decline of mining and the poor soil conditions limited the growth of human settlements and made community life difficult. Population has been steadily declining due to constant migration. As a result, according to data from the reserve management plan, in 2006 there were only 353 inhabitants.

Only a few families live within the reserve while the majority inhabits the buffer zone. Nearby there are also small groups of people without any connection with the reserve providing a few services and trading. States and municipality activities are limited and only a few federal programs such as Progress and Temporary Employment Program (PET) are operating.

Rather than established villages, most families live in isolation under a “ranch model” dedicated mainly to extensive cattle-rearing; cattle is estimated to be around 9.000 animals comprising a mix of bovines, sheep, goats and horses; the common feature is the over-grazing of scarce pastures. In Laguna Paloma and Estación Carrillo salt production is the main source of income; however this activity is facing difficulties due to reduced prices. There is also a limited number of small mining activities.

The reserve has also some tourist activity around the so called “Silence Zone” and the old haciendas and factories; however this activity was carried out in a disorganized manner by external operators, damaging the area without real benefits for the local people, the true owners of the area. As a result, they decided to stop this operation and carry out a full reorganization.

Currently, with the support of the NPA Directorate, a pilot ecotourism program is being executed at Ejido La Flor. The core of the attraction though, the “Silence Zone” remains closed to visitors.

Main organizations

Because of isolation and lack of social cohesion, there are no relevant organizations in Mapimí except the traditional ejido authorities and some groups organized around some activities like the salt producers and the cattle association.

The RB Directorate plays a critical role in Mapimí and has been very active seeking opportunities to promote partnerships and coordinate activities among federal, states and municipal authorities. Recently, it has reached an agreement with CONAFOR to finance conservation activities such as the cultivation of

“nopal⁴” for cattle feeding; it has also obtained the support by Mapimí municipal government in Durango to protect micro-catchments in ejidos La Flor and Los Alamos.

Conservation issues

There is not a full study of the impact of economic activities in the NPA. However, according to a sample study carried out by the reserve’s staff over an area of 51, 597 hectares, 3.5 percent of the surface (1,807 ha) requires priority conservation; 28.9 percent (14,942 ha) is in good conditions; 44.5 percent (22,934 ha) is in regular conservation state; a 19.08 percent (9,844 ha) is in bad conditions; and 4 percent (2,067 h) requires urgent restoration.

The main damages are the result of over grazing due to extensive cattle rearing and to the inadequate exploitation of some natural resources. To address these issues the NPA Directorate has been closely working with local inhabitants in the design and execution of a social strategy.

Social Strategy

There are no indigenous peoples in NPA Mapimí and population is scarce; therefore, the social strategy focuses on the implementation of a Sustainable Action Plan to transform damaging practices and avoid negative social impacts for limiting the access to natural resources. The promotion of participation in conservation planning and activities as well as the implementation of a communication program complement this effort.

a. Sustainable Development Action Plan

Through this SDAP the NPA’s staff has directly involved the ranchers in a program to improve cattle rearing by providing training, technical assistance and small investment to improve infrastructure. Participation is voluntary and the staff closely provides support and technical assistance to minimize risks and achieve results. However, there are some ranchers that are not yet participating.

The main issues regarding conservation and sustainable use of natural resources are concentrated on an area of national lands under the official perimeter of the reserve that has been illegally occupied by five families of Ejido La Soledad of Jimenez Chihuahua. The agreement reached with these families is that while the land will be legally under the reserve, they will continue using the resources under an agreement comprising sustainable activities and application of conservation practices. The dialogue has been and will continue to be the main instrument to address conservation issues.

In the case of tourism for instance, the NPA Directorate prepared a report on the damages produced by inadequate tourism activities. The land owners used this report as a basis to complain on the external operators and, on their own initiative, agreed to close temporarily the access to the area during a session of the Advisor Council on March 15, 2005. Recently, an agreement was reached to grant restricted access to selected areas jointly defined with the NPA Directorate.

At the same time, the NPA Directorate has developed an alternative to promote ecotourism with ejidatarios in Ejido La Flor (Durango) that has been very successful. La Flor has built with the support of the NPA a Visitors Center and a Museum; women and men in La Flor have received training to carry themselves the activity; they are currently the guides and provide food and accommodation to visitors. This success has attracted other communities to develop similar activities. The plan is to build facilities to benefit other communities within the framework of the Conservation Management Plan of the NPA in

⁴ *Nopal* refers to the species within the genus *Opuntia* in the cactus family, Cactaceae, which consists of more than 300 species spread between the U.S. and Patagonia.

Laguna Palomas and La Soledad at Jimenez, Chihuahua; and ejidos Vicente Guerrero, and Mohovano de las Lilas in Sierra Mojada, Coahuila.

Some other activities under the sustainable action plan include reopening the exploitation of marble that exists in Tlahualilo. This activity was initially carried out irregularly by a private miner from outside the region and closed its activities when the NPA was established in 2000. Negotiations are under way with ejidatarios that want to reinitiate this activity; some alternatives are being jointly evaluated to reach an agreement.

A program to improve salt production to benefit the population at Laguna Palomares dedicated to this activity is also under process to make it more productive and sustainable. The program includes: (i) the establishment of a better production process; (ii) identification of additional business and market opportunities; and (iii) the promotion of a business oriented organization. The community is receiving training and support to undertake this program focusing on strengthening the role of young entrepreneurs.

Finally, there is an agreement with seven land owners to carry out an Integrated Pasture Management Program to reduce over-exploitation in order to restore and preserve the pasture ecosystem.

Altogether this action plan is expected to produce convincing results in order to bring voluntarily all inhabitants in the reserve to adopt sustainable practices and support conservation efforts.

b. Participation

The NPA Directorate has been able to establish, despite difficult conditions, the Advisor Committee which is the main forum to discuss and support conservation strategy. Promoting active participation of its main stakeholders will help to consolidate its role and further support towards conservation.

The Advisor Committee has allowed the discussion of conservation planning, the use of soil, reach agreements about natural resources use and the kind of activities to be included in the Sustainable Development Action Plan. It has also helped to rescue local traditions and begin to build an identity around the importance of the reserve.

Some achievements promoting community-based organizations are: (i) the support to the salt producers' organization in Laguna de Palomas in which women play a critical role; (ii) the ecotourism project in La Flor in which women's participation was instrumental; and (iii) the organization of seven plot owners to participate in an integral program to better use pastures.

c. Communication

Mapimí NPA has been implementing a communication strategy centered on an environment education program targeting ranchers, inhabitants, school children, high school students and municipal population as well as visitors. The purpose is to raise awareness towards the four main problems affecting the NPA: (i) inadequate cattle rearing; (ii) lack of order in tourism; (iii) inadequate solid waste disposal; and (iv) the illegal extraction of fauna, plants and illegal hunting.

Between the years 2003-2007, this strategy obtained the following results:

- The recognition of the importance of the NPA among the communities in the influence area;

- The operation of the visitor's center that has received annually on average 1,400 visitors;
- The training of 150 teachers who are the basis to expand environmental education and three certified instructors by the program: Learning a Tree. This effort is supported by educational materials such as the manual about the "*Bolson Turtle*," soil conservation, the global biodiversity value of the reserve, etc.
- The establishment of two communal centers to promote environmental education at two of the most important population centers.
- The NPA produces also a periodical informative bulletin to disseminate best practices and provide general information to continue communication.
- The plan is to expand the program bringing local authorities to contribute to this effort.

Annex C4. Consolidated Social Strategy Action Plan Budget for New Protected Areas

The table below summarizes the proposed budget to support the social strategy in the three NPA included in this fourth tranche.

Action Plan Budget (US dollars – Estimated for 2009 to 2013)

Social Strategy Action Plan Budget Estimates for period 2009 - 2013

ACTIVIDAD	MAPIMÍ	LA SEPULTURA	EL OCOTE	TOTAL
Participation	80,288.46	141,666.67	176,442.31	398,397.43
Sustainable development initiatives	1,125,000.00	692,147.40	1,094,230.77	2,911,378.17
Communication	96,153.85	70,512.82	70,000.00	236,666.67
Area Staff	386,538.46	171,618.37	171,618.37	729,775.19
Indigenous Peoples Development Plan	0.00	96,153.85	0.00	96,153.85
Support Transport Minister ⁵	0.00	961.54	0.00	961.54
National lands regularization ⁶	4,807.69	0.00	0.00	4,807.69
Operation Plan for Emiliano Zapata ⁷	0.00	0.00	395,769.23	395,769.23
TOTAL POR ANP	1,692,788.46	1,173,060.64	1,908,060.67	4,773,909.77

Please note that Social Strategy in El Ocote has been prepared as an IPDP to target indigenous population that is the majority in that NPA.

WB88570

C:\DOCUME~1\wb88570\LOCALS~1\Temp\notes7AA731\SINANP 2 PAD Fourth Tranche May 7 2008.doc
05/16/2008 3:38:00 PM

⁵ It comprises investments by the Ministry of Communication and Transport SCT to compensate for environmental impact caused by a road construction.

⁶ It refers to resources to regularized national lands ownership.

⁷ Comprises activities specifically agreed with Ejido Emiliano Zapata in El Ocote.



Applying the GEF Tracking Tools

Objective: To measure progress in achieving the targets and indicators established at the portfolio level under Strategic Priority One and Strategic Priority Two of the biodiversity focal area. The following targets and indicators are being tracked for all GEF-3 projects and will be tracked for all GEF-4 projects. Please note that the specific numerical and percentage targets (e.g., number of hectares, percentage of individual protected areas that demonstrate improved management effectiveness, etc.) are different for GEF-3 and GEF-4 and can be found in the programming documents for each respective phase of the GEF.

Indicators for Strategic Priority One : Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

- The number of countries that receive support for strengthening protected areas (PA) systems to ensure their long-term sustainability.
- The number of hectares of PAs supported.
- The number of PAs supported and the percentage of marine or freshwater protected areas.
- Number of protected areas and total hectares under any “global priority lists” or other international recognition (e.g. Biosphere reserves, World Heritage Sites, Ramsar, WWF Global 200 etc.).
- The percentage of individual PAs that demonstrate improved management effectiveness against baseline scenarios by mid-term and end of project as a contribution to a national PA system.
- The percentage of PA systems that demonstrate improved management effectiveness against baseline scenarios by mid-term and end of project.

Indicators for Strategic Priority Two: Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors

- Number of projects in each production sector (forestry, fisheries, agriculture, and tourism, etc.) targeted to mainstreaming biodiversity into the sector.
- Number of hectares in production landscapes and seascapes that contribute to biodiversity conservation or the sustainable use of its components.
- Percentage of projects in each sector that have supported the incorporation of biodiversity aspects into a) sector policies and plans at national and sub-national levels; b) legislation; c) implementation of regulations and its enforcement, and d) monitoring of enforcement.
- Percentage of projects that mainstream biodiversity into GEF Implementing Agency/Executing Agency development assistance, sector, lending programs or other technical assistance programs.
- Measurement of cumulative market changes to which GEF projects have contributed.
- Number of individuals that demonstrate improved livelihoods based on sustainable use and harvest against the baseline scenarios.

Rationale: Project data from the GEF-3 and GEF-4 project cohort, respectively, will be aggregated for analysis of directional trends and patterns at a portfolio-wide level to both inform the strategic priorities of the GEF and to report to GEF Council on portfolio-level performance in the biodiversity focal area.

Structure of Tracking Tool: Each tracking tool requests background and coverage information on the project and specific information required to track the indicator sets listed above. Please note that Section Two of the tracking tool for **Strategic Priority One: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels** provides an assessment of protected area management effectiveness. Section Two of this Tracking Tool is derived from the “World Bank/WWF Alliance for Forest Conservation and Sustainable Use Site-Level Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) for Protected Areas” and complete instructions on how to apply the METT are provided with the METT.

Guidance in Applying the Tracking Tool: The tracking tools are applied three times: at work program inclusion or CEO endorsement¹, at project mid-term, and at project completion. Projects which fall clearly within Strategic Priority (SP) #1 or Strategic Priority (SP) #2 will only apply the tracking tool for the respective Strategic Priority. On *very rare occasions*, projects make substantive contributions to each Strategic Priority. In this instance, the tracking tool for both SP#1 and SP#2 should be applied. It is important to keep in mind that the objective is to capture the full range of a project’s contributions to delivering on the targets set for each of the strategic priorities. The GEF Implementing Agency/Executing Agency will guide the project teams in the choice of the tracking tools. Please submit all information on a single project as one package (even where more than one tracking tool is applied).

Multi-country projects may face unique circumstances in applying the tracking tools. The GEF requests that multi-country projects complete one tracking tool per country involved in the project, based on the project circumstances and activities in each respective country. The completed forms for each country should then be submitted as one package to the GEF. Global projects which do not have a country focus, but for which the tracking tool is applicable, should complete the tracking tool as comprehensively as possible.

The tracking tools are designed to be “user-friendly”, while attempting to ensure objective assessment of the progress of the project situation. *The tracking tool does not substitute or replace project level M&E processes, or GEF Implementing Agencies’/Executing Agencies’ own monitoring processes.* Project proponents and managers will likely be the most appropriate individuals to complete the Tracking Tool, in collaboration with the project team, since they would be most knowledgeable about the project. Staff and consultants already working in the field could also provide assistance in filling out the Tracking Tool.

Submission: The finalized tracking tool will be cleared by the GEF Implementing Agencies and Executing Agencies before submission. The tracking tool is to be submitted to the GEF Secretariat at three points:

- 1.) With the project document for work program inclusion or CEO endorsement²;
- 2.) Within 3 months of completion of the project’s mid-term evaluation or report; and
- 3.) With the project’s terminal evaluation or final completion report, and no later than 6 months after project closure.

¹ For Medium Sized Projects when they are submitted for CEO approval.

² For Medium Sized Projects when they are submitted for CEO approval.

Section One: Project General Information

1. Project Name: Consolidation of the Protected Areas System Project
2. Project Type (MSP or FSP):
3. Project ID (GEF):
4. Project ID (IA):
5. Implementing Agency: World Bank
6. Country(ies): Mexico

Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion dates:

	Name	Title	Agency
Work Program Inclusion	Andrew Rhodes Ana Laura Barillas	Coordinador Central Asistente Técnico	FMCN
Project Mid-term			
Final Evaluation/project completion			

7. Project duration: **Planned:** 8 years **Actual:** 8 years
8. Lead Project Executing Agency (ies): CONANP (via NAFIN) and FMCN
9. GEF Operational Program:
 - drylands (OP 1)
 - coastal, marine, freshwater (OP 2)
 - forests (OP 3)
 - mountains (OP 4)
 - agro-biodiversity (OP 13)
 - integrated ecosystem management (OP 12)
 - sustainable land management (OP 15)

Other Operational Program not listed above: _____

10. Project coverage in hectares: **3,412,660.00**
Please complete the table below.

Targets and Timeframe	Foreseen at project start	Achievement at Mid-term Evaluation of Project	Achievement at Final Evaluation of Project
Project Coverage			
Extent in hectares of protected areas targeted by the project included in the endowment for 12 priority PA's.	4 PA's at 2000: 1,574,668.38 hectares.	5 PA's at 2004: 1,667,557.88 hectares.	12 priority PA's expected: 3,412,660.00 hectares.

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

Please complete the table below for the protected areas that are the target of the GEF intervention. Use **NA** for not applicable.

Name of Protected Area	Is this a new protected area? Please answer yes or no.	Area in Hectares	Global designation or priority lists (E.g., Biosphere Reserve, World Heritage site, Ramsar site, WWF Global 200, , etc.)	Local Designation of Protected Area (E.g, indigenous reserve, private reserve, etc.)	IUCN Category for each Protected Area ³					
					I	II	III	IV	V	VI
1. Reserva de la Biosfera La Sepultura.	No	167,309	Biosphere Reserve	Biosphere Reserve						X
2. Reserva de la Biosfera Selva El Ocote.	No	101,228	Biosphere Reserve and Man and Biosphere (MAB) Program of UNESCO.	Biosphere Reserve						X

3

- I. Strict Nature Reserve/Wilderness Area: managed mainly for science or wilderness protection
 II. National Park: managed mainly for ecosystem protection and recreation
 III. Natural Monument: managed mainly for conservation of specific natural features
 IV. Habitat/Species Management Area: managed mainly for conservation through management intervention
 V. Protected Landscape/Seascape: managed mainly for landscape/seascape protection and recreation
 VI. Managed Resource Protected Area: managed mainly for the sustainable use of natural ecosystems

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

3. Reserva de la Biosfera Mapimí.	No	342,388	Biosphere Reserve, MAB and World Priority Region (RTP-52).	Biosphere Reserve						X
-----------------------------------	----	---------	--	-------------------	--	--	--	--	--	---

Section Two: World Bank/WWF Site-Level Management Effectiveness Tracking
Tool for Protected Areas

Please complete the WB/WWF Site-level management effectiveness tracking tool for each protected area that is the target of the GEF intervention.

Reporting Progress in Protected Areas A Site-Level Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool

Contact Information:

Sue Stolton	equilibrium@compuserve.com
Marc Hockings	m.hockings@mailbox.uq.edu.au
Nigel Dudley	equilibrium@compuserve.com
Kathy MacKinnon	kmackinnon@worldbank.org
Tony Whitten	twhitten@worldbank.org

Printed in May 2003

© World Bank/WWF Alliance for Forest Conservation and Sustainable Use.

The *Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool* is a working document, and will be periodically updated based on experience with its implementation. Any such revisions will be reprinted accordingly.

Contents

Background	1
The WCPA Framework	1
Purpose of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool	3
Guidance notes for using the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool	3
Data Sheet and Questionnaire	4

Acknowledgements

Prepared for the World Bank/WWF Alliance.

Many thanks to those people who commented on earlier drafts, including Rod Atkins, David Cassells, Peter Cochrane, Finn Danielsen, Jamison Ervin, Jack Hurd, Glenys Jones, Leonardo Lacerda, Rosa Lemos de Sá, Mariana Montoya, Marianne Meijboom, Sheila O'Connor, Christian Peter, Jeff Sayer. This version of the system also benefited considerably from a consultant's report written by Antoine Leclerc. Antoine interviewed many people in WWF's Indochina Programme about the tracking tool, and their experience is reflected here.

Sue Stolton, Marc Hockings, Nigel Dudley, Kathy MacKinnon, and Tony Whitten

April 2003

Background

There is a growing concern amongst protected area professionals that many protected areas around the world are not achieving the objectives for which they were established. One response to this concern has been an emphasis on the need to increase the effectiveness of protected area management, and to help this process a number of assessment tools have been developed to assess management practices. It is clear that the existence of a wide range of situations and needs require different methods of assessment. The World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) has therefore developed a 'framework' for assessment¹. The WCPA framework aims both to provide some overall guidance in the development of assessment systems and to encourage standards for assessment and reporting.

The WCPA Framework is based on the idea that good protected area management follows a process that has six distinct stages, or elements:

- it begins with understanding the **context** of existing values and threats,
- progresses through **planning**, and
- allocation of resources (**inputs**), and
- as a result of management actions (**processes**),
- eventually produces products and services (**outputs**),
- that result in impacts or **outcomes**.

The World Bank/WWF Alliance for Forest Conservation and Sustainable Use ('the Alliance') was formed in April 1998, in response to the continued depletion of the world's forest biodiversity and of forest-based goods and services essential for sustainable development. As part of its programme of work the Alliance has set a target relating to management effectiveness of protected areas: *50 million*

¹ Hockings, Marc with Sue Stolton and Nigel Dudley (2000); *Assessing Effectiveness – A Framework for Assessing Management Effectiveness of Protected Areas*; University of Cardiff and IUCN, Switzerland

*hectares of existing but highly threatened forest protected areas to be secured under effective management by the year 2005*². To evaluate progress towards this target the Alliance has developed a simple site-level tracking tool to facilitate reporting on management effectiveness of protected areas within WWF and World Bank projects. The tracking tool has been built around the application of the WCPA Framework and Appendix II of the Framework document has provided its basic structure.

The Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool forms part of a series of management effectiveness assessment tools, which range from the *WWF Rapid Assessment and Prioritisation Methodology* used to identify key protected areas at threat within a protected area system to detailed monitoring systems such as those being developed by the *Enhancing Our Heritage* project for UNESCO natural World Heritage sites. The Alliance has also supported the development of both the WCPA framework and the development of the WWF Rapid Assessment and Prioritisation Methodology.

The WCPA Framework

To maximise the potential of protected areas, and to improve management processes, we need to understand the strengths and weaknesses of their management and the threats that they face. In the last few years, various methodologies for assessing management effectiveness of protected areas have been developed and tested around the world. The World Commission on Protected Areas provides an overarching framework for assessing management effectiveness of both protected areas and protected area systems, to give guidance to managers and others and to help harmonise assessment around the world.

² Dudley, Nigel and Sue Stolton (1999); *Threats to Forest Protected Areas: Summary of a survey of 10 countries*; project carried out for the WWF/World Bank Alliance in association with the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas, IUCN, Switzerland

Table 1 contains a very brief summary of the elements of the WCPA Framework and the criteria that can be assessed³. The Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool has been designed to fulfil the elements of evaluation included in the Framework.

Questions in the following tracking tool have been ordered to make completion as easy as possible; the element(s) that each refers to are indicated in the left hand column.

Table 1: Summary of the WCPA Framework

Elements of evaluation	Explanation	Criteria that are assessed	Focus of evaluation
Context	<i>Where are we now?</i> Assessment of importance, threats and policy environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significance - Threats - Vulnerability - National context - Partners 	Status
Planning	<i>Where do we want to be?</i> Assessment of protected area design and planning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protected area legislation and policy - Protected area system design - Reserve design - Management planning 	Appropriateness
Inputs	<i>What do we need?</i> Assessment of resources needed to carry out management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Resourcing of agency - Resourcing of site 	Resources
Processes	<i>How do we go about it?</i> Assessment of the way in which management is conducted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suitability of management processes 	Efficiency and appropriateness
Outputs	<i>What were the results?</i> Assessment of the implementation of management programmes and actions; delivery of products and services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Results of management actions - Services and products 	Effectiveness
Outcomes	<i>What did we achieve?</i> Assessment of the outcomes and the extent to which they achieved objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts: effects of management in relation to objectives 	Effectiveness and appropriateness

³For a copy of the WCPA Framework or a more detailed summary please visit the WCPA web-site at: www.iucn.org/themes/wcpa or contact WCPA at wcpa@hq.iucn.org

Purpose of the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool

The Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool has been developed to help track and monitor progress in the achievement of the World Bank/WWF Alliance worldwide protected area management effectiveness target. It is also hoped that the tracking tool will be used more generally where it can help monitor progress towards improving management effectiveness; for example it is being used by the Global Environment Facility.

The Alliance has identified that the tracking tool needs to be:

- Capable of providing a harmonised reporting system for protected area assessment within both the World Bank and WWF;
- Suitable for replication;
- Able to supply consistent data to allow tracking of progress over time;
- Relatively quick and easy to complete by protected area staff, so as not to be reliant on high levels of funding or other resources;
- Capable of providing a “score” if required;
- Based around a system that provides four alternative text answers to each question, strengthening the scoring system;
- Easily understood by non-specialists; and
- Nested within existing reporting systems to avoid duplication of effort.

Limitations

The Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool is aimed to help **reporting progress** on management effectiveness and should not replace more thorough methods of assessment for the purposes of adaptive management. The tracking tool has been developed to provide a quick overview of

progress in improving the effectiveness of management in individual protected areas, to be filled in by the protected area manager or other relevant site staff. As such it is clear that there are strict limitations on what it can achieve: it should not for example be regarded as an independent assessment, or as the sole basis for adaptive management.

Because of the great differences between expectations, resources and needs around the world, the tracking tool also has strict limitations in terms of allowing comparison between sites: the scoring system, if applied at all, will be most useful for tracking progress over time in one site or a closely related group of sites.

Lastly, the tracking tool is too limited to allow a detailed evaluation of *outcomes* and is really aimed at providing a quick overview of the management steps identified in the WCPA Framework up to and including *outputs*. Although we include some questions relating to outcomes, the limitations of these should be noted. Clearly, however good management is, if biodiversity continues to decline, the protected area objectives are not being met. Therefore the question on condition assessment has disproportionate importance in the overall tracking tool.

Guidance notes for using the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool

The Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool can be completed by protected area staff or project staff, with input from other protected area staff. The tracking tool has been designed to be easily answered by those managing the protected area without any additional research.

All sections of the tracking tool should be completed. There are two sections:

1. **Datasheet:** which details key information on the site, its characteristics and management objectives and includes an overview of WWF/World Bank involvement.
2. **Assessment Form:** the assessment form includes three distinct sections, all of which should be completed.

- **Questions and scores:** the main part of the assessment form is a series of 30 questions that can be answered by **assigning a simple score ranging between 0 (poor) to 3 (excellent)**. A series of four alternative answers are provided against each question to help assessors to make judgments as to the level of score given. **Questions that are not relevant to a particular protected area should be omitted**, with a reason given in the comments section (for example questions about use and visitors will not be relevant to a protected area managed according to the IUCN protected area management Category Ia). In addition, there are six supplementary questions which elaborate on key themes in the previous questions and provide additional information and points. This is, inevitably, an approximate process and there will be situations in which none of the four alternative answers appear to fit conditions in the protected area very precisely. We suggest that you choose the answer that is nearest and use the comments section to elaborate.

- **Comments:** a box next to each question allows for **qualitative judgements to be justified** by explaining why they were made (this could range from personal opinion, a reference document, monitoring results or external studies and assessments – the point being to give

anyone reading the report an idea of why the assessment was made). In this section we also suggest that respondents comment on the role/influence of WWF or World Bank projects if appropriate. On some occasions suggestions are made about what might be covered in the comments column.

- **Next Steps:** for each question respondents are asked to identify a long-term management need to further adaptive management at the site, if this is relevant.

Final Score: a final total of the score from completing the assessment form can be **calculated as a percentage of scores from those questions that were relevant to a particular protected area**. (So for example if 5 questions are believed to be irrelevant (and this is justified in the comments column) then the final score would be multiplied by 30/25 to offset the fact that some questions were not applied.) If the additional questions are relevant to the protected area, add the additional score to the total if they are relevant and omit them if they are not.

Disclaimer: The whole concept of “scoring” progress is fraught with difficulties and possibilities for distortion. The current system assumes, for example, that all the questions cover issues of equal weight, whereas this is not necessarily the case. Accuracy might be improved by weighting the various scores although this would provide additional challenges in deciding differing weightings. In the current version a simple scoring system is maintained, but the limitations of this approach should be recognized.

Reporting Progress in Protected Areas: Data Sheet

Name of protected area	Reserva de la Biosfera Selva El Ocote.	
Location of protected area (country, ecoregion, and if possible map reference)	México, al Este de Chiapas se ubica entre los paralelos 16°45'42" y 17°09'00" de latitud Norte y entre los meridianos 93°54'19" y 93°21'20" de longitud Oeste.	
Date of establishment (distinguish between agreed and gazetted*)	Agreed:	Gazetted: September 18, 1998
Ownership details (i.e. owner, tenure rights etc)	National lands, lands illegally occupied, ejidos and small owners.	
Management Authority	Public – national: Comisión Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas.	
Size of protected area (ha)	101,228	
Number of staff	Permanent: 7	Temporary: 0
Annual budget (US\$)	Fiscal 2008: USD \$ 300,000 aprox.	
Designations (IUCN category, World Heritage, Ramsar etc)	MAB, IUCN Category: VI	
Reasons for designation	El Ocote protege uno de los centros de diversidad biológica más importantes de México y el mundo, ya que se encuentra ubicada en una zona de transición de dos provincias neotropicales, la pacífquense y la tehuatepequense. Este macizo forestal se encuentra en un área donde confluyen la Selva de los Uxpanapa en Veracruz, y de los Chimalapas en Oaxaca. Su amplia gama de condiciones topográficas y microclimas, son la base para la existencia de varios tipos de vegetación y de comunidades animales.	
Brief details of GEF funded project or projects in PA	Not necessary for GEF-funded projects.	
Brief details of other relevant projects in PA	Not necessary for GEF-funded projects.	
List the two primary protected area objectives		
Objective 1	Maintain karstic tropical ecosystems as well as the continuity of natural processes and cycles of the Biosphere Reserve Selva El Ocote.	
Objective 2	Promote and strength the development of the local and regional communities under sustainable use with the objective of improving the social welfare and the life quality.	
List the top two most important threats to the PA (and indicate reasons why these were chosen)		
Threat 1	The predominance of non sustainable agriculture practices and grazing.	
Threat 2	The road constructions and the recurrent fires.	
List top two critical management activities.		
Activity 1	Fire Prevention and Control	

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

Activity 2	Alternative income generating activities in accordance with conservation objectives.
------------	--

Name/s of assessor (including people consulted): CONANP: Roberto Ecalante , FMCN: Andrew Rhodes.

Contact details (email etc.): CONANP: rescalante@conanp.gob.mx FMCN: arhodes@conanp.gob.mx

Date assessment carried out (Day/Month/Year): 03/07/20085

* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

* Or formally established in the case of private protected areas

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
1. Legal status Does the protected area have legal status? <i>Context</i>	The protected area is not gazetted	0	<i>The PA is legally gazetted September 18, 1998</i>	
	The government has agreed that the protected area should be gazetted but the process has not yet begun	1		
	The protected area is in the process of being gazetted but the process is still incomplete	2		
	The protected area has been legally gazetted (or in the case of private reserves is owned by a trust or similar)	<u>3</u>		
2. Protected area regulations Are inappropriate land uses and activities (e.g. poaching) controlled? <i>Context</i>	There are no mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area	0		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are major problems in implementing them effectively	1		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist but there are some problems in effectively implementing them	<u>2</u>		
	Mechanisms for controlling inappropriate land use and activities in the protected area exist and are being effectively implemented	3		
3. Law enforcement Can staff enforce protected area rules well enough? <i>Context</i>	The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations	0	<i>The staff lacks the capacity to arrest; that is why they cooperate with other government agencies.</i>	
	There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budget)	1		
	The staff have acceptable capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations but some deficiencies remain	<u>2</u>		
	The staff have excellent capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and Regulations	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
4. Protected area objectives Have objectives been agreed? <i>Planning</i>	No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area	0	<i>A workshop to elaborate firm objectives has taken place on 2006, since then, the PA has worked accordingly.</i>	
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these Objectives	1		
	The protected area has agreed objectives, but these are only partially implemented	2		
	The protected area has agreed objectives and is managed to meet these objectives	<u>3</u>		
5. Protected area design Does the protected area need enlarging, corridors etc to meet its objectives? <i>Planning</i>	Inadequacies in design mean achieving the protected areas major management objectives of the protected area is impossible	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: does the protected area contain different management zones and are these well maintained?</i> <i>Due to the different management zones the staff is capable in redirecting the stakeholder's interests to appropriate zones.</i>	
	Inadequacies in design mean that achievement of major objectives are constrained to some extent	1		
	Design is not significantly constraining achievement of major objectives, but could be improved	2		
	Reserve design features are particularly aiding achievement of major objectives of the protected area	<u>3</u>		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation Is the boundary known and demarcated? <i>Context</i>	The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: are there tenure disagreements affecting the protected area?</i>	
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land users	1		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by both the management authority and local residents but is not appropriately demarcated	<u>2</u>		
	The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority and local residents and is appropriately demarcated	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
7. Management plan	There is no management plan for the protected area	0		
Is there a management plan and is it being implemented? <i>Planning</i>	A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented	1		
	An approved management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of <u>funding constraints or other problems</u>	<u>2</u>		
	An approved management plan exists and is being implemented	3		
	Additional points	The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence <u>the management plan</u>	+1	
<i>Planning</i>	There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	<u>+1</u>		
	The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	+1		
	8. Regular work plan	No regular work plan exists	0	
Is there an annual work plan? <i>Planning/Outputs</i>	A regular work plan exists but activities are not monitored against the plan's targets	1		
	A regular work plan exists and actions are monitored against the plan's targets, but <u>many activities are not completed</u>	2		
	A regular work plan exists, actions are monitored against the plan's targets and most or all prescribed activities are completed	<u>3</u>	<i>An annual plan is elaborated each year according to the strategic planning and main objectives.</i>	
9. Resource inventory	There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area	0		
Do you have enough information to manage the area?	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient to support planning and decision making	1		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Context</i>	Information on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient for key areas of planning/decision making but the necessary survey work is not being maintained	<u>2</u>		
	Information concerning on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area is sufficient to support planning and decision making and is being maintained	3		
10. Research Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work? <i>Inputs</i>	There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area	0	<i>There is a monitoring programme in the PA but it is too early to draw conclusion from it, complementary studies must be done to direct management.</i>	
	There is some ad hoc survey and research work	1		
	There is considerable survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management	<u>2</u>		
	There is a comprehensive, integrated programme of survey and research work, which is relevant to management needs	3		
11. Resource management Is the protected area adequately managed (e.g. for fire, invasive species, poaching)? <i>Process</i>	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values have not been assessed	0		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are known but are not being <u>addressed</u>	1		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are only being <u>partially</u> addressed	<u>2</u>		
	Requirements for active management of critical ecosystems, species and cultural values are being substantially or fully addressed	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
12. Staff numbers Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area? <i>Inputs</i>	There are no staff	0		
	Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities	1		
	Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities	<u>2</u>		
	Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the site	3		
13. Personnel management Are the staff managed well enough? <i>Process</i>	Problems with personnel management constrain the achievement of major management objectives	0		
	Problems with personnel management partially constrain the achievement of major management objectives	1		
	Personnel management is adequate to the achievement of major management objectives but could be improved	<u>2</u>		
	Personnel management is excellent and aids the achievement major management objectives	3		
14. Staff training Is there enough training for staff? <i>Inputs/Process</i>	Staff are untrained	0		
	Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area	1		
	Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of management	<u>2</u>		
	Staff training and skills are in tune with the management needs of the protected area, and with anticipated future needs	3		
15. Current budget Is the current budget sufficient?	There is no budget for the protected area	0		
	The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage	1		
	The available budget is acceptable, but could be further improved to fully achieve effective management	<u>2</u>		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
<i>Inputs</i>	The available budget is sufficient and meets the full management needs of the protected area	3		
16. Security of budget	There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or year by year funding	0		
Is the budget secure?	There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding	1		
<i>Inputs</i>	There is a reasonably secure core budget for the protected area but many innovations and initiatives are reliant on outside funding	<u>2</u>		
	There is a secure budget for the protected area and its management needs on a multi-year cycle	3		
17. Management of budget	Budget management is poor and significantly undermines effectiveness	0		
Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness	1		
	Budget management is adequate but could be improved	<u>2</u>		
<i>Process</i>	Budget management is excellent and aids effectiveness	3		
18. Equipment	There are little or no equipment and facilities	0		
Are there adequate equipment and facilities?	There are some equipment and facilities but these are wholly inadequate	1		
	There are equipment and facilities, but still some major gaps that constrain management	<u>2</u>		
<i>Process</i>	There are adequate equipment and facilities	3		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
19. Maintenance of equipment Is equipment adequately maintained? <i>Process</i>	There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities	0		
	There is some ad hoc maintenance of equipment and facilities	<u>1</u>		
	There is maintenance of equipment and facilities, but there are some important gaps in maintenance	2		
	Equipment and facilities are well maintained	3		
20. Education and awareness programme Is there a planned education programme? <i>Process</i>	There is no education and awareness programme	0		
	There is a limited and ad hoc education and awareness programme, but no overall planning for this	1		
	There is a planned education and awareness programme but there are still serious gaps	<u>2</u>		
	There is a planned and effective education and awareness programme fully linked to the objectives and needs of the protected area	3		
21. State and commercial neighbours Is there co-operation with adjacent land users? <i>Process</i>	There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	0		
	There is limited contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users	1		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, but only limited co-operation	<u>2</u>		
	There is regular contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land users, and substantial co-operation on management	3		
22. Indigenous people	Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area	0		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the PA have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct involvement in <u>the resulting decisions</u>	1		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly contribute to some decisions relating to management	2		
	Indigenous and traditional peoples directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
23. Local communities	Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the <u>protected area</u>	0		
Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions? <i>Process</i>	Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no <u>direct involvement in the resulting decisions</u>	1		
	Local communities directly contribute to some <u>decisions relating to management</u>	2		
	Local communities directly participate in making decisions relating to management	3		
Additional points	There is open communication and trust between local stakeholders and protected area managers	+1		
<i>Outputs</i>	Programmes to enhance local community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	+1		
24. Visitor facilities	There are no visitor facilities and services	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: Do visitors</i>	
Are visitor facilities (for tourists, pilgrims etc) good enough?	Visitor facilities and services are <u>Inappropriate for current levels of visitation or are under construction</u>	1		
	Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be improved	2		
<i>Outputs</i>	Visitor facilities and services are excellent for current levels of visitation	3		
25. Commercial tourism	There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the <u>protected area</u>	0	Possible issue for comment: examples of contributions	

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management? <i>Process</i>	There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to <u>administrative or regulatory matters</u>	<u>1</u>		
	There is limited co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences and maintain protected <u>area values</u>	2		
	There is excellent co-operation between managers and tourism operators to enhance visitor experiences, protect values and resolve <u>conflicts</u>	3		
26. Fees If fees (tourism, fines) are applied, do they help protected area management? <i>Outputs</i>	Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected	0		
	The fee is collected, but it goes straight to central government and is not returned to the protected area or its environs	1		
	The fee is collected, but is disbursed to the local authority rather than the protected area	2		
	There is a fee for visiting the protected area that helps to support this and/or other protected areas	<u>3</u>		
27. Condition assessment Is the protected area being managed consistent to its objectives? <i>Outcomes</i>	Important biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded		<i>Possible issue for comment:</i> It is important to provide details of the biodiversity, ecological or cultural values being affected	
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being severely degraded	1		
	Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded but the most important values have not been significantly impacted	<u>2</u>		
	Biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are predominantly intact	3		
Additional points <i>Outputs</i>	There are active programmes for restoration of degraded areas within the protected area and/or the protected area buffer zone	<u>+1</u>	<i>There are areas (2800 ha) under restoration.</i>	
28. Access assessment	Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) are ineffective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	0		

Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One:
Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels

Issue	Criteria	Score	Comments	Next steps
Is access/resource use sufficiently controlled? <i>Outcomes</i>	Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	1		
	Protection systems are moderately effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	<u>2</u>		
	Protection systems are largely or wholly effective in controlling access or use of the reserve in accordance with designated objectives	3		
29. Economic benefit assessment Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities? <i>Outcomes</i>	The existence of the protected area has reduced the options for economic development of the local communities	0	<i>Possible issue for comment: how does national or regional development impact on the protected area?</i>	
	The existence of the protected area has neither damaged nor benefited the local economy	1		
	There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities from the existence of the protected area but this is of minor significance to the regional economy	<u>2</u>		
	There is a significant or major flow of economic benefits to local communities from activities in and around the protected area (e.g. employment of locals, locally operated commercial tours etc)	3		
30. Monitoring and evaluation Are management activities monitored against performance? <i>Planning/Process</i>	There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area	0		
	There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results	1		
	There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but results are not systematically used for management	<u>2</u>		
	A good monitoring and evaluation system exists, is well implemented and used in adaptive management	3		
TOTAL SCORE		68		

EVALUACION DE TERMINO MEDIO
“Consolidation of the Protected Areas System Project”
(050311TF050311-GEF2: MEXICO)

Shepherdstown, Noviembre, 2005

AGRADECIMIENTOS

A lo largo del desarrollo de este proyecto, tuvimos la oportunidad de interactuar con muchas personas y enriquecer nuestro trabajo con su orientación. Particularmente en la última etapa de este trabajo, la revisión de los primeros resultados y sugerencias que presentamos al final del mes de julio, fueron elementos críticos para su satisfactoria conclusión.

Como hombres del campo, recordamos con tanto cariño nuestro tiempo fabuloso y a veces emocionante con estos equipos de campo altamente motivados, sobre todo queremos aplaudir a los jóvenes de cada ANP por su pasión por su trabajo.

Queremos agradecer a las personas que nos apoyaron en nuestra orientación, entre otros a Lic. Andrés Zamortegui, Lic. Héctor Arce Mejía, Lic. Liliana Velásquez, Biól. Rocio Esquivel, Carlos Enríquez, David Gutiérrez, Flavio Cházaro, Luz María Murillo, Lorenzo Rosenzweig, Mauricio Ruiz Galindo, Ernesto Enkerlin H. Mireya Méndez, Ximena Yáñez, y Gustavo Ramírez por sus valiosos comentarios.

De manera especial, queremos señalar nuestro agradecimiento a Alfredo Ávila, Concepción Molina, Renée González y Mireya Méndez por su paciencia cuando volvimos a pedir datos e información que ya nos prestaron y en la complejidad y la multitud de la documentación ya habíamos recibidos. De igual forma sentimos la obligación de reconocer el apoyo que recibimos del personal del Banco Mundial y queremos agradecer a Adriana Moreira y María Elena Castro por sus aportaciones.

Atentamente,
Sergio Graf y Daan Vreugdenhil

ACRÓNIMOS Y SIGLAS

ANP	Área Natural Protegida
APFFC	Área de Protección de Flora y Fauna Cuatrociénegas
APSA	Área de Protección de Flora y Fauna Sierra de Álamos y Río Cuchujaqui
BANOBRAS	Banco Nacional de Obras y Servicios Públicos, S. N. C.
BM	Banco Mundial
CA	Consejo Asesor (antes CTA) Advisory Council
CBC	Área de Protección de la Fauna y Flora Corredor Biológico Chichinautzin
CBM	Corredor Biológico Mesoamericano Mesoamerican Biological Corridor
CC	Coordinación Central (del FANP en la CONANP)
CDB	Convención de la Diversidad Biológica
CDI	Comisión de Desarrollo de Pueblos Indígenas
CIAD	Centro de Investigación en Alimentación y Desarrollo

CNA	Comisión Nacional del Agua
CONABIO	Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la Biodiversidad
CONAFOR	Comisión Nacional Forestal
CONANP	Comisión Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas
CONAP	Consejo Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas
CONAPESCA	Comisión Nacional de la Pesca
CONAPO	Consejo Nacional de Población
CTFANP	Comité Técnico del Fondo para Áreas Naturales Protegidas
DEAyEI	Dirección Ejecutiva de Administración y Efectividad Institucional de la CONANP
DES	Dirección de Evaluación y Seguimiento de la CONANP
DF	Distrito Federal
DFANP	Dirección del Fondo para Áreas Naturales Protegidas
DGDIP	Dirección General de Desarrollo Institucional y Promoción del CONANP
DOF	Diario Oficial de la Federación
EEUU	Estados Unidos de América
FANP	Fondo para Áreas Naturales Protegidas
FMCN	Fondo Mexicano para la Conservación de la Naturaleza A.C.
GM	Gobierno de México
GoM	Government of Mexico
GEF	Global Environment Facility (Fondo para el Medio Ambiente Mundial)
IABIN	InterAmerican Biological Network
IDS	Iniciativas de Desarrollo Sustentable
IMAC	Iniciativa Mexicana de Aprendizaje para la Conservación
INE	Instituto Nacional de Ecología
INEGI	Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática
INF	Inventario Nacional Forestal
LCA	Límites de cambios aceptables
LGEEPA	Ley General de Equilibrio Ecológico y Protección al Ambiente
LOAPF	Ley Orgánica de Administración Pública Federal
M&E	Monitoreo y Evaluación
ME&IR	Monitoring, Evaluation and Institutional Response
NAFIN	Nacional Financiera
OCDE	Organización para la Cooperación y el Desarrollo Económico
OEA	Organización de Estados Americanos
OAS	Organization of American States
ONG	Organización no Gubernamental
PA	Protected Area
PAD	Project Appraisal Document (Documento del Proyecto)
PDPI	Programas de Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas
PET	Programa de Empleo Temporal
PN	Parque Nacional

PNUMA	Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Medio Ambiente
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
POA	Programa Operativo Anual
PROCYMAF	Programa para la Conservación y Manejo Sustentable de Recursos Forestales
PRODERS	Programa de Conservación para el Desarrollo Sustentable
PROFEPA	Procuraduría Federal de Protección al Ambiente
PDC	Programa de desarrollo comunitario
RAN	Registro Agrario Nacional
Ramsar	Convención Mundial de Humedales de Importancia Internacional (Convention on Wetlands of International Importance)
RBAG	Reserva de la Biosfera Alto Golfo de California y Delta del Río Colorado
RBTC	Reserva de la Biosfera Tehuacán-Cuicatlán
SAGARPA	Secretaría de Agricultura, Ganadería, Desarrollo Rural, Pesca y Alimentación
SCT	Secretaría de Comunicaciones y Transportes
SEDESOL	Secretaría de Desarrollo Social
SEMARNAT	Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
SHCP	Secretaría de Hacienda y Crédito Público
SIG	Sistema de Información Geográfica
SIMEC	Sistema de Monitoreo y Evaluación para la Conservación
SINAP	Sistema Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas
SINAP-1	Donación del BM/GEF TF028678 (la donación para la cual se creó el FANP)
SINAP-2	Donación del BM/GEF TF050311 (el presente proyecto)
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
UCANP	Unidad Coordinadora de Áreas Naturales Protegidas
UCP	Unidad de Coordinación del Proyecto
UE	Unión Europea
UICN	Unión Mundial para la Conservación
IUCN	The World Conservation Union
UNAM	Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
USAID	United States Agency for International Development Agencia de los Estados Unidos para el Desarrollo Internacional
WCPA	Comisión Mundial de Áreas Protegidas de la UICN
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature (Fondo Mundial para la Conservación de la Naturaleza)

RESUMEN EJECUTIVO

De conformidad con el convenio de donación TF050311 entre el Gobierno de México (GM), NAFIN, Fondo Mexicano para la Conservación de la Naturaleza (FMCN) y el Banco Mundial (BM), el proyecto “*Consolidación del Sistema de Áreas Naturales Protegidas, TF050311*” (SINAP-2) debía ser objeto de una evaluación independiente de medio término. Dicha evaluación tenía los siguientes objetivos:

- Analizar los logros del proyecto a través de los indicadores y la relación entre las actividades y los objetivos formulados, tanto financiera como técnicamente, según haya quedado reflejado en el marco lógico (ver documento de proyecto PAD, Anexo 1);
- Identificar lecciones aprendidas para beneficio de la segunda fase y de otros proyectos GEF (Global Environment Facility/Fondo para el Medio Ambiente Mundial);
- Plantear recomendaciones a la fase final del proyecto.

El proyecto ha sido evaluado por equipo de evaluación integrado por el Dr. Ir. Daan Vreugdenhil y el M. en C. Sergio Graf. El presente resumen ejecutivo presenta de forma organizada todas las recomendaciones a nivel de proyecto para facilitar su seguimiento. Con apenas 11 años de existencia de la Comisión Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas (CONANP) (antes la Unidad Coordinadora de Áreas Naturales Protegidas UCANP), la institución a cargo de las áreas naturales protegidas (ANP) en México es una de las más nuevas en el mundo. Sin embargo, en este corto espacio de tiempo, el país ha logrado un programa de conservación que en muy pocos otros países de desarrollo ha mostrado tanto éxito. Los evaluadores felicitan al GM por sus impresionantes avances en el campo de la conservación bajo el liderazgo de la CONANP en estrecha colaboración con las comunidades rurales, dueños de la mayoría de las tierras de muchas ANP, una variedad de ONG, instituciones académicas y otros representantes del sector civil.

El resumen ejecutivo, las conclusiones y recomendaciones se organizan en dos capítulos:

1. Lecciones aprendidas y conclusiones generales;
2. Observaciones y conclusiones específicas.

Las recomendaciones para las ANP individuales son presentadas al final de cada capítulo sobre las mismas.

1. LECCIONES APRENDIDAS Y CONCLUSIONES GENERALES

Después de un cuidadoso estudio, los evaluadores han llegado a la conclusión de que el Proyecto SINAP-2, es un apoyo financiero necesario y oportuno por parte del GEF/BM, ya

que forja alianzas entre el sector público y privado en el ámbito de la conservación de la biodiversidad *in situ*.

Para el GM, la conservación de la naturaleza en ANP es un sector nuevo que fue iniciado, de manera formal, hace menos de 15 años. A pesar de estar pasando por un período de austeridad, el GM asignó a 663 personas para administrar su creciente sistema de ANP. Sin embargo, aún con esta dedicación y el apoyo de la sociedad mexicana, estos trabajadores federales de la conservación enfrentan un reto enorme para conservar los ecosistemas y la biodiversidad de las enormes áreas que han sido encomendadas a su cuidado.

Los evaluadores estudiaron las cinco ANP objeto de la evaluación bajo este proyecto. Sin embargo, también se tomó en cuenta su experiencia en el Sistema Nacional de Áreas Naturales Protegidas (SINAP) de misiones anteriores cuando se estudiaron 14 ANP más durante un período de una década. Los evaluadores se reunieron y entrevistaron con los hombres y mujeres de los equipos gerenciales. Sin excepción alguna, su dedicación y pasión por su trabajo son un verdadero ejemplo para el servicio civil mexicano.

A principio de la década de los noventa, el GM y el BM exploraron formas en las que el GEF pudiera apoyar económicamente al GM para alcanzar sus objetivos de conservación. Este diálogo culminó en marzo de 1992 con la aprobación de 25 millones de dólares de fondos provenientes del GEF para el Programa de Áreas Naturales Protegidas de México.

A finales de 1992, la agencia responsable de implementar el proyecto para las ANP, la Secretaría de Desarrollo Urbano y Ecología, fue reorganizada dando lugar a dos dependencias, una de ellas, el Instituto Nacional de Ecología (INE), bajo el cual quedó la responsabilidad del SINAP. En este contexto el GM decidió enfocar su esfuerzo para la atención de 25 ANP prioritarias que serían apoyadas por los fondos del GEF, ajustándose la cifra original a diez ANP y 20 millones de dólares.

En 1994 la Secretaría del Medio Ambiente, Recursos Naturales y Pesca (SEMARNAP) fue creada. El INE quedó bajo la jurisdicción de esta Secretaría y la supervisión del SINAP quedó a su cargo a través de la UCANP. Debido al lento progreso en cuanto a la ejecución de los proyectos con fondos GEF, el GM y el BM convinieron a mediados de 1995 comisionar un análisis independiente sobre el desempeño del proyecto. Este análisis identificó posibles soluciones.

Paralelamente, el GM tomó medidas para mejorar el marco financiero, operativo y político con respecto al SINAP. Como parte de esta nueva estrategia, se estableció el Consejo Nacional para Áreas Naturales Protegidas (CONAP), integrado por representantes de organizaciones conservacionistas, la comunidad académica, de negocios, el sector social y de las comunidades indígenas. El CONAP inició actividades en abril de 1996 como órgano asesor del GM en materia de ANP. Al mismo tiempo, se formuló y presentó el “Programa para las Áreas Naturales Protegidas 1995-2000”.

En el 1996, el CONAP aprobó la propuesta de crear un Fondo para Áreas Naturales Protegidas (FANP) dentro del Fondo Mexicano para la Conservación de la Naturaleza, A. C. (FMCN).

En el año 2000, la SEMARNAP creó la CONANP, elevando a la institución encargada de la conservación de los hábitats críticos del país de una unidad dentro del INE a un órgano desconcentrado directamente dependiente de la SEMARNAP (ahora SEMARNAT).

El número y extensión de las ANP federales de México se ha incrementado significativamente, así como la superficie bajo protección. En el 1991, el país contaba con 81 ANP con una superficie de 8.8 millones de hectáreas. Para finales del año 2000 existían 127 áreas decretadas con una superficie de 17.05 millones de hectáreas pasando en 2005 a 154 áreas con una superficie total de 18.7 millones de hectáreas.

En cuanto a los sitios inscritos en la convención de humedales de importancia internacional (RAMSAR), en 2001 había 7 sitios y para 2005 se tenían 58 humedales ubicando a México como el tercer país con más humedales inscritos y el quinto en cuanto a superficie bajo este esquema de reconocimiento internacional.

Desde su creación y a la fecha ha habido una evolución institucional que se refleja en su estructura organizacional con la creación de una Dirección encargada de la Evaluación y Monitoreo y la integración de la Dirección General de Conservación para el Desarrollo.

El desarrollo institucional se refleja no sólo en lo referente a la creación e incorporación de ANP, sino también en que se ha impulsado un cambio organizativo. Para atender el reto que representa la escasez de plazas que permitan la contratación de personal, se diseñó una estructura por regiones que tiene como objetivo mejorar la atención en las ANP. Esto ha implicado una reasignación de recursos y funciones redirigiéndolos a la conservación directa a la vez que se adelgaza el aparato de administración central.

Las regiones son: Noroeste, Noreste, Occidente, Centro y Golfo, Pacífico Sur, Frontera Sur y Península de Yucatán. Este modelo de siete oficinas regionales para todo el país prevé que las oficinas regionales y centrales realicen acciones relativas al conocimiento, cultura y gestión, mientras las Direcciones Regionales atienden las necesidades comunes a las ANP de la región. Las Direcciones de las ANP se enfocan en tareas de protección, manejo y restauración en sus áreas. Las oficinas centrales pueden concentrar ciertas labores para varias ANP en una sola persona, aumentando así la eficiencia para llevar a cabo tareas especializadas o apoyando situaciones en donde no hay suficiente personal. Este modus operandi desconcentrado permite una considerable agilidad administrativa y de manejo.

Para atender sus tareas la CONANP cuenta actualmente con 663 personas que son contratadas a través de diversas modalidades y proyectos (plazas presupuestales, honorarios y servicios de consultoría).

Las tareas de la CONANP son financiadas por diversas fuentes de recursos que incluyen presupuesto fiscal, proyectos GEF (proyectos “Tres ecoregiones”, “Sierra Gorda”, “SINAP-2”), y aportaciones de otros sectores como de Petróleos Mexicanos y de Comisión Federal de Electricidad.

Durante el periodo 2002 a 2004, el presupuesto federal de la CONANP pasó de 249.4 millones de pesos a 406.1, un crecimiento importante de 61 %. El cobro de derechos también es una fuente de recursos de creciente importancia. Mediante este mecanismo la CONANP ha recaudado 75.6 millones de pesos entre el 2002 y 2004. Durante el primer año la CONANP recaudó 10.5 millones y en 2004, dos años después, 39.5 millones, lo que representa un crecimiento de casi 400%. Estos recursos recaudados en diferentes regiones regresan para su inversión en las zonas que generaron el ingreso.

Los principales programas de la estrategia de conservación para el desarrollo sustentable de la CONANP, el Programa de Desarrollo Regional Sustentable (PRODERS¹) y el Programa de Empleo Temporal (PET), han crecido desde el año 2000 al 2004 en aproximadamente 300%. En este último año se invirtieron 87 millones de pesos.

La creación del FANP fue una solución a la limitante del GM para cubrir las necesidades básicas de operación en las ANP decretadas. Cuando se estableció el FANP durante el primer proyecto GEF conocido como SINAP-1, originó la posibilidad de iniciar un proceso para incrementar el número de personal de campo para algunas ANP prioritarias; así respondiendo a unas de las deficiencias más graves de las ANP mexicanas: la falta de personal en campo.

Ahora la CONANP y el FANP forman una alianza pública/privada madura, en la cual cada socio cumple funciones que se complementan, tales como:

- **Operación de áreas protegidas:** CONANP tiene el mandato de esta función;
- **Procuración y manejo de fondos:** El GM y gobiernos en general, no pueden recibir donativos y operar fondos patrimoniales con recursos privados e internacionales. Por eso el GM impulsó la creación del FANP dentro del FMCN, que tiene la confianza del sector privado y de agencias bi- y multilaterales. Por otra parte, el GM capta exitosamente recursos extinguidos de donantes bi- y multilaterales;
- **Ejecutar presupuesto federal:** La CONANP ejecuta muy exitosamente (cerca a 100%) su presupuesto federal asignado;
- **Depositar fondos federales de contrapartida:** Una parte de los fondos del FANP son contribuciones fiscales federales de contrapartida;
- **Contratación de personal de campo:** El FANP puede contratar personal de campo adicionalmente a lo permitido por el gobierno federal.

El FMCN y la CONANP han consolidado su alianza a través del FANP como instrumento financiero de las ANP. Sin embargo, ambos socios necesitan trabajar continuamente por mantener esta relación saludable y productiva. El dinero es una fuente potencial importante de conflicto en cualquier relación. El FANP necesita trabajar continuamente para

¹ Los característicos del PRODERS y PET se explican en capítulo 4.4.2.

desempeñarse bien financieramente, y para mostrar siempre la transparencia de sus operaciones. Por su parte, es recomendable que la CONANP siga con mucha atención las administraciones financieras complejas que ocurren dentro el FANP para evitar que a través de malentendidos se desarrollen fricciones innecesarias. Tanto la CONANP como el FANP deben mostrar al sector privado, y especialmente al público mexicano, los beneficios de las ANP confiadas en su custodia y los resultados de esta colaboración para lograr su conservación para el bienestar y el goce de todos los mexicanos.

Los evaluadores desean expresar su preocupación por un hecho en particular. En su opinión, si bien el FANP puede contribuir a complementar las necesidades de personal y necesidades de tipo financiero en algunas de las ANP, y puede también ayudar a moldear los procesos financieros, administrativos y de preparación de informes, no es muy probable que el FANP pueda movilizar los recursos necesarios para resolver adecuadamente todas las necesidades de personal de las ANP federales. El FANP es una buena solución parcial, a este problema inmediato del GM, que radica en la escasez de posiciones permanentes para personal federal. Considerando:

- La importancia de las ANP para el bienestar de todos los mexicanos;
- La importancia de las áreas protegidas para la economía nacional como uno de los principales destinos de visita dentro del país; y
- La responsabilidad de México como signatario de la Convención sobre Diversidad Biológica;
- La cuantía del trabajo que está en juego,

el GM no puede esperar a que la protección del patrimonio natural del país se logre con 663 empleados federales. Al firmar la CDB México asumió una responsabilidad nueva que no se puede alcanzar sin aumentar significativamente el personal para el manejo de las ANP federales. **Por lo tanto, es recomendable que el GM evalúe las necesidades reales de personal y de presupuesto a fin de manejar las ANP federales de manera adecuada. Con base en esto podría desarrollar una estrategia de cómo asumir, de manera gradual, la responsabilidad total del manejo apropiado de todas las ANP federales de México**

Una manera de incrementar el personal en las ANP federales es mediante colaboración con los estados. El Estado de Coahuila, por ejemplo, a través de un convenio de colaboración está apoyando con personal, equipo y difusión al ANP de Cuatrociénegas. Esta forma de colaboración Federación-Estado puede ser un modelo a seguir en otras ANP y así contribuir resolver al problema señalado.

Las condiciones para la conservación de la naturaleza en México son difíciles. La mayoría de las áreas protegidas son propiedad de las comunidades locales, ejidos y pequeños propietarios. Los miembros de estas comunidades muestran alta marginación y niveles educativos de los más bajos en todo el país, mientras el uso adecuado de la tierra es la excepción. Después de todo, es precisamente por esta razón que la naturaleza ha perdurado en estas localidades hasta el día de hoy. Sin embargo, la vida en México está cambiando rápidamente, así como la vida en las comunidades rurales – frecuentemente indígenas. Mucha gente joven está dejando sus comunidades para irse a las ciudades y, con frecuencia, emigran a otros países. Muchos pueblos han comenzado ya a reflejar tasas negativas de

crecimiento y, en algunos casos, los habitantes están abandonando sus tierras ancestrales de forma masiva. Si bien a primera vista esta situación podría parecer ventajosa para la conservación de la naturaleza, en realidad no lo es.

En un vacío de aplicación adecuada de las leyes, en algunos casos, y especulación de tierra en otros, las personas que sienten gran apego por las tierras han comenzado a ser reemplazadas por personas sin raíces profundas y sin vínculos culturales a las mismas. En el ANP Chichinautzin, este proceso ya ha comenzado de manera bastante visible. Este proceso es reflejo de procesos a nivel nacional, que en menor medida, afectan a las ANP, pero que son dignos de atención. Habiendo observado los primeros signos, los evaluadores temen que una vez que el proceso de inicio, será un proceso rápido, devastador e imparable. Este problema podrá surgir no solamente en las ANP, sino también en muchas otras comunidades y ejidos abatidos por la pobreza, particularmente en localidades montañosas y pintorescas que son atractivas para la construcción de complejos habitacionales y recreativos. Si esta observación de los evaluadores es correcta, el abandono de las comunidades y ejidos puede convertirse en un problema de grandes proporciones que puede afectar a muchas de las comunidades tradicionales de las ANP y poner en riesgo los objetivos en las ANP del proyecto SINAP-2 y muchas otras ANP federales.

Si bien se encomendó a los evaluadores la difícil tarea de evaluar este proyecto complejo y rico en insumos, los evaluadores no han contado con el tiempo suficiente para estudiar el problema de emigración en detalle y sugerir soluciones bien elaboradas a este nuevo desafío que no fue identificado ni abordado durante el diseño del proyecto. Los evaluadores pueden únicamente expresar su preocupación de que este fenómeno de emigración de las comunidades locales hacia afuera de las ANP amenaza con afectar los logros alcanzados por dos proyectos que hasta ahora han sido exitosos: el SINAP-1 y 2. Si bien los evaluadores esperan que sus observaciones sean un tanto prematuras o hasta erróneas, sienten la necesidad de que en su segunda fase, el SINAP-2 analice el proceso de emigración, evalúe el grado de sus consecuencias potenciales y proponga distintas vías de solución.

Aunque algunos de los elementos del proyecto no han sido finalizados todavía debido a que el proyecto apenas va a la mitad de su ejecución, los evaluadores quisieran aprovechar la oportunidad para felicitar a todos los actores involucrados en este proyecto por los logros alcanzados a la fecha: a la CONANP, al FANP, a la CC, a la UCP, a los equipos de manejo de las ANP, las ONG que colaboran con la CONANP, y las comunidades que luchan tanto por la conservación de sus tierras ancestrales para sus hijos y en realidad para todos los mexicanos. El progreso a la fecha es el resultado de la dedicación innegable e inusual, y del espíritu de entusiasmo que caracteriza a los trabajadores de la conservación en México. Los evaluadores tienen confianza en que la segunda fase será ejecutada con el mismo grado de dedicación y éxito que la primera fase, y desean para todos los actores la fortaleza que necesitarán en sus labores frecuentemente difíciles pero gratificantes.

Nacional Financiera ha sido elegida como agente financiero del GM por sus procedimientos eficientes. Sin embargo, desde 2002, el Manual de Normas Presupuestarias modificó el mecanismo y desde entonces los ejecutores requieren de la autorización de Acuerdos de

Ministración por la Secretaría de Hacienda y Crédito Público (SHCP). Las solicitudes de reembolsos de las donaciones se envían a la SHCP a través de la Tesorería de la Federación. Esta situación modificó el esquema financiero que planteó originalmente la CONANP durante las negociaciones de la donación, repercutiendo en una disminución en la eficiencia de los procedimientos administrativos. Sin embargo los procedimientos nuevos siguen siendo ejecutables y no requieren cambios para la segunda fase del proyecto.

Al final de la misión de evaluación, los evaluadores llegaron a la conclusión, que el proyecto está marchando bien. Evidentemente, el proyecto se encuentra en su tercer año de ejecución y cabe considerar que su impacto en la conservación y el uso sustentable de los recursos sólo podrá medirse en el largo plazo. Tomando en cuenta estos puntos, los evaluadores concluyeron que:

1. Todos los instrumentos están operando;
2. Se están ejecutando los instrumentos acordados para lograr los objetivos del proyecto;
3. Los objetivos corresponden a los principios de las instituciones involucradas; y
4. El proyecto se está ejecutado satisfactoriamente.

Las conclusiones y recomendaciones específicas se encuentran en el capítulo siguiente.

2. CONCLUSIONES Y RECOMENDACIONES ESPECÍFICAS

2.1 ACERCA DE LA EFICIENCIA Y EFECTIVIDAD DE LA ADMINISTRACIÓN POR EL FANP:

Con relación a la eficiencia del FANP, los evaluadores han revisado cuidadosamente los costos de manejo de los fondos de inversión y de sus rendimientos. El documento del proyecto (PAD) del SINAP-2 entre el BM, el GM y el FMCN estipula los siguientes porcentajes de los intereses para operar el FANP:

- 12 por ciento para cubrir gastos de manejo financiero, canalización de los intereses a las ANP, supervisión de la aplicación de los intereses y procuración adicional por el FMCN;
- 8 por ciento para cubrir los gastos de contabilidad y contratación de los Programas Operativos Anuales (POA) de las ANP por organizaciones no gubernamentales (ONG);
- 6.5 por ciento por coordinación entre CONANP y FANP, y para la supervisión y monitoreo técnico de conceptos financiados (solamente sobre los rendimientos de US\$ 16.5 millones de SINAP-1).

Si bien el FMCN ha negociado una tasa por manejo financiero del 12%, únicamente cobra costos reales de manejo, como son los salarios, costos operativos de la oficina, y otros costos operativos. Actualmente, estos costos son alrededor de un 9.6% de los rendimientos anuales del FANP.

La tasa administrativa por contratación de personal fue ha sido presupuestada originalmente en un 8%, pero como estos contratos se hacen mediante licitación pública, estos costos, actualmente, son de alrededor de un 6.5%. A primera vista, estos gastos meramente parecen pérdidas administrativas. Pero esto está lejos de ser cierto. A través de este mecanismo, el FANP fortalece procedimientos financieros y administrativos en aquellas ONG que apoyan a las ANP a nivel local en una variedad de labores, además de la contratación de personal. Este costo de administración permite a estas ONG contar con un buen administrador financiero, y por lo tanto este gasto es una importante contribución al fortalecimiento institucional de las mismas. A su vez, este mecanismo promueve la alianza entre el sector público y el privado de la cual depende el manejo de las ANP y que fortalece el trabajo de la CONANP a través de las ONG. Podría decirse que una buena parte de este costo de administración es en realidad un valor agregado a la conservación de las ANP financiadas por el FANP.

Sobre los costos del CC, cabe constar que el porcentaje cobrado para las operaciones del CC sólo se cobra de los fondos patrimoniales del SINAP-1, mientras el CC da seguimiento a todas las ANP que se benefician del FANP. Tomando en cuenta esto, los costos de coordinación efectivamente son un poco más de 2% sobre el total de los rendimientos anuales del FANP. De este monto, también se financian cursos anuales, contratación de personal para el monitoreo del cambio del suelo en las ANP, lo que en realidad no son costos, sino gastos para el cumplimiento de los objetivos del FANP. Los gastos de los cursos deberían ser deducidos de los costos de manejo.

Entonces, lo que a la primera vista, parece un costo de manejo de 26.5 % sobre los rendimientos de los fondos patrimoniales, es en la realidad un costo de aproximadamente 9.6 % de costos de manejo y 8.5% son gastos principalmente de utilidad productiva para los objetivos para los cuales el FANP ha sido creado.

A medida que el valor total del patrimonio de la FANP creció, generando una considerable economía de escala, el Comité de Inversiones del FMCN se involucró más directamente en el manejo de la inversión a través de un asesor nacional independiente. Esto ha permitido bajar los costos del manejo de la inversión a un 0.2% del capital. Dada la tasa internacional de manejo de inversiones que es de alrededor de un 1% sobre la inversión, esta cifra debe considerarse extremadamente baja, y con un rendimiento actual de alrededor de 9.5 %, se debe considerar al FMCN como un administrador de fondos altamente eficiente desde el punto de vista financiero.

La CC ha ido modificando sus funciones a medida que los recursos canalizados a las ANP han aumentado. En una constante reingeniería, sus funciones principales en capacitación, seguimiento, monitoreo y certificación del uso adecuado de los recursos se han enfocado a reducir estas tareas a las dos últimas, a medida que los equipos de las ANP se fortalecen. Esto ha permitido atender 20 ANP con la misma cantidad de personas (dos) que al inicio de SINAP-1 con 10 ANP. Se espera que esta constante reingeniería permita continuar con este tipo de economías de escala, así como con la posibilidad de crecer en nuevas funciones estratégicas de esta pieza central entre el sector público y privado. Con un amplio conocimiento de ambas instituciones, la CC está en una posición privilegiada para acercar proyectos de ambos organismos, generar sinergias y facilitar una mayor captación de recursos.

Para mejorar la transparencia y la simplicidad, los evaluadores recomiendan que el FMCN renegocie la operación del CC como porcentaje general sobre los rendimientos de todos los fondos patrimoniales manejados por el FANP. Así se permitirá al CC atender un mayor número de ANP apoyadas por el FANP. También se recomienda que cualquier reducción en los costos del CC sea disponible para financiar capacitación y otros servicios disponibles para múltiples ANP.

El equipo evaluador ha examinado cuidadosamente el ciclo de desembolsos. Éste ha concluido que, si bien el proceso es detallado y complicado, y parece burocrático a primera vista, al final se trata de un procedimiento que bien vale la pena, debido a las siguientes razones:

- La rutina disciplinada de tiempos permite desembolsos oportunos y puntuales al comienzo del año para todas las ANP que cumplen con los requerimientos;
- Los procedimientos que se han desarrollado han resultado en la institucionalización de un ciclo eficiente para las solicitudes, los pagos y la preparación de asuntos financieros que ha tenido un impacto muy positivo en las ANP que reciben su apoyo;

- El financiamiento fiscal disponible se agota²;
- Los equipos gerenciales definen y priorizan sus necesidades financieras y las presentan de manera estandarizada y eficiente a las administraciones centrales, tanto de la CONANP como del FANP;
- Al recibir asignaciones financieras tanto del FANP como de la CONANP, las ANP beneficiarias del FANP pueden planificar mejor sus acciones durante todo el año y, por ende, trabajar más eficientemente;
- La rutina promueve una proyección consolidada de necesidades y preparación de informes sobre logros, desafíos gerenciales y progresos, la impresión del personal sobre el estado de la conservación del ANP, etc. y así también sirve de un mecanismo de respuesta rápida a eventuales incumplimientos de las metas;
- A través de la presentación de minutas de los Consejos Asesores de las ANP, se promueve y monitorea la planificación participativa y el co-manejo.

En general el ciclo de los POA y las oportunidades de entrenamiento de la CC contribuyen significativamente a un desarrollo y renovación permanente que se está multiplicando en todo el SINAP. Luego de 8 años de desarrollar, probar y mejorar el procedimiento de desembolso y de manejo de fondos, el FANP se ha convertido en una máquina muy bien aceiteada que apoya oportunamente a las ANP involucradas. La CONANP, a través de sus direcciones de las ANP ha demostrado un excelente desempeño en el ciclo del proyecto, que sumado con sus importantes avances en los últimos años en la planeación de los recursos fiscales, ha potenciado la capacidad de las ANP involucradas. **Dadas estas observaciones, los evaluadores recomiendan continuar y mejorar los ejercicios de planeación y definición de ciclos de proyecto para todas las ANP.**

El FANP es una importante fuente de memoria institucional para períodos de transición administrativa en el GM, puesto que su personal y la mayor parte de los miembros del Comité Técnico del Fondo para Áreas Naturales Protegidas (CTFANP) son independientes del gobierno y su reemplazo sigue procedimientos y ritmos muy distintos a aquellos del gobierno. El presente documento también ha sido preparado con la transición en mente y los evaluadores trataron de siempre dar amplia explicación y referencia para futuros funcionarios nuevos que se integren a la CONANP.

Mientras que el FANP continúe siendo la fuente principal disponible para dar respuesta a las eminentes necesidades de personal de campo, se recomienda que el FANP sea utilizado mayormente, con un tope de 80% para el financiamiento de personal de campo y gastos menores indispensables – tales como el teléfono y atención de emergencias (ej. incendios forestales). Aunque las necesidades de financiamiento de proyectos de desarrollo sustentable e iniciativas de desarrollo sostenible son igualmente importantes, tales proyectos pueden ser financiados por otras fuentes - especialmente PRODERS y PET. Con el tiempo, se espera que el GM aumente el personal de las ANP, lo que permitirá mayor libertad para la

² Un problema importante en la administración pública es que los fondos no siempre se ejercen durante el año fiscal y así se pierde su disponibilidad. El mecanismo de los POA da mucha claridad a la disponibilidad de fondos y así previene que los fondos fiscales no sean usados.

asignación de los recursos FANP y según se vayan cubriendo las necesidades de personal la proporción dedicada a contrataciones se debe ir reduciendo.

En varias ANP, tanto en algunas del proyecto como en otras visitadas anteriormente, el tema de la “graduación” genera inquietudes entre los equipos de manejo, tanto por razones de incertidumbre de la continuidad de su empleo como por la desmoralización que genere el sentido de “abandono” por un apoyo que consideran esencial en los objetivos de la conservación. Una nueva propuesta diseñada de forma participativa fue recientemente aprobada por el CTFANP. Esa permitirá que se "gradúen" con 1.5 veces el recurso que les otorga el FANP y ello será a perpetuidad (su parte de la herencia) y tienen diez años para lograrlo. **Los evaluadores, esperan que esta nueva política, dará la tranquilidad al personal, que trabaja bajo condiciones muy difíciles y merece todo el apoyo moral posible.**

El Fondo de emergencia del FANP se estableció para permitir a las ANP dar respuesta inmediata a emergencias, tales como contratación de personal para combate de incendios forestales y desastres naturales. El FANP tiene un mecanismo de respuesta rápida que le permite depositar fondos dentro de las 24 horas posteriores a la solicitud de la Dirección de un ANP, usualmente dentro un par de horas después. Actualmente este fondo solamente está disponible para las ANP que califican para el FANP. La CONANP cuenta con un fondo adicional de 4 millones de pesos que aporta la CONABIO para la atención de emergencias en las ANP y que se aplican en sinergia con los recursos del FANP. Si bien esto es un gran avance, es todavía insuficiente para responder a todas las necesidades. **Los evaluadores recomiendan que de forma experimental, el FANP también incluye en su programa de emergencias las ANP que no son del proyecto y que tampoco califican por el mecanismo de financiamiento de la CONANP.**

2.2 ACERCA LA PROCURACIÓN DE FONDOS DE CONTRAPARTIDA:

El proyecto SINAP-2 conlleva varios compromisos en términos de procuración de recursos. A continuación se describen dichos compromisos y su estado actual en términos de su cumplimiento:

- US\$ 5 millones como primera inversión (para el SINAP-1): el FMCN y la CONANP aseguraron compromisos por parte de donantes privados en el 2000;
- US\$ 1.9 millones para igualar los fondos para el arranque del proyecto: se efectuaron los depósitos por parte de las fundaciones privadas a través de los esfuerzos de movilización de recursos por parte del FMCN en el 2002;
- US\$ 7.5 millones para igualar el primer depósito de GEF para el SINAP-2: la SEMARNAP depositó US\$ 2.5 millones en el 2000, mientras el FMCN movilizó US\$ 5 millones;
- US\$ 2.21 millones para igualar el segundo depósito para el SINAP-2: US\$ 0.71 millones movilizadas por el FMCN de fondos privados, y US\$ 1.5 millones depositados por la SEMARNAT entre el 2001 y el 2002;

- US\$ 6.6 millones para igualar el tercer depósito para el SINAP-2: US\$ 5.18 millones movilizados por el FMCN y US\$ 1.42 millones depositados por la SEMARNAT.

En términos generales, un total de US\$ 23.21 millones han sido movilizados para igualar el monto de los fondos GEF (US\$ 28.11 entre SINAP-1 y depósitos a la fecha para el SINAP-2). Un total de US\$ 17.79 millones han sido movilizados por el FMCN mediante gestiones conjuntas con la CONANP y US\$ 5.42 millones han sido proporcionados por la SEMARNA(P)T. Compromisos pendientes de asegurar incluyen US\$ 0.1 millones de parte del FMCN, US\$ 3 millones de parte del SEMARNAT, y US\$3 millones por parte de la CONANP. El FMCN cuenta con el compromiso por escrito de un donante que depositará US\$ 0.2 millones a principios de 2006.

El FANP se ha convertido en el fondo más grandes del mundo para áreas naturales protegidas para un país en desarrollo. Sus recursos se han más que triplicado en los últimos ocho años. Ha probado que puede recaudar fondos y luego administrarlos eficientemente, conservando siempre el capital patrimonial. Esto le ha generado fama y credibilidad a nivel mundial. A medida que aumenta el monto total de las finanzas, los costos administrativos han disminuido proporcionalmente. Además, su credibilidad es un factor esencial en la recaudación de recursos. **Por estas razones, los evaluadores son del parecer que la creación de otros fondos para manejar los fondos del SINAP-2 los remanentes recursos patrimoniales del GEF no es aconsejable.**

Según una disposición legislativa publicada en el 2004, los fideicomisos en México en los que participen funcionarios públicos no pueden recibir recursos públicos. El FMCN no es un fideicomiso, sin embargo en el consejo del FMCN y en el CTFANP participan funcionarios del Gobierno Federal. Es por lo tanto sumamente importante que la CONANP y el FMCN hagan un análisis y las gestiones necesarias para eliminar la incertidumbre de cómo se cumplirá con el compromiso adquirido por el Gobierno Mexicano para aportar US\$ 6 millones de contrapartida a los fondos GEF. **Los evaluadores recomiendan que el Gobierno de México, en su calidad de signatario del acuerdo, y el FMCN, encuentren una solución para poder cumplir con este compromiso.**

De los US\$ 6 millones que faltan de movilizar por parte del sector público, US\$ 3 millones son compromiso de la CONANP y US\$ 3 millones son la aportación que aún queda pendiente por parte de la SEMARNAT. Para la procuración de los tres millones de compromiso de la CONANP, ésta contrató con recursos extinguidos del SINAP-2 a una empresa privada, “Desarrollo Organizacional Sustentable”, que plantea como una de sus estrategias la creación de un fondo paralelo. Al revisar los productos entregados resultado de este contrato, los consultores tienen la preocupación de que esta empresa no tenga la capacidad de procuración de fondos esperada.

Los evaluadores están preocupados de la situación, en la cual se encuentra la CONANP y la SEMARNAT con sus compromisos de proveer los fondos de contrapartida (matching funds), tanto por las aparentes limitaciones del GM de contribuir económicamente a fideicomisos con la participación de funcionarios del gobierno como por su dependencia de una empresa sin

historial (“track record”) establecida. **Dada la importancia de este punto, los consultores recomiendan que la CONANP dé seguimiento estrecho al contrato con esa empresa.**

Hasta el momento, el FMCN se ha enfocado mucho en donantes institucionales para su procuración de fondos. Sin embargo, la ventaja de procurar fondos a través pequeños donantes y jóvenes es que no sólo generaría fondos adicionales, sino que al mismo tiempo construye agrupaciones de apoyo para la conservación. **Se recomienda que tanto la CONANP como el FMCN/FANP colaboren en una campaña nueva para procurar recursos de donantes pequeños y jóvenes, preferiblemente en combinación con algún tipo de membresía y una promoción para visitar las ANP.**

En el transcurso de los años el FANP ha crecido mucho y maneja actualmente un buen número de cuentas de fondos patrimoniales para ANP distintas. El manejo de inversiones para doce donantes es complejo y dificulta el entendimiento del manejo financiero por el FANP y las condiciones de donantes distintos. Bajo tales condiciones es vital explicar claramente a personas no familiarizadas con el proyecto cómo funciona el FANP y cuáles son los compromisos de cada una de las cuentas. Tal comunicación es esencial para la procuración de fondos y para mantener la confianza tanto de la CONANP como de los donantes potenciales. **Los evaluadores brindaron sugerencias específicas de cómo mejorar las presentaciones y recomiendan, asimismo, presentaciones frecuentes para los diferentes actores interesados de los beneficios del programa.**

Con relación al financiamiento de personal de campo con el mecanismo de un fondo patrimonial, los evaluadores son de la opinión que el mecanismo es muy efectivo y eficaz en la presente situación. Sin embargo, constatan que la conservación de las ANP es un rol nuevo asumido por el GM como parte de su compromiso con la Convención de la Diversidad Biológica (CDB). Sin embargo, el nuevo sector creado para cumplir con este nuevo compromiso sólo puede ser efectivo tras la asignación de personal en cantidad adecuada a la tarea a enfrentar. Esperar que se pueda cumplir con el compromiso de la Convención de la CDB con alrededor de 400 personas con contratos permanentes de la CONANP que son responsables para la conservación efectiva de más de 18 millones de hectáreas no es realista. Tampoco es realista esperar que donantes internacionales financien el crecimiento necesario para pagar el personal necesario para todas las 150 ANP federales priorizadas. **Para poder cumplir con su compromiso como parte de la CDB, el GM necesita aumentar el número del personal de planta de CONANP a un nivel consistente con la tarea asumida al firmar la CDB.**

2.3 ACERCA DEL OBJETIVO DEL PROYECTO “PROMOVER LA SUSTENTABILIDAD ECONÓMICA, SOCIAL Y AMBIENTAL DE ACTIVIDADES PRODUCTIVAS”:

Una de las necesidades básicas para el manejo efectivo de las ANP es la disponibilidad de personal de campo que pueda llevar a cabo funciones esenciales como la interacción con las comunidades locales otras instituciones gubernamentales y ONG; monitoreo; promoción de proyectos socio-económicos; el desarrollo de materiales de interpretación, etc. Al financiar de

forma permanente un equipo de campo para las ANP seleccionadas, se cumple con una condición básica estructural para poder lograr con el objetivo de establecer la sustentabilidad económica, social y ambiental de actividades productivas.

El proyecto ha sido diseñado para centrarse en el desarrollo socio-económico sostenible y la sustentabilidad ambiental. Si esto puede lograrse o no, depende de varios factores, y todavía es muy temprano para determinar si los insumos del proyecto lograrán, de manera realista, estas metas ambiciosas.

Los instrumentos escogidos, los micro-proyectos en apoyo a las actividades económicas (Programas de desarrollo comunitario, PDC e Iniciativas de Desarrollo Sustentable, IDS) para los grupos locales involucrados, han sido ofrecidos a las comunidades locales a través de un proceso altamente participativo. Como tal, éstos han logrado al menos un aumento significativo en la confianza de las comunidades en los funcionarios públicos de la CONANP. Sin esta confianza, no puede lograrse ningún avance en los objetivos de conservación y sustentabilidad ambiental. Sin embargo, al ser seleccionados por las comunidades locales, los proyectos no necesariamente son económicamente o ambientalmente sostenibles.

En la mayor parte de las comunidades de las ANP visitadas, los evaluadores percibieron el aprecio a la gestión realizada por las direcciones de las ANP y al estatus de conservación adquirido de sus tierras. Tienen, asimismo, grandes expectativas de trabajar con la CONANP en el desarrollo socio-económico de sus comunidades, al mismo tiempo que protegen la biodiversidad de sus tierras. Se han observado conflictos de manejo únicamente en las comunidades pesqueras de la RB Alto Golfo de California y Delta del Río Colorado.

Cabe observar que la gran mayoría de las áreas protegidas de México se encuentran en zonas rurales, donde la población consiste de comunidades tradicionales y etnias de gran vulnerabilidad tanto económica como social. Las administraciones de cada ANP de la CONANP luchan en la búsqueda de un equilibrio justo entre las necesidades de la conservación de la biodiversidad y la obtención de los derechos y necesidades de las comunidades. En estas regiones aisladas, los servicios gubernamentales, de los tres niveles del gobierno (Federación, Estado y Municipio) generalmente son muy débiles o ausentes, mientras que las comunidades se caracterizan por deficiencias en autogestión, recursos económicos, niveles de educación y servicios básicos de saneamiento y salud.

Los beneficios de las intervenciones de la CONANP y la dedicación de los gestores en las esquinas olvidadas del país donde se encuentran la mayoría de las ANP contribuyen a la reducción de la pobreza y al fortalecimiento social de los grupos más vulnerables del país. La CONANP no sólo logra la conservación de la biodiversidad, sino que en el proceso, adelanta los objetivos del GM de la reducción de la pobreza extrema y la equidad del género dentro de las comunidades rurales tradicionales donde este tema todavía es incipiente. Todos estos logros han sido observados en todas las áreas del presente proyecto así como en las del proyecto de la UE y del SINAP1. Estos beneficios también son conocidos por algunos legisladores de la federación, que han mencionado a la CONANP como “Una de las instituciones más queridas y reconocidas del Gobierno Federal”.

Uno de los elementos con mayor potencial para crear incentivos económicos en la conservación en las ANP de esta evaluación, está relacionado con la valoración de los servicios ambientales que prestan los ecosistemas. Específicamente se identificó un enorme potencial para generar un mecanismo local de compensación por pago de servicios ambientales hídricos que el APFF Corredor Biológico Chichinautzin presta a las ciudades aledañas. Por otra parte, este tema facilita la sinergia con otras instituciones de los tres niveles de gobierno e incidir en las causas raíz de los problemas de degradación de los recursos naturales. **Sin embargo, se observa una gran disparidad y que algunas direcciones de las ANP no están dando la importancia que merece a este tema por lo que los evaluadores recomiendan que la CONANP elabore una estrategia en alianza con la CONAFOR para el impulso de estos mecanismos en todas las ANP de montaña del país. Entre otras cosas, se puede contemplar la promoción de incentivos económicos y/o fiscales para estimular el uso sustentable de los recursos naturales en las ANP y sus áreas aledañas, así como mecanismos de procuración de fondos locales.**

Los proyectos seleccionadas por las direcciones de las ANP son listados y en preparación se encuentran en su fase de inicio (véase Anexo 6.6). Aunque todavía es temprano llegar a conclusiones definitivas, los evaluadores no están convencidos que estos proyectos siempre:

- Contribuyen a la conservación;
- Son socialmente y/o técnicamente ejecutables;
- Son sostenibles; o
- Económicamente factibles.

Sin embargo, para ganar la confianza de las poblaciones es muy importante iniciar pequeños proyectos de su propia elección. Una vez realizada una pequeña inversión, los equipos de manejo, pueden evaluar de forma participativa con los actores y desde ahí tocar otros temas, más enfocados en la conservación de la naturaleza y mayor rendimiento socio-económico.

En el campo, los evaluadores se dieron cuenta que hay un riesgo de que la formación del oficial responsable pueda influir demasiado en la naturaleza del programa de inversión. Por ejemplo un forestal promueve actividades forestales, o un veterinario promueve proyectos de uso ganadero, mientras para la conservación o el rendimiento económico, podría mejor involucrarse en una actividad de una naturaleza muy distinta. **Los evaluadores recomiendan que se mantenga siempre un alto nivel de objetividad y que los equipos de campo evalúen las opciones de proyectos en equipos multidisciplinarios.**

2.4 UNAS OBSERVACIONES ACERCA LA EFECTIVIDAD DE LA ORGANIZACIÓN DE LAS ANP:

Dado lo observado anteriormente, los evaluadores consideran a los proyectos de inversión efectivos pero no suficientes para crear un ambiente de confianza. Para mantener la confianza, se requiere reglas claras del juego por parte de todos los niveles del Gobierno y una ejecución clara de la ley. El proyecto está trabajando en eso a través del componente “mainstreaming”, donde los evaluadores constatan que todavía es necesario hacer mucho progreso, al igual que en los Consejos Asesor (CA), que requieren de fortalecimiento.

En varias ANP, la falta de cumplimiento de las leyes ambientales y de recursos naturales es un asunto de mayor importancia ya que impide contener los procesos de deterioro en las ANP y crear en la sociedad un ambiente de confianza con el gobierno y sus acciones. Cuando se estableció la CONANP se decidió mantener en PROFEPA la ejecución de la ley, a fin de evitar tensiones entre los equipos de manejo y la población local. Sin embargo, en varias ANP (particularmente el CB Chichinautzin), PROFEPA no brinda un apoyo adecuado a las ANP dificultando el cumplimiento de los objetivos por lo que fueron creadas las ANP. **En la visión de los evaluadores, es fundamental crear los mecanismos necesarios para una adecuada aplicación de la ley dentro de las ANP, ya que esto es una de las principales limitantes para la creación de modelos efectivos de gobernanza para el manejo de las ANP. Se sugiere en estrecha colaboración con PROFEPA buscar soluciones efectivas, tales como asignar inspectores de la PROFEPA dedicados exclusivamente a las ANP.**

La CONANP contrató a la empresa consultora DESOPAC para desarrollar un análisis de las opciones de incorporación de criterios y componentes ambientales en planes, programas y presupuestos de cinco de las dependencias del Ejecutivo Federal con mayor incidencia en las ANP: SAGARPA, SEDESOL, SRA, SCT y SSA. Este documento es una excelente herramienta para la CONANP y las Direcciones de ANP para identificar la oferta institucional y los recursos públicos disponibles para hacer frente a los enormes retos sociales que enfrentan las ANP y fomentar la conciliación de las necesidades de las comunidades locales y de la conservación del patrimonio natural.

Los evaluadores sugieren que la información de este documento se sistematice en una plataforma que permita que la base de información sea fácilmente utilizada por las direcciones de ANP, los municipios, las organizaciones sociales y las propias comunidades. Esta base informática que podría llamarse el “mapa del tesoro para el desarrollo sustentable” deberá incluir las reglas de operación y formatos de solicitud de cada uno de los programas públicos implementados por estas dependencias y deberá ser actualizada regularmente para mantener su vigencia.

Los avances en el sub-componente “Sinergia” fueron firmados por la SEMARNAT y la CONANP, de manera que cuentan con un marco institucional y jurídico muy favorable para potenciar la sinergia institucional, y han logrado establecer acuerdos operativos con dependencias del gobierno Federal, de algunos Estados y Municipios para abordar temas específicos. Sin embargo, en el análisis de resultados en campo, es aún evidente el limitado

efecto de la sinergia institucional a nivel del ANP, incluso en dependencias del mismo sector de Medio Ambiente como CONAFOR y CNA, situación que es más crítica en la vinculación con otros sectores como SAGARPA y CONAPESCA. **Los evaluadores sugieren a las direcciones de las ANP seguir trabajando en efectuar plataformas locales en donde se armonicen las políticas y acciones que afectan a las ANP.**

Mientras la vinculación con la CONAFOR se mantiene satisfactoria al más alto nivel con reuniones trimestrales, se sugiere crear una rutina institucionalizada de coordinación que también involucre a la PROFEPA y la CNA, así como el desarrollo de mesas de trabajo específicas para fomentar programas de impacto en varias ANP como el Pago por Servicios Ambientales, PROCYMAF, Incendios forestales (CONAFOR), Inspección y Vigilancia (PROFEPA), Consejos y Comisiones de Cuenca (CNA).

En el caso de la vinculación con las otras dependencias del Gobierno Federal, se espera que la CONANP continúe sus esfuerzos de crear un mecanismo similar a nivel de Direcciones Generales cuya misión sea crear las condiciones institucionales para la puesta en práctica de las Bases de Coordinación Intersecretarial, así como diseñar y crear los mecanismos para poner en práctica instrumentos para la incorporación de criterios de sustentabilidad en programas, proyectos y presupuestos de SAGARPA, SEDESOL, SRA, SCT y SSA.

La mayoría de las ANP son espacios donde históricamente una multiplicidad de actores e intereses interactúan muchas veces de manera conflictiva. Con los decretos de las ANP se establecieron nuevas reglas del juego que modificaron esta interacción, a veces eliminando ciertos conflictos. En unas ocasiones también se introdujeron nuevos elementos de conflicto al determinar restricciones sobre la propiedad con relación al uso de los recursos naturales a través de la zonificación. Para eso, en la opinión de los evaluadores es fundamental la existencia de una estructura institucional de negociación y de toma de decisiones que permita atender un amplio espectro de problemas y conflictos entre los mismos miembros mediante los cuales ellos puedan llegar a tomar decisiones vinculantes y satisfactorias.

Según las observaciones de los evaluadores, los mandatos actuales de los CA no son suficientemente amplios y funcionan como consejos de consulta y de asesoría y no de toma de decisiones. En muchas ocasiones, los CA son más una representación de ONG, instituciones de investigación y dependencias gubernamentales, que una estructura formal incluyente con adecuada representación de los dueños y poseedores de la tierra. Así los temas esenciales como los proyectos de desarrollo sostenible financiados por SINAP-2 y otras fuentes de financiamiento, en muchos de los casos no son tratados y decididos satisfactoriamente dentro de los CA.

Para poder abordar de manera satisfactoria los problemas que enfrentan los equipos de manejo de las ANP, los evaluadores recomiendan que se modifique el reglamento de las ANP con los siguientes elementos:

- **Mantener la figura de Consejo Asesor con fines exclusivamente de asesoría técnica y científica;**

- **Dar flexibilidad al número de integrantes en función de las características de cada ANP;**
- **Crear una nueva figura que podría denominarse Consejo de Gestión que**
 - ③ **en el caso de ANP donde la propiedad sea principalmente social y privada, se de una mayor representación a los propietarios de las tierras (ejidos, comunidades y /os pequeños propietarios); y**
 - ③ **de facultades de deliberación y consenso en los temas de interés común dentro las ANP;**
- **Según las características de cada reserva permitir la creación de comités micro regionales de gestión en donde las decisiones las tomen los dueños del recurso con respeto a la vocación de las ANP y no los actores externos (ONG, agencias gubernamentales, Académicos).**

Los evaluadores recomiendan que el diagnóstico que está realizando el IMAC se profundice y alcance propuestas de funcionamiento a partir de mecanismos participativos y que incluya por lo menos los puntos señalados anteriormente.

A medida que aumenta el personal en las ANP, es importante que los directores y sub-directores de las ANP reciban capacitación en el manejo de recursos humanos básica y/o programas de actualización, según sus necesidades.

2.5 ACERCA DE LA MIGRACIÓN DE LA POBLACIÓN LOCAL DE LAS ANP Y LA COLONIZACIÓN DE ZONAS CERCANAS A AREAS URBANAS:

Desde hace un buen tiempo, los evaluadores están observando una emigración de habitantes locales desde varias ANP. Aunque este proceso y sus impactos varía por área y por comunidad, la migración contribuye al riesgo de que paulatinamente los ejidatarios y los miembros de las comunidades tierras pierdan su relación tradicional con sus tierras y comiencen a venderlas y/o que las tierras sean invadidas o compradas por gente sin raíces tradicionales en el área. Así las ANP poco a poco pierden su relación con la comunidad local, los nuevos habitantes comienzan a introducir nuevos usos de la tierra iniciando con deforestación y/o en zonas cercanas a las metrópolis, la urbanización. Es muy probable que en el transcurso de unas décadas, grandes partes de varias ANP sean transformadas, o que los equipos de manejo ya no tengan ninguna manera de influir el comportamiento en grandes zonas de las ANP afectadas. **Así los evaluadores temen que en muchas ANP existen zonas donde la conservación de la biodiversidad ya no será sostenible si no se aplican mecanismos mínimos que puedan:**

- **Prevenir o frenar la salida de la población tradicional;**
- **Prevenir la adquisición (compra de tierras o de derechos ejidatarios) por personas de otras partes;**
- **Prevenir la construcción de nueva infraestructura urbana y productiva en zonas destinadas a la conservación de biodiversidad;**
- **Promover un monitoreo de la dinámica poblacional y la tenencia de la tierra de todas las ANP;**

- **Iniciar un presupuesto – aún modesto – para los lugares donde sea factible la compra de tierras a favor de la CONANP y/o de las ONG involucradas que decidan vender voluntariamente. Esto también podría aplicarse a comunidades donde las mismas solicitan explícitamente el deseo de vender terrenos para su conservación;**
- **Iniciar un presupuesto – aún modesto – para experimentar con la compra de tierras voluntaria en pequeñas propiedades dentro de las ANP o de comunidades donde las comunidades lo soliciten explícitamente.**

Adicionalmente, varios instrumentos están disponibles para prevenir un cambio de uso de las tierras, tales como:

- **El Programa de Manejo para el ANP;**
- **El Ordenamiento Ecológico del territorio municipal;**
- **Los planes comunitarios de ordenamiento territorial y de manejo de los recursos naturales;**
- **El plan estratégico de turismo y de visita pública.**

Los evaluadores recomiendan que se promueva sistemáticamente la aplicación de todos ellos en todas las ANP. Además es importante, una vez desarrollados y aprobados los planes, que PROFEPA ejecute la ley y prevenga establecimientos residenciales y construcciones ilegales.

Los evaluadores están conscientes que es difícil enfrentar este proceso efectivamente, y no es posible proponer soluciones bien desarrolladas con base en una misión de unas pocas semanas. Por lo que se recomienda a la CONANP:

- **Iniciar un análisis de la situación;**
- **Desarrollar un juego de instrumentos nuevos para enfrentar esta nueva tendencia (legislación que permita la compra voluntaria de tierras como propiedad federal, presupuesto inicial, prevención de venta de tierras comunales y ejidales);**
- **Fomentar y aplicar al máximo todos los instrumentos ya existentes;**
- **Fomentar la aplicación de la ley donde haya infracciones de adquisiciones y construcciones ilegales e invasiones de las tierras comunales y ejidatarios.**

2.6 ACERCA DE UNA VISIÓN DE LARGO PLAZO PARA EL SINAB:

A nivel nacional no existe una visión de manejo de largo plazo clara de las ANP o del SINAP, como patrimonio de todos los mexicanos. La estrategia de la CONANP, por falta de recursos, es incipiente e insuficiente para lograr contacto con el pueblo mexicano, se requiere una priorización de las áreas más aptas para funcionar de enlace del sistema con el público. La función pública de las ANP del país como patrimonio nacional de biodiversidad y espacios verdes al beneficio de todos los mexicanos podría tener mayor atención por parte de las direcciones de las ANP. Eso se traduce en un enfoque mayor de los beneficios de las ANP para la población local.

Aun cuando a nivel central de la CONANP se promueve la visitación como una estrategia de posicionamiento, sensibilización y participación, en muchas ANP se privilegia a los visitantes como “turistas” que traen dinero en vez de mexicanos compatriotas que tienen derechos al acceso a las ANP y que necesitan ser involucrados en la conservación. Para una planificación sistemática de una visión nacional, se necesita un proceso de dos caminos integrados: de abajo hacia arriba y de arriba hacia abajo de tal forma que se establezca una integración de un punto de vista nacional que tome en cuenta las potencialidades y los retos locales.

Experiencias en Costa Rica y China muestran que una vez que la visitación a un ANP empieza, las tasas de crecimiento tienden a acelerarse de forma alarmante. En Costa Rica, la visitación al SINAP se duplicó entre 1992 y 1994. En China, el crecimiento de la visitación a un parque nacional³ (PN) analizado aumentó de un estable crecimiento de 13% en los años 90 a una duplicación cada 2.5 años en este siglo, debido a un alto crecimiento de:

- La clase media;
- Carreteras nuevas y renovadas;
- Tiempo disponible de vacaciones; y
- Acceso de vehículos privados al parque.

China está invirtiendo seriamente en la infraestructura de visitación a través de préstamos del estado en todos sus parques nacionales con alta visitación. México, que tiene condiciones similares a China no está haciendo nada para prepararse para un alto crecimiento de la visitación, a pesar de que las indicaciones ya muestran que el mercado ya está listo para un crecimiento rápido, como muestran las visitas en el ANP Monarca. Lo que México puede aprender de China, es que inicialmente, el turismo / visitación se desarrolla aparentemente en una manera lenta, pero a partir de cierto momento puede crecer rápidamente, ariscando devastar todo lo que no está preparado para el impacto inesperado. Si la CONANP no se prepara a tiempo para un mercado interno de crecimiento rápido en las ANP cercanas a las metrópolis, la visitación inevitablemente causará daños inesperados y potencialmente irreversibles, tanto en el campo social como para la conservación. Sólo el desarrollo de infraestructura seria y duradera puede resistir tal uso intensivo. Eso requiere inversiones considerables, lo que se puede recuperar con cobros de derechos.

Los evaluadores recomiendan que se desarrolle al menos una visión a 10 años para el SINAP que pueda servir de norma para el desarrollo de visiones a 10 años⁴ para cada una de las ANP, especialmente con un enfoque en las posibilidades y riesgos de un crecimiento rápido de la visitación a las ANP con alto potencial de visitación por sus características de ubicación y sus recursos naturales.

³ Un artículo por uno de los evaluadores en prensa sobre la visitación en los parques nacionales en China, confidencialmente compartido con la CONANP y el FANP.

⁴ También se lo puede hacer para un período mayor, pero dada la dinámica enorme del país en temas sociales, desarrollo rural, crecimiento de la clase media, etc. una visión para muy largo plazo arriesga ser un tanto especulativa.

Para proyectos futuros, se sugiere contemplar inversiones en algunas áreas protegidas con financiamiento de préstamos para experimentar con un nuevo mecanismo de financiamiento.

En cada una de las ANP, los evaluadores preguntaron si existía un plan maestro y/o una visión de largo plazo para el ANP y resultó que ninguna lo tenía. Notaron que los equipos de manejo generalmente conocen los valores principales de sus áreas, pero no toman estos valores como punto de partida para analizar cuales son los problemas principales que los amenazan o para identificar y priorizar actividades de manejo integral. Así los equipos de manejo se enfocan principalmente en problemas visibles inmediatamente sin trabajar desde una visión de a donde quieren estar en 10 años.

Para un manejo eficiente así como para una planeación de presupuesto y requisitos de personal es primordial que cada ANP cuente con una visión a 10 años basada en un buen conocimiento de los recursos naturales y de los ecosistemas pertenecientes en el área. **Se aconseja que se desarrollen planes de manejo o planes maestros de largo plazo para cada ANP con base en un mapa de ecosistemas, una línea base biológica, un perfil social, relación de la ubicación relacionada a grandes centros urbanos y/o fuentes de turistas, etc. Estos planes deberían ser armonizados con la visión nacional mencionada anteriormente.**

Para facilitar una visión externa, tanto para proyectos en camino como para generar ideas nuevas, se recomienda que se financien misiones de apoyo periódicas con consultores externos con amplia experiencia en muchas ANP distintas para evaluar y explorar ideas sobre los resultados de acciones tomadas y generar ideas de respuesta a nuevas situaciones. Así las ANP se pueden beneficiar de una gran variedad de experiencias de otras ANP a través de los consultores y pueden avanzar en una revisión sistemática de sus indicadores de impacto en la conservación y su rutina de monitoreo. Según la necesidad, es posible usar estos ejercicios para iniciar el desarrollo de las visiones antes mencionadas, dependiendo de las necesidades de cada ANP.

Las visiones también son esenciales para poder definir las tareas a asumir y presupuestar los requisitos financieros y de personal para poder realizarlas. A pesar del progreso enorme e inesperado durante la última década, la CONANP todavía no tiene suficiente orientación sobre el porvenir del SINAP para presupuestar sus necesidades financieras y de personal. Durante la evaluación del proyecto de la UE, los evaluadores facilitaron un pequeño programa para presupuestar todas las necesidades financieras y de personal de un ANP que fortalece el proceso de los POA en donde las ANP presupuestan lo mínimo, básico y lo suficiente. **Si se utiliza éste o un programa parecido para todas las ANP, con el que se pueda proyectar las necesidades financieras y de personal totales de la CONANP, esto permitiría encaminar a la CONANP estratégicamente en el proceso político. Los evaluadores aconsejan que se inicie este ejercicio con todos los equipos de manejo de la CONANP. Esto se puede lograr desde las oficinas regionales en grupos pequeños involucrando al director y/o subdirector de cada ANP con su administrador(a) financiero(a) en entrevistas de no más de un día por ANP. Una vez establecido esto, se**

puede incorporar y continuar el proceso en la rutina de los POA. Con base en esto y las visiones de las ANP, se puede empezar un ejercicio presupuestal de 10 años para el SINAP con estimados de requisitos financieros y de personal.

Un problema que observaron los evaluadores es que muy poco personal de las ANP conoce ANP con avanzados programas de manejo en el exterior. Eso es una limitación en su conceptualización de las posibilidades y retos de manejo y el potencial de uso de las ANP. **Se recomienda que se organicen giras a parques y bosques nacionales en la parte occidental de los EEUU para observar como el National Parks Service y el Forest Service de los EEUU manejan grandes cantidades de visitantes, durante la estación pico del verano.** Tales programas, que ya se organizaron una vez en el contexto del MOU entre Canadá, los EEUU y México son muy valiosos para los equipos involucrados en el desarrollo de las visiones de manejo para las ANP mencionadas anteriormente.

2.7 ACERCA DE LA PROMOCION AMPLIA DEL SINAP

Los evaluadores consideran el estilo desarrollado por la DGDIP de buen gusto, moderno y alegre, sin ser exagerado. Acerca del enfoque de la DGDIP, opinan que se debería enfocar más al aumento de la visita del público mexicano a las ANP y a la producción de materiales para el uso del mismo. **Así la DGDIP podría buscar más oportunidades de promoción con museos, escuelas y espacios de alta visita, tales como el aeropuerto, estaciones de buses, etc., informando al público que es posible visitar las ANP con la familia y dónde se puede conseguir más información. En ese sentido la incorporación de la Semana Nacional de la Conservación, que la CONANP estableció a partir del año 2001, en el calendario escolar a partir del año 2005 - 2006 se considera una parte aguas en materia de sensibilización a nivel nacional y uno que podría convertirse en el motor de una cultura de la conservación a nivel nacional. Adicionalmente todos los museos y centros de visitantes en cada ANP debe tener una exposición estandarizada del SINAP con información de cómo y dónde encontrar información sobre los rasgos sobresalientes y los datos logísticos de las ANP incluyendo la distribución de un folleto con el sitio web y la venta de un libro de las ANP de México. La impresión de folletos de visita de las ANP debe estar relacionada con la frecuencia de visitas de tal forma que los cobros de derecho paguen la impresión cada vez que se acaban.**

Con el objetivo de reducir costos, se recomienda que el proyecto compre una instalación completa para producir rótulos y experimentar con la producción en masa de rótulos y señales, experimentando en la búsqueda de métodos más económicos. Una vez descubiertos, se recomienda comprar los equipos necesarios para un taller de impresión de rótulos y señales para cada oficina regional para que se produzcan los materiales interpretativos de campo para cada ANP y contratar un dibujante para cada región exclusivamente encargado de la producción de rótulos y señales. Al inicio es importante que se enfoque en la producción en masa para en pocos años todas las ANP dispongan de material de base – aún a veces con compromisos en cuanto a la calidad. Es más importante al inicio por lo menos tener los materiales básicos y en el transcurso del tiempo se puede mejorar la calidad.

Para ser efectiva en la promoción de la visita a las ANP, la página web de la CONANP necesita un rediseño completo con un mapa nacional y con sus propio vínculos para cada ANP, páginas estandarizadas para todas las ANP (la sub-página de la RBGC es un buen ejemplo) incluso con sus mapas, rutas de transporte, los aeropuertos más cercanos y las líneas aéreas con sus conexiones principales y enlaces para servicios de alquiler carros, etc. Especialmente la publicación en diferentes idiomas es importante, y se puede contemplar inglés, alemán, italiano, francés, japonés, portugués y holandés. Un especialista en páginas web debe revisar las sub-páginas de cada ANP para mejorar su visibilidad en los buscadores del Internet, especialmente en Google.com. Los tamaños de las páginas deben ser menores, preferiblemente en htm (Java-script es mucho más lento) para que las páginas sean accesibles incluso con líneas de teléfono lentas.

La DGDIP acaba de publicar un libro de muchas de las ANP del país que es atractivo y útil, pero por su costo no es replicable. Como instrumento de promoción de visitación se recomienda desarrollar una versión más barata que cubra todas las ANP y venderlo ampliamente con apoyo de una ONG desde todas las librerías, estaciones de gasolina del país y a través de imprentas librerías en el Internet, como Amazon.com, de tal manera que las ventas refinancien ediciones siguientes, incluso su actualización.

2.8 EL COBRO DE DERECHOS Y EL MONITOREO DE LA VISITACIÓN:

En coordinación con Canadá y los EUA la CONANP está preparando un sistema nacional de cobro de derechos para el 2006, con precios diferenciados considerando factores como edad, estudiantes, grupos, habitantes locales, extranjeros, frecuencia de visita, etc. Asimismo la CONANP lanzará a partir de 2006 el “Pasaporte a la Conservación” un pase anual de entrada nacional, una versión similar al “Eagle Pass” de los PPNN de los EEUU con un “kit de sensibilización”. Para niños se puede pensar en un “pasaporte” de Rangers, que proporciona un sello distinto para cada ANP visitada. Los evaluadores consideran esta iniciativa un logro significativo para la promoción de la visitación a las ANP.

En casi todas las ANP, los datos de visitación son incompletos y no están sistematizados. En algunas áreas se monitorea la visitación con base en censos (ejemplo: Cuatrociénegas), lo que produce impresiones del momento. En otras áreas hay información con relación al cobro de derechos, pero eso solamente informa sobre los boletos vendidos, no sobre el total de los visitantes. Por ejemplo, los menores de edad que no pagan no son contados. La visitación es uno de los productos más importantes de un sistema de ANP y es primordial saber con la mayor precisión posible, cuantas personas visitan cada ANP cada año y estar informado sobre las características principales de los visitantes. **Los consultores aconsejan que se desarrolle un sistema de conteo ligado al cobro de derechos que sistemáticamente dé un folleto a cada visitante por categoría distinta, indiscriminadamente si se paga o no, diferenciando entre otras cosas por (Véase la recomendación del año pasado):**

- **Edad (por ejemplo niños hasta 12 años, colegiales, estudiantes académicos, adultos, oficiales, etc.);**
- **Habitante local;**
- **Extranjeros;**
- **Participantes en grupos educativos.**

Si las cantidades de los folletos están bien registradas, se puede llegar a cifras mucho más confiables sobre el grado de visitación y las características de los visitantes. Tales datos permitirían respuestas de manejo y promoción específica por parte de las direcciones.

Especialmente durante los días pico, este sistema debe ser complementado con revisiones periódicas para complementar las cifras con información cualitativa, tal como:

- **Medio de transporte;**
- **Origen de los visitantes;**

- **Edad, composición de grupos (familiares, grupos turísticos o de instituciones de educación, etc.);**
- **Actividades en el ANP;**
- **Grado de satisfacción.**

2.9 ACERCA DEL MONITOREO, EVALUACIÓN Y RESPUESTA INSTITUCIONAL:

Con respecto al monitoreo de especies de preocupación especial, los evaluadores observaron que existe una interesante y creciente lista de especies que están siendo monitoreadas entre la DES y el CC. Sin embargo, en cada ANP, los métodos de colecta de datos varían grandemente en términos de rigor científico y consistencia en el tiempo. **Las mejores prácticas deberían ser identificadas y compartidas para optimizar los protocolos de monitoreo y promover un mejor compromiso con la labor de monitoreo en todas las ANP. Los guardaparques de cada ANP deben estar altamente involucrados en esta actividad a fin de desarrollar sus capacidades de observación y de análisis** (Véase Vreugdenhil et. al. 2003).

Los evaluadores señalaron una aparente deficiencia del ciclo completo del proceso ‘monitoreo, evaluación y respuesta institucional’. Un ejemplo podría ser el monitoreo del pavón (*Oreophasis derbianus*), una especie en peligro de extinción en la Reserva El Triunfo. Después de dos años de monitoreo, el número de observaciones disminuyó a un nivel de 20%. El estar alerta a fluctuaciones bruscas en los datos debe ser una actividad institucionalizada a fin de detonar una alarma inmediata. Una disminución de esta naturaleza debería haber generado una respuesta documentada que podría incluir:

- La verificación de la consistencia en el protocolo;
- La contratación de un estudio de emergencia del estado de la población actual y la causa potencial de su descenso;
- Un plan de acción para ser implementado basado en el estudio.

Los evaluadores recomiendan que se aumente el proceso M&E con un tercer paso a “monitoreo, evaluación y respuesta institucional” de tal forma que la CONANP pueda responder debidamente a la anomalía señalada por el sistema de “ME&RI”.

Los evaluadores recomiendan que se facilite a cada área protegida del proyecto, a cada región involucrada y a la oficina del SIG nacional, las licencias de un programa de SIG de muy bajo costo y muy amigable que combine raster y vector – preferiblemente ILWIS – y un curso de su aplicación. El curso debería ser de forma integrada de tal forma que combine el entrenamiento en monitoreo, uso de planeación y que los integrantes del curso preparen el mapa de ecosistemas de su propia ANP y aprendan a hacer sus propios relieves en parcelas permanentes de monitoreo y de caracterización. El curso debería idóneamente también ser acorde a la metodología en desarrollo por la IABIN.

Dados los compromisos del DES y del CC, los evaluadores recomiendan que se institucionalice una armonización integral tanto por rutina como por tema. Se sugiere

que las unidades desarrollen una rutina de colaboración que involucre reuniones trimestrales y de información mutua a través de copias de correos electrónicos sobre toda la comunicación relacionada al monitoreo. Temas a elaborar incluyen:

- Un análisis de diferencias metodológicas y de datos del monitoreo biológico entre el SIMEC y el programa de monitoreo del FANP;
- Con la base en el análisis mencionado elaborar un programa de armonización máxima de (i) la metodología, de (ii) datos y de su recolecta y (iii) reporte de acuerdo a las necesidades de la CONANP sin descuidar en casos que se requiera algo adicional en las ANP del proyecto;
- Identificar los elementos que no pueden ser armonizados y acordar la modalidad de recolecta y reporte;
- Colaboración en el mejoramiento metodológico y recolecta de datos confiables;
- Capacitación del personal en obtención de datos.

Actualmente el InterAmerican Biological Network (IABIN) está empezando un proyecto de armonización de información biológica, ejecutado por la Organización de los Estados Americanos (OEA) y financiado por el GEF. Seis institutos coordinan temas distintos para el hemisferio americano, de los cuales los temas “Áreas Protegidas” y “Ecosistemas” son los más relevantes en el contexto de M&E. **Por el desarrollo conceptual de estos temas, se recomienda que tanto la DES como el CC participen en este esfuerzo para compartir las valiosas experiencias de México y para que CONANP y FANP se beneficien y contribuyan al diálogo hemisférico de alto nivel. Un buen número de las preguntas clave será tratado y habrá la oportunidad de presentar temas de su propio interés y preocupación.** Al colaborar conjuntamente en el proyecto IABIN, la DES y el CC desarrollarán métodos nuevos de forma coordinada.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In agreement on the donation contract TF050311 between the Government of Mexico (GoM), NAFIN, Fondo Mexicano para la Conservación de la Naturaleza (FMCN) and the World Bank, the GEF project “*Consolidation of the Protected Areas System, TF050311*” (SINAP-2) has been subject to an independent midterm evaluation. This evaluation had the following objectives:

- To analyze the achievements of the project through performance indicators and the relationship between the activities and the project objectives, both from a financial as a technical perspective, as reflected in the logical framework (See project document PAD, Annex 1);
- To identify lessons learned both for the benefit of the second phase and for other GEF projects;
- To outline recommendations for the final phase of the project.

The project has been evaluated by an evaluation team consisting of Dr. Ir. Daan Vreugdenhil and Sergio Graf, MSc. The present executive summary presents all the recommendations at project level in an organized fashion to facilitate their follow-up. With just 11 years of existence, the National Commission on Protected Areas (CONANP, previously the “Coordination Unit for Protected Areas, UCANP), the Mexican institution in charge of managing protected areas in Mexico, is one of the most recently created protected areas agencies in the world. Nevertheless, during this rather short period of time, the country has succeeded with a conservation programme that has been equalled by very few other developing countries in the world. The evaluators congratulate the GoM with its impressive progress in the field of conservation under the leadership of CONANP and in close collaboration with the rural communities that own the majority of the land in many PAs a variety of NGOs academic institutions and other representatives of civil society. The executive summary has been organised in the following chapters:

- 1) Lessons learned and main conclusions;
- 2) Specific observations and conclusions.

The recommendations for the individual PAs are presented at the end the chapters on each individual PA.

1. LESSONS LEARNED AND MAIN CONCLUSIONS

After careful consideration, the evaluators have come to the conclusion, that the SINAP-2 Project is a necessary and timely support from GEF/World Bank funding as it forges public-private partnerships in the sector of biodiversity conservation.

For the GoM, the conservation of nature in protected areas is a new sector that was initiated seriously less than 15 years ago, and only in the last decade a network of protected Areas was identified and their protection set as a priority at the Federal level. In spite of a period of

austerity the GoM assigned 663 federal staff to manage its growing System of Protected Areas. However, it is obvious that in spite of their dedication, these federal conservation workers face an enormous challenge by having to conserve the ecosystems and biodiversity of the enormous areas entrusted in their care.

The evaluators studied the 5 protected Areas subject to evaluation under this project. However, they also took into account their experience elsewhere in the National Protected Areas System (SINAP) accumulated from other missions during which they studied another 14 PAs over the last decade. The evaluators met and interviewed the men and women of the management teams, and without exception, their dedication and passion to their work were exemplary for the Mexican civil service.

Until the beginning of the nineties, the GoM and the World Bank explored ways in which the Global Environment Facility (GEF) could help the GoM financially to achieve its conservation objectives. In March of 1992, this dialogue culminated with the approval of 25 million dollars from GEF for the Programme of Protected Areas of Mexico.

At the end of 1992, the responsible agency of implementing the project for the PAs, the Secretary of Urban Development and Ecology, was reorganized, to be replaced by two dependences, one of them the National Institute for Ecology (INE), which became responsible for SINAP. In this context the GoM decided to focus its attention on 25 high-priority PA that would be supported by the GEF funds, which in the end was adjusted to ten PAs and 20 million dollars.

In 1994 the Department of the environment, Natural Resources and Fisheries (SEMARNAP) was created. The INE was placed under the jurisdiction of this department and supervision and management of the SINAP was assigned to UCANP. Due to slow execution of the projects with GEF funds, the GoM and the World Bank agreed to contract an independent analysis of the project performance in 1995. This analysis identified several potential solutions.

Simultaneously, the GoM took measures to improve the financial, operational and political framework of the SINAP. As part of this new strategy, the National Council for Protected Natural Areas (CONAP, consisting of representatives of conservation organizations, the academic community, the commercial sector, the social sector and indigenous communities). The CONAP began its activities in April of 1996 as advisory body on protected areas to the GoM. During the same period, the 1995-2000 Programme for the Protected Natural Areas was formulated.

In 1996, CONAP approved the proposal to create a Fund for Protected Natural Areas (FANP) within the Mexican Fund for Nature Conservation (FMCN).

In the year 2000, SEMARNAP (presently called SEMARNAT) created CONANP, thus elevating the government institution responsible for the conservation of the critical habitats of

the country from a unit within INE, to a deconcentrated entity directly dependent on SEMARNAP

The number and extension of the federal PAs of Mexico has increased significantly, both in area under protection and in number. In the 1991, the country had 81 PAs with an extension of 8.8 million hectares. By the end of the year 2000, 127 areas were declared accumulating a total of 17.05 million hectares, which in 2005 increased to 154 PAs with a total area of 18.7 million hectares.

As for the PAs listed under the convention of wetlands of international importance (RAMSAR), the number increased from 7 in 2001 to 58 in 2005 which places Mexico at the third place of countries with listed wetlands and fifth in terms of extension under this category of international recognition.

From their creation and to date there has been an institutional evolution that is reflected in organizational structure with the creation of the Directorate for Monitoring and Evaluation and the General Directorate for Conservation for Development.

The institutional development is not only reflected by the creation and institutionalisation of PAs, but also in organizational developments. To address the challenge created by the shortage of staff allocation, which limits the possibilities to recruit additional staff, CONANP was restructured into regions that had as its objective to improve the attention to the PAs. This has implied a reassignment of finances and functions by redirecting them to direct conservation tasks, while the central administration was downsized.

The regions are: Northwest, Northeast, West, Centre and Gulf, South Pacific, Southern Frontier and the Yucatan Peninsula. This model of seven regional offices for the entire country assumes that the regional and central offices deal with tasks related to knowledge, culture and management. While the Regional Directorates address common needs of the PAs of the region, the Directions of the PAs focus on protection, management and restoration of the PAs. The headquarters can concentrate attention of several PAs in one person, thus increasing its efficiency to carry out specialized tasks or supporting situations where there is not enough personal. This deconcentrated modus operandi allows a greater administrative agility and facilitates more effective cooperation between CONANP and local NGOs.

To assist their tasks, CONANP has 663 staff that is hired through a variety of contractual modalities and projects (regular positions, contracts and consultancy services).

The tasks of CONANP are financed by different financial sources that include fiscal budget, GEF projects (projects “Three ecoregiones”, “Sierra Gorda”, “SINAP-2”), and contributions from other sectors such as Mexican Petroleum and the Federal Commission for Electricity.

During the period 2002 - 2004, the federal budget of CONANP increased from 249.4 million pesos to 406.1, a growth of 61%. The collection of entry fees is becoming a financial source of growing importance. By means of this mechanism CONANP has collected 75.6 million

pesos between 2002 and 2004. During the first year CONANP collected 10.5 millions and in 2004, two years later, 39.5 millions, what represents an increase of almost 400%. These fees were collected in different regions and return for re-investment into the regions that generated their recollection.

The main programs of the conservation strategy for sustainable development of CONANP, the Regional Program for Sustainable Development (PRODERS) and the Program for Temporary Employment (PET), 2000 have grown from the year 2000 to 2004 with about 300%. In the last year 87 million pesos have been spent.

The creation of FANP was an solution to the restriction of the GoM to attend it's basic operational needs in the PAs. When FANP was created during the first GEF project known as SINAP-1, the possibility arose to add field staff to the PAs, thereby responding to some of the direst needs of Mexico's PAs: shortage of field staff.

Today, CONANP and FANP are engaged in a mature private-public partnership, in which each partner carries out functions that complement each other, such as:

- **Operation of protected areas:** CONANP has the mandate for this function;
- **Funds raising and management:** The GoM and governments in general, cannot receive financial contributions and manage endowment funds from private and international donations. Therefore, the GoM endorsed the creation of FANP within the FMCN, which has the trust of the private sector and of bi- and multilateral agencies. On the other hand, the GoM successfully handles sink funds from donations from bi- and multilateral grants;
- **To administer the federal budget:** CONANP very successfully administers its assigned federal budget (close to 100%);
- **To provide federal counterpart funding:** A part of FANP funds come from federal counterpart contributions;
- **Hiring of additional field staff:** FANP can finance the hiring of field staff in addition to CONANPS allotment from the Federal Government.

The FMCN and CONANP have consolidated their alliance through FANP as the financial instrument to co-finance the protected areas. Yet, both partners need to work continuously at maintaining this healthy and productive relationship. Money is an important source of potential conflict in any relationship. FANP needs to work continuously at its financial performance and continuously clarify its ministrations in a transparent way. The directors of CONANP must follow attentively the complex financial administrations that take place within FANP for their own benefit. Only then can frictions and misunderstandings over money be avoided. Together, CONANP and FANP must show the private sector, and specifically the Mexican public, the benefits of the protected areas in their care, that they manage them well for the enjoyment and well being of all Mexicans.

The evaluators wish to express their concerns about the total staffing need of SINAP. FANP can contribute significantly to the conservation of protected areas by complementing staffing

and financial needs of some areas, as well as to the improvement of financial, administrative and monitoring procedures. However, it is unlikely that FANP can ever raise sufficient money to adequately solve the overall staffing needs of SINAP. FANP is but partial solution of the GoM, which is a shortage of permanent positions for federal staff.

Considering:

- 1) Importance of the protected areas for the well-being of all the Mexicans;
- 2) Importance of the PAs for the national economy as one of the prime visitation destinations of the country;
- 3) Responsibility Mexico has undertaken as party to the Convention on Biological Diversity; and
- 4) The amount of work at hand,

the GoM cannot expect that it can adequately protect the nation's natural heritage with a corps of 663 federal staff. By signing the Convention on Biological Diversity, Mexico assumed a new responsibility that can't be achieved without significantly increasing the staff for the federal protected areas. **Therefore, it is recommended that the GoM evaluates the real staffing needs and the budget required to manage the federal PAs properly. On the basis of this it can develop a strategy on how to gradually assume the responsibility of managing all the federal Pas properly.**

One way of increasing staff in federal PAs is by collaboration with the states.

The State of Coahuila for instance, supports Cuatrociénegas Nature Reserve, by means of an agreement with staff, equipment and promotion. This form of collaboration between the federation and state can serve as a model for other Pas and thus contribute to solving the problem of staff shortage.

The conditions for nature conservation in Mexico are difficult. Most of the PAs are communal property of local communities, ejidos and small-holders. The members of these communities are among the poorest and least educated in the country, while the conditions of the lands almost without exception are marginal. After all, this is the very reason why nature has persisted in those locations until the present day. Life in Mexico is changing fast, and so are those rural – often ethnic – communities. Many young people are leaving their homelands for the cities and often migrate to other countries. Many villages have begun to show negative growth rates and in some cases people are massively abandoning their ancestral lands. While at first sight, this may seem advantageous to conservation, this is not the case.

In a vacuum of adequate law enforcement in some cases, and land speculation in others, the people with great affinity to the lands have started to become replaced by people without such roots and cultural affiliations. In some cases, this process has become serious, such as in CB Chichinautzin. In other places it is not yet clearly visible, but having noticed the first signs, the evaluators fear that once the process starts, it will be fast, devastating and unstoppable. This problem may not only arise in the PAs, but in many poverty stricken communities and ejidos, and particularly in mountainous and otherwise scenic locations that are attractive for the construction of medium class residential and recreational developments. If the observation of the evaluators is correct, the abandonment of communities and ejidos may become a problem of national magnitude, affecting many of the traditional communities of the PAs and

put the objectives of the project on the PAs subject to this evaluation and many other federal PAs.

While being assigned the task of evaluating this very complex and input-rich project, the evaluators have not been able to spend enough time to study the problem of emigration in sufficient detail to suggest well-elaborated solutions to this newly arisen challenge, that had not yet been identified during the design of the project. They can merely express their concern that the phenomenon of emigration by the local communities away from the protected areas, threatens to undermine the accomplishments of the otherwise very successful SINAP-1 and 2 projects. While hoping that their observations are premature or even in error, they feel the necessity that in its second phase, SINAP-2 analyses the emigration process, assesses the extent of its potential consequences and proposes avenues of solution.

While some of the elements of the project have not been finished yet for the obvious reason that the project is only half way its execution, the evaluators like to congratulate all the players in this project with the progress booked: CONANP, FANP, CC, UCP, the management teams of the PAs, the NGOs collaborating with CONANP in the managing the PAs and last but not least, the local communities that work so hard to protect their ancestral lands for their children and in fact for all Mexicans. The progress booked so far, is obviously the result of unusual dedication and the esprit de corps that characterises the conservation workers of Mexico. The evaluators are confident that the second phase will be executed with the same degree of dedication and success as the first phase and they wish all the players the strength they will need in their often difficult but gratifying tasks.

The GoM has chosen Nacional Financiera as its financial agency for its efficient payment procedures. However, since 2002, the Manual for Budgetary Norms has changed the disbursement mechanisms and since then, the executors need the authorisation under the Administrative Agreements from the Secretaría de Hacienda y Crédito Público (SHCP). The requests for grant disbursements have to be sent to the SHCP via the Federal Treasury. These new conditions changed the financial scheme originally worked out by CONANP during the grant negotiations, and have resulted in a decrease in efficiency of the administrative procedures. Nevertheless, the new procedures continue to be operational and no changes are required for the second phase of the project.

At the end of the valuation mission, the evaluators came to the conclusion that the project is functioning well. As the project is only in its third year of execution, one should take into account that its impact on conservation and sustainable resources use are only measurable in the long term. Under this reservation, the evaluators concluded that:

1. All instruments are operational;
2. All the agreed instruments to reach the objectives of the project are in the process of being carried out;
3. The objectives correspond to the mandates of the institutions involved; and
4. The project execution is satisfactory.

Specific conclusions and recommendations are presented in the following chapter.

2. SPECIFIC CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 ABOUT THE EFFICIENCY AND MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS OF FANP:

With regard to the project efficiency, the evaluators have taken a good look at the management costs of the endowment funds. The project document of SINAP-2 between the World Bank, the GoM and FMCN stipulates the following percentages over the interests to operate FANP:

- 12 percent to cover financial management costs, channelling of the interests to the Pas, supervision of the application of the interests and procurement by the FMCN;
- 8 percent, to cover expenses of financial administration and the contracting of the Annual Plans of Operation (POAs) of the PAs made by the non-government organisations (NGOs);
- 6.5 percent for coordination between CONANP and FANP, and for the supervision and technical monitoring of financed activities (only over the proceeds of US \$16.5 millions of SINAP-1).

Although the FMCN has negotiated a financial management fee of 12%, it only charges real management costs, such as staff salaries, office costs and other operational costs. Currently, these costs are around 9.6%, the remaining 2.4% is returned to the proceeds of the endowment funds.

The administration costs for hiring PA staff has been budgeted originally at 8%, but as these contracts are given out by public bidding, they currently are around 6.5%. At first sight, these expenses seem mere administrative losses. But this is far from being the case. Through this mechanism, FANP strengthens financial and administrative procedures in NGOs that support the PAs at the local level, in a variety of ways. These management fees allow these NGOs to contract a good financial administrator, and therefore this expense is an important contribution to their institutional strength. Further, this mechanism strengthens the public / private partnership on which the management of the PAs depends and thereby it strengthens the work of CONANP through the NGOs. It could be argued that a part of this administration cost, in fact is an added value to the PA conservation effort financed by the FANP.

On the costs of the Central Coordination Unit, (CC), it should be emphasised that the percentage paid for the operations of the CC only apply to the endowment funds of the SINAP-1, while the CC coordinates all the PAs that benefit from FANP. When considering that, the real coordination costs are just over 2% over the total of the annual proceeds of FANP. Additionally, annual courses are financed out of this amount; these, in fact are not costs, but expenses for the objective of which FANP was created and the expenses of these courses should be deduced from the management costs.

Thus, what at first sight, seem management fees of 26.5% over the proceeds of the endowment funds, in reality are only 9.6% of real management costs, while 8.5% are primarily expenses on productive activities for which FANP has been created.

As the total value of the endowment of FANP grew, generating a considerable economy of scale, the Investment Committee of FMCN became more directly involved in the investment management together with an independent national advisor. As a result, the investment management costs have gone down to about 0.2% of the capital. Given the fact that the international rate for fund management is about 1% over the investment, from a financial management point of view, this figure should be considered extremely low, and with a current yield of around 9.5%, the FMCN should be considered an efficient funds manager.

The tasks of the CC have been modified continuously as the financial resources to be channelled to the PAs increased. In a constant re-engineering, of its main functions training, monitoring, evaluation and verification of appropriate use of financial resources, it now focuses primarily on the last two tasks, as the teams of the PAs are gathering strength. This allowed it to attend 20 PAs with the same number of staff (two) as in the beginning of SINAP-1 with only 10 PAs. It is expected that this constant adjustment will continue with further economy of scale, as well as to grow into new strategic functions of this central unit in service of the public and private sector. With a broad insight in both institutions, the CC is in a privileged position to bring together projects of both institutions, to generate synergies and to facilitate further fundraising.

To improve transparency and simplicity, the evaluators recommend that FMCN renegotiates the operation of the CC as a general percentage on the proceeds over all the endowment funds managed by FANP. That would allow the CC to grow proportionately with the growth of the PAs supported by FANP. It is also recommended that any reduction in the costs of the CC be made available to finance training courses and other services benefiting multiple PAs.

The evaluation team has carefully examined the disbursement cycle. It has concluded that, although the process is detailed and complicated, and, at first sight seemingly somewhat bureaucratic, it is an exercise well worth the effort, given the following considerations:

- The disciplined time-phased routine allows punctual disbursements at the beginning of the year for all complying PAs;
- The procedures that have been developed have resulted in the institutionalisation of an efficient cycle of applications, disbursements and the planning of the PA finances, which has had a very positive impact on the qualifying PAs;
- The available financing is being spent⁵, while over-expenditure is avoided;
- The managerial teams define and prioritize their financial needs and they present them in a standardized and efficient fashion to the central offices, both of CONANP and FANP;
- When receiving their financial allocations of both FANP and CONANP, the PA management teams that benefit from the project can plan their actions better during the whole year and as a result, work more efficiently;

⁵ An important problem in public administrations is that funds are not always spent during the fiscal year, after which it loses its availability. The mechanism of the POAs provide clear information on the availability of funding and thereby prevents funding from not being spent.

- The routine instigates a consolidated projection of financial needs and the preparation of reports on management challenges and progresses, the impact of staff on the state of conservation of the park, etc. and at the same time it serves as a mechanism for quick response to eventual inability to meet goals;
- Through the presentation of minutes of the Advisory Councils of the PAs, participative planning and joint management it is promoted and monitored.

In general, the POA cycle and the training opportunities of the CC contribute significantly to development and permanent renovation from which the entire SINAP is benefiting. In the course of 8 years of development, testing and improvement of the disbursement procedure and fund management, FANP has become a well-oiled machine in support of the qualifying PAs. CONANP, through its PA directions has demonstrated an excellent performance in project cycles, that together with important progress in the planning of fiscal funding in the last few years, has considerably improved the capacity of the PAs involved. **Given these observations, the evaluators recommend to continue with and improve these planning routines and introduce these project cycles in all the PAs.**

FANP is an important institutional memory for periods of administrative transition in the GoM, since its personnel and most of members of the Technical Committee for Protected Areas (CTFANP) are independent of the government and their re-placement procedures and cycles are very different from those of the government. The present document has also been prepared with the upcoming transition in mind and the evaluators always tried to give ample explanation and references for new government officials who may join CONANP in the near future.

Since FANP is the primary financing source to give respite to the eminent needs for field staff, the evaluators recommend that it is used primarily, with a ceiling of 80%, for the financing of field staff and minor but essential expenses - such as telephone and emergencies (e.g. forest fires). While other financing needs, such as for sustainable development projects, although equally important, it should be born in mind that those can also be financed from other sources - especially PRODERS and PET. It is hoped that over time, the GOM would increase the number of staff of the PAs, which would allow more flexibility for using the funds generated by FANP and as it would gradually begin to cover the staffing needs, the proportion dedicated to staff hiring would decrease.

In several PAs, both in some of this project and other ones visited previously, the subject of “graduation” generates unrest among the field teams, both for the uncertainty of their employment status and for the demoralizing effect generated by a feel of abandonment of a support that they consider essential for the conservation objectives.

A new proposal that underwent a participatory process, has recently been approved by CTFANP. This allows that the beneficiaries “graduate” with 1.5 times the resources that FANP disburses and that would be permanent (a part of the “heritage” of a PA) and they would have 10 years to pay for it. The evaluators hope that this new policy will give the peace of mind to staff, that works under very stressful conditions and that deserves all the moral support it can get.

The FANP emergency Fund allows the PAs to respond immediately to emergencies, such as the hiring of fire-fighters for forest fires and natural disasters. FANP has a rapid response procedure that allows it to deposit funds within 24 hours after an application by the director of a PA, usually already within a couple of hours. CONANP has an additional fund with 4 million pesos from CONABIO for emergencies in the PAs and that are used in coordination with funding from FANP. Although this is significant progress, it is not enough for addressing to all the needs. **Therefore, the evaluators recommend that on an experimental base, FANP also includes PAs in its emergency programme that don't fall under the project and that don't qualify under the financing mechanism of CONANP.**

2.2 ABOUT RAISING MATCHING FUNDS:

SINAP-2 involves various conditions on raising matching funds, which are listed with their current state of accomplishment:

- US \$5 million as the first investment (for the SINAP-1): In 2000, FMCN and CONANP have acquired commitments from private donors;
- US \$1.9 million to match the funds required to initiate the project: In 2002 deposits were made by private foundations resulting from fundraising by FMCN;
- US \$7.5 million to match the first deposit of the GEF donation for the SINAP-2: in 2002 SEMANAP deposited US \$2.5 million, while the FMCN raised US \$5 million;
- US \$2.21 million to match the second deposit for SINAP-2: Between 2001 and 2002, US \$0.71 million have been raised by FMCN from private funds, and US \$1.5 millions have been deposited by SEMARNAT;
- US \$6.6 millions to match the third SINAP-2 deposit: US \$5.18 millions mobilized by FMCN and US \$1.42 millions deposited by the SEMARNAT.

In general terms, a total of US \$23.21 millions have been raised to match the amount of GEF funds (US \$28.11 between SINAP-1 and deposits to date for SINAP-2). A total of US \$17.79 million has been raised by FMCN in collaboration with CONANP and US \$5.42 million has been deposited by SEMARNAT. Pending commitments include US \$0.1 million on behalf of the FMCN, US \$3 million on behalf of the SEMARNAT, and US\$3 million by CONANP. FMCN has the commitment in writing of a donor, that will deposit US \$0.2 millions in the beginning of 2006.

FANP has become the biggest funds in the world for protected areas for a developing country. Their resources have more than tripled over the last eight years. It has proven that it can raise funds and then administer them efficiently, while always conserving the endowment capital. This has given it worldwide prestige and credibility. As it increased the total amount of its endowment, its proportionate administrative costs have decreased and continue to do so. Also, FANP credibility is an essential factor in fundraising. **For these reasons, the evaluators feel that it would be ill-advised for CONANP to engage another fund management institution to manage the remaining GEF endowment and/or matching funding.**

According to a legislative disposition published in 2004, in Mexico, “fideicomisos” in which public officials participate, cannot receive public funds. The FMCN is not a fideicomiso under Mexican law, but officials of the Federal Government do participate within FMCN, for instance, in CTFANP. It is therefore extremely important that CONANP and FMCN assess the legal situation and take the necessary measures to end the uncertainty on how it will meet the commitment acquired by the Mexican Government to contribute US \$6 million of matching funds. **The evaluators recommend that the Government of Mexico, in their quality of signatory to the agreement, and FMCN, find a solution to comply with its commitment.**

Of the US \$6 million that still need to be matched by the public sector, US \$3 million is a commitment by CONANP and US \$3 millions are the contribution that is still pending from SEMARNAT. For raising the three million dollars by CONANP, a private firm, “Desarrollo Organizacional Sustentable” was hired with expendable grant money from SINAP-2, which suggests as one of its strategies the creation of another trust fund. However, when reviewing the results from this contract, the consultants are concerned that this company doesn't have serious fundraising capacity.

The evaluators are very concerned about the situation, in which CONANP and SEMARNAT encounter major difficulties to live up to their commitments of raising matching funds, considering both the potential limitations of the GoM of making financial contributions to fideicomisos and its dependence on fundraising by a firm without any fundraising track record. **Given the importance of this point, the consultants recommend that the CONANP closely watch the contract with this firm.**

Thus far, FMCN has focused primarily on institutional donors for its fundraising. However, the advantage of raising funds from small donors and youngsters has been undervalued as one would not only generate additional funds, but at the same token, one would build popular support for conservation. **It is recommended that CONANP and FMCN/FANP initiate a joint campaign to raise money from small donors and youngsters, preferably in combination with some sort of membership status and a campaign to visit the PAs.**

In the course of the years, FANP has grown significantly and currently, it manages a good number of accounts of endowments for different PAs. The management of endowments from twelve different donors is complex and it obscures the understanding of the financial management by FANP and the conditions imposed by different donors. Under such conditions it is vital to explain to people not clearly familiar with the donations, how FANP works and which are the conditions for each one of the accounts. Such communication is vital for fundraising and to maintain the trust of CONANP as well as of potential donors. **The evaluators offered specific suggestions on how to improve the presentations and they also recommend giving frequent presentations to stakeholders interested in the results of the programme.**

Regarding the financing programme for field-staff through the mechanism of an endowment fund, the evaluators are of the opinion that the mechanism is very effective and efficient

given the present circumstances. However, they observe that the conservation of PAs is a new task assumed by the GM, which inter alia, comes forth from signing the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). It thus created a sector to comply with the new commitment that can only live up to its task, if it gets sufficient staff. Expecting that one can fulfil the commitment of the CBD with approximately 400 permanent staff of CONANP that is responsible for the effective conservation of more than 18 million hectares, is not realistic. Neither is it realistic to expect that international donors will finance the necessary staff for all the 150 Federal PAs . **To be able to live up to its commitment as part of the CBD, the GM needs to increase the number of permanent staff of CONANP to a level consistent with the conservation task it assumed when signing the CBD.**

2.3 ABOUT THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE “TO PROMOTE SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY OF PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITIES IN THE SELECTED AREAS”:

One of the basic necessities for effective management of PAs is the disposition of field staff that can assume essential tasks, such as the interaction with local communities, other government agencies and NGOs, monitoring, promotion of socio-economic projects, the development of interpretation materials, etc. By financing the permanent hiring of field staff for the selected areas, the project provides a structural bases to meet the objective of establishing socio-economic and environmental sustainability of productive activities.

The project has been designed to focus on sustainable socio-economic development and environmental sustainability. Whether or not this can be achieved, depends on several factors, and it is still very early to assess if the project inputs will achieve those ambitious goals realistically.

The chosen instruments, the micro-projects in support of economic activities (community development programmes, PDC and sustainable development initiatives, IDS) for involving local groups have been developed by local communities through a highly participative process. As such, these projects have generated a significant increase in trust in CONANP’s civil servants. Without this trust, no progress in conservation and environmental sustainability can be made. However, when being selected by the local communities, the projects are not necessarily environmentally or economically sound.

In most of the visited communities, the evaluators perceived appreciation for the support by the PA management teams as well as for the protected status of their lands. They have also big expectations of working with CONANP on the socio-economic development of their communities, while at the same time protecting the biodiversity of their lands. Management conflicts have only been observed in the fishing communities of the RB Alto Golfo de California y Delta del Río Colorado.

The majority of the protected areas of Mexico are rural areas, where the population consists of traditional communities made up by extremely vulnerable small holders and ethnic groups, both economically as socially. The administrations of each PA of CONANP fight not only for

biodiversity conservation needs but also for the strengthening the rights and needs of the local communities. In those isolated regions, the services of all three levels of government (Federation, State and Municipality) are usually very weak or absent, while the communities typically have poorly functioning self-management structures in terms of economic resources, education and basic health services.

The benefits of the interventions of CONANP and the dedication of its officials in these forgotten corners of the country where most of the PAs are located, contribute to the reduction of the poverty and the social strengthening of some of the most vulnerable groups in the country. CONANP doesn't only achieve biodiversity conservation; in the process, it enhances the objectives of the GoM to reduce extreme poverty and to promote gender equity within traditional rural communities where this topic is still incipient. **All these achievements have been observed in each of the project areas as well as in those of the projects of the UE and of SINAP 1.** Those benefits have been recognised by several federal legislators, who have stated publicly: "CONANP to be one of the most appreciated and best-known institutions of the Federation"

One of the elements with better potential to create economic incentives for conservation in the PAs of this evaluation, is related to environmental services that ecosystems can provide. Particularly the APFF Biological Corridor Chichinautzin has an enormous potential for generating a local compensation mechanism to pay for environmental water services that for the neighbouring cities. On the other hand, this topic facilitates the synergy with other institutions at the three levels of government and it implies in the root causes of degradation of the natural resources. However, there is a considerable disparity in how directions of PAs deal with this matter and in some areas, this topic is not given the importance that deserves and the evaluators recommend that CONANP elaborates a strategy in collaboration with CONAFOR to work with these mechanisms in all mountainous PAs in the country. Among other things, one may contemplate the promotion of economic and/or incentives or district attorneys to stimulate the sustainable use of natural resources in the PAs and their surrounding areas, as well as mechanisms to raise funds locally.

The projects that were selected or are in preparation are still in an initial face (see Annex 6.6). Although it is still early to reach final conclusions, the evaluators are not convinced that these projects always:

- Contribute to the conservation;
- Are socially and technically sound;
- Are sustainable; and/or
- Are economically feasible.

However, to win the trust of the local people it is very important to begin small projects of their own choice. Once carried out a small investment, the management teams can evaluate them in a participative process with the stakeholder and from there engage in other topics, more focused on conservation of nature and/or better socio-economic returns.

In the field, the evaluators realized that the responsible official's educational background risks influencing too much the nature of the investment programme. For example a forester would

be inclined to promote forest activities, or a veterinarian, to promote cattle raising, while for conservation it might be better to promote other activities, while economically again activities of a different nature would be called for. **The evaluators recommend that the fieldworkers always remain critical of their own work by assessing sustainable use options and that the field teams evaluate those options for micro-project financing in multidisciplinary teams.**

2.4 SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS OF THE THE PAS:

Given what was observed previously, the evaluators consider the investment projects effective but not sufficient in their objective of creating an atmosphere of trust. To maintain the trust, clear rules of the game on the part of all the Government's levels and clear and adequate law enforcement are imperative. The project is working on that through the component "mainstreaming", on which the evaluators conclude that still considerable progress needs to be made, as well as in the advisory councils (CA) of the PAs, that need strengthening.

In several PAs, the lack of enforcement of the environmental laws and those on natural resources protection is an issue of mayor importance as it impedes the containment of processes that lead to the gradual environmental decline in the PAs and the creation of an atmosphere of trust in the government and its actions. When CONANP was created, it was decided to maintain PROFEPA for law enforcement, in order to avoid tensions between the management teams and the local population. However, in several PAs (particularly CB Chichinautzin), PROFEPA doesn't provide adequate support, thus hindering the execution of the objectives for which the PAs were created. **The evaluators feel that it is essential to create the necessary mechanisms for adequate law enforcement within the PAs, as this is one of the primary limiting factors for creating effective governance for PA management. They suggest to strife for effective solutions in close collaboration with PROFEPA, such as assigning PROFEPA staff dedicated exclusively to the PAs.**

CONANP has hired the consultant firm DESOPAC to develop an analysis of the options of incorporating environmental considerations and components in plans, programmes and budgets of five of the Federal Dependences with the greatest weight on PAs: SAGARPA, SEDESOL, SRA, SCT and SSA. This document is an excellent tool for CONANP and the directions of the PAs to identify available public services to address the enormous social challenges faced by the PAs and to promote the reconciliation of the needs of local communities and the conservation of the natural resources.

The evaluators suggest that the information of this document be presented and propagated in a way that allows this information to be readily available in a user-friendly format to the administrations of the PAs, the municipalities, the social organizations and the local communities. This information base should include the operational regulations and request forms of each of the public programmes of the implementing agencies and should be updated regularly.

Under the component “synergy” an principles were signed by the SEMARNAT and CONANP, to create favourable institutional and legal conditions that promote institutional “synergy”; this has resulted in operational agreements with federal, state and municipal offices to deal with specific issues. However, from field analyses, it is evident that at the level of the PAs the institutional synergy, still has a long way to go, even with dependences within the environment sector like CONAFOR and CAN; the situation is even more critical with other sectors like SAGARPA and CONAPESCA. The evaluators suggest that the administrations of the PAs to continuously work at creating and maintaining local platforms where policies and actions that may affect the PAs may be harmonized.

While the collaboration with CONAFOR is satisfactory at the top level with three-monthly meetings, the evaluators suggest to create an institutionalized coordination routine that also involves PROFEPA and CNA, as well as the creation of specific working groups to promote beneficial programmes in PAs like payment for environmental services, (PROCYMAF), forest fires (CONAFOR), inspection and surveillance (PROFEPA), Water Authorities (CNA).

In the case of collaboration with the Federal Government’s other institutions, it is expected that CONANP continues its efforts of creating and maintaining similar mechanisms at the level of Directorates General with the objective to put interdepartmental coordination into practice, as well as develop and create practical instruments for incorporating sustainability mechanisms in the programmes, projects and budgets of SAGARPA, SEDESOL, SRA, SCT and SSA.

The PAs are organised in deconcentrated regions that enjoy a high degree of authority to take decisions. The regional office can bundle certain tasks for several PAs in a single person, thus increasing efficiency in carrying out certain specialised tasks or in dealing with situations where there is not enough staff. This deconcentrated structure allows a considerable agility and an effective alliance between CONANP and local NGOs.

Most PAs are areas where historically a multitude of stakeholders and interests have interacted with different and often conflicting interests. The new decrees on PAs changed the rules of the game, which often changed such interaction, in some cases ending certain conflicts. However, in other cases, new elements of conflict arose, when, without compensation, restrictions on natural resources use were imposed on properties through zoning. In the opinion of the evaluators, it is fundamental that an institutional structure of negotiation and decision-taking be created for each PA that can attend to on a wide spectrum of problems and to resolve conflicts among the members by means of which they can reach decisions satisfactorily.

According to the observations of the evaluators, the current mandates of the CA are not sufficiently broad and they work rather as platforms of consultation and advice than for decision taking. In many cases, the CAs are more a representation of NGOs, research institutions and government dependences, than a effectively organised platform that properly

represents the owners and users of the land. As a result, essential topics, such as sustainable development projects financed by SINAP-2 and other financing sources, are often not dealt with and resolved satisfactorily within the CAs.

To be able to deal adequately with the problems that the management teams face in their PA, the evaluators recommend that the PA Regulation be modified by dealing with the the following elements:

- **Continue the format of the CA exclusively for technical and scientific advice;**
- **Allow flexibility regarding the number of participants in the CAs taking in consideration the functions of each PA;**
- **Create a new platform, which might be coined Management Council, that**
 - **in each PA where ownership is primarily communal or private the majority representation be with the landowners (ejidos, communities and/or small-holders), and**
 - **which would facilitate dialogue and advice in topics of common interest within the PAs;**
- **Depending on the characteristics of each PA, allow the creation of micro-regional management committees in which the land owners – in agreement with the vocation of the PA – take the decisions and not the external stakeholders (NGOs, governmental institutions, and scientists);**

The evaluators recommend that in each PA, the analysis being carried out by IMAC be worked out in more detail and includes proposals on mechanisms for participation, covering at least the issues listed above.

As personnel increases in the PAs, it is important that the directors and sub-directors of the PAs receive basic respectively refreshment training in human resources management in accordance with their human resources management needs.

2.5 ON MIGRATION OF THE LOCAL POPULATION FROM THE PAS AND THE INVASION OF NEAR-CITY ZONES:

For quite some time, the evaluators have been observing significant migration out of several protected areas by local inhabitants. Although this process and their impacts vary per area and per community, the observed migration risks that gradually the ejidatarios and the members of the communities lose their traditional relationship with their lands and begin selling them off and/or that the lands become invaded or purchased by people without traditional roots in the area. This way a PA little by little may lose its relationship with the local community, as the new inhabitants begin to introduce new land-uses, begin deforestation and/or in areas near major cities induce urbanization. It is very probable that in the course of some decades, big parts of several PAs will be transformed, or that the management teams no longer have any way to influence behaviour in large areas within their PA. **The evaluators fear that soon in many parts of PAs areas, biodiversity conservation can no longer be achieved unless minimum preventive mechanisms are applied that can:**

- **Prevent or slow down the traditional population's exodus;**

- **Prevent land acquisition (purchase of lands or the land rights of “ejidatarios”) by people from elsewhere;**
- **Prevent the construction of new urban and production infrastructure in areas with biodiversity conservation management objectives;**
- **Promote monitoring of the population dynamics and landownership of all the PAs;**
- **Initiate an – albeit modest – budget to facilitate the voluntary land purchase by CONANP and NGOs, where local communities decide that they want to sell their lands. This would also be applicable for communities that on their own explicit request express the wish to sell their lands for conservation.**

Further, several regulatory instruments to prevent land-use change exist, such as:

- **Management Programmes for PAs;**
- **Municipal ecological zoning plans;**
- **Zoning and natural resources management plans for communal lands;**
- **Strategic tourism and of public visitation plans.**

The evaluators recommend that the application of each one of these plans be promoted systematically for all the PAs. It is also important, once these plans have been developed and approved, that PROFEPA enforces the law and prevents illegal new residential establishments and constructions.

The evaluators are conscious that it is difficult to effectively deal with this very complex process, and it is not possible to propose well developed generic solutions based on a few weeks mission. Therefore they recommended that CONANP:

- **Initiates an analysis of the situation;**
- **Develops new instruments to face this new tendency (legislation that allows the voluntary purchase of lands as federal property, initial budget, prevention of the sales of communal and ejidal lands);**
- **Promote the maximum application of all the already existing instruments;**
- **Promote law-enforcement where land-acquisitions and constructions are illegal and where communal lands are invaded.**

2.6 ABOUT A LONG TERM VISION FOR SINAP:

There is no clear long-term national management vision for the PAs or SINAP as the natural heritage of all Mexicans. For Lack of funding the strategy of CONANP is preliminary and inadequate in establishing a liaison with the Mexican public, for which a prioritisation is needed of the areas most suitable for establishing a relationship with the public. The public function of SINAP as Mexico’s national heritage of nature and green spaces for the benefit of all the Mexicans could have more attention at the level of the administrations of a number of PAs. That translated in a focus on the benefits of the areas for the local population. Although at the central level CONANP promotes visitation as a primary strategy of outreach and participation, in many PAs visitors are considered “tourists” that bring money instead of Mexican countrymen that are entitled to the access to the PAs and that need to be involved in

their conservation. For a systematic planning of a national vision, one needs a two-tiered approach that combines top down and bottom up analyses to integrate a national vision with local opportunities and challenges. Nevertheless, at a central level, CONANP is developing a strategy for promoting the PAs and involving the public at large.

Experiences in Costa Rica and China show that once the visitation to PAs starts to rise, growth rates may accelerate very rapidly. In Costa Rica, the visitation to their SINAP was duplicated between 1992 and 1994. In China, the growth of the visitation to a recently studied national park⁶ had increased steadily by 13% per year in 90s, to then duplicate every 2.5 years in this century, due to a high growth of:

- the middle class;
- new and renovated highways;
- newly available vacations periods; and
- access of private by cars to the park.

China is investing seriously in the visitation infrastructure of its national parks through government loans for all its national parks with high visitation. Mexico, that has similar conditions to China, is not doing anything to get ready for a high visitation growth, although the indications already show that the market is ready for rapid visitation growth, like can be seen from the visits to the Monarca nature reserve. What Mexico can learn from China, is that at first tourism / visitation develops seemingly lowly, but all of a sudden it can start to grow rapidly, risking to destroying all that is not prepared for the unexpected impact. If CONANP doesn't get ready on time for a quickly growing internal market for visitation to the PAs near the major cities, the visitation inevitably will cause unexpected and potentially unrecoverable damage, both socially and to conservation. Only serious and durable infrastructure can resist such intensive use. This will require considerable investments, that can however be recovered from entry fees.

The evaluators recommend that CONANP develops at least a 10 year vision for SINAP that can serve as the norm for the development of 10 year visions⁷ for each of the PAs, with a focus on the possibilities and risks of how to deal with a rapid visitation growth in the PAs with potential for high visitation growth given their location and the characteristic of their natural resources.

For eventual future projects, the evaluators suggest considering financing visitation infrastructure in some protected areas through loans to experiment with such new financing mechanism.

In each one of the PAs, the evaluators asked if a master plan and/or a long-term vision existed for the PA, which was nowhere the case. They noticed that the management teams generally know the main values of their areas, but they hadn't taken those values as a starting point for

⁶ An article in press on national parks visitation in China by one of the evaluators, has been confidentially shared with CONANP and FANP.

⁷ A longer period is possible as well, but given the fast changing conditions in Mexico, the exercise risks being rather theoretical,

analysing the main problems and opportunities and to prioritize their management actions. As a consequence, the management teams focus primarily on immediately visible problems without working from a vision of where they want to be 10 years from now.

For an efficient management as well as for budget and staff planning, it is essential that each PA has a 10 year vision based on good knowledge of the natural resources and ecosystems of the area. **It is therefore advised that long term management plans be developed for each PA based on an ecosystems map, a biological baseline, a social profile, its relationship to a big urban centre and/or the tourism markets, etc. These plans should be harmonized with the national vision.**

To facilitate an external vision, both for ongoing projects and to generate new ideas, it is recommended that periodic support missions be financed with external consultants with broad experience in many different PAs to evaluate on-going management and to explore new ideas and to come up with ideas for management challenges. This way, the PAs can benefit from a great variety of experiences of other PAs through these consultants, while they can also advance in a systematic review of their conservation impact indicators and their monitoring routines. According to need, it is possible to use such exercises to begin the development of aforementioned visions, depending on the necessities of each PA.

The visions are also essential for defining the tasks to be assumed and budgeting the financial and staffing needs to carry them out. In spite of the enormous and unexpected progress during the last decade, CONANP still doesn't have sufficient direction on the future of SINAP to budget its financial and staffing needs. During their evaluation of the project of the UE, the evaluators facilitated a small programme to budget all the financial and staffing needs of a PA which can strengthen the POA process in which the PAs budget for minimal, basic and satisfactory conditions. **If this or a similar program is used for all the PAs, one can project the total financial staffing and financial needs of CONANP and embed them strategically in the political process. The evaluators advise that such an exercise be initiated with the management teams of all the PAs. This can be done from the regional offices in no more than one day per PA, holding interviews in small groups involving the director and/or sub-director with their financial administrator. Once this has been done, the process can be continued by incorporating it in the POA routine. On the basis of this and the visions of the PAs, one can begin a 10 year rolling budgeting process for the SINAP for its financial and staffing needs.**

A problem that the evaluators observed is that very few staff of the PAs is familiar with advanced management programmes abroad. That is a serious limitation for their conceptualization of the management options and challenges and assessing the use potential of their PA. **It is recommended that some three-weeks tours be organised to some parks and national forests in the western part of the USA to observe how the USA National Parks Service and Forest Service manage large quantities of visitors during the peak season in the summer.** Once such study tour has already been organised in the context of the MOU between Canada, the USA and Mexico. Excursions of this nature are particularly useful for teams that work on the development of the PA management visions mentioned previously.

2.7 ABOUT A BROAD CAMPAIGN TO PROMOTE SINAP:

The evaluators found the house style developed by DGDIP very tasteful; they perceived it as pleasant for they eye, modern and joyous, without being exaggerated. With regard to the focus of the DGDIP, they felt that it should focus more on promoting SINAP to the Mexican public at large and target the production of its materials to that purpose. **The DGDIP could look for more promotion opportunities with museums, schools and public spaces with high visibility, such as airports, bus stations, etc., where it can inform the public about the possibility to visit the PAs with their families and where one can get more information. The promotion of the National Conservation Week for the school curriculum, introduced by CONANP in 2001, will become part of the school curriculum from 2005 – 2006 onward. This has been a major achievement for promoting conservation at a national level and this might become the motor for developing a national conservation culture. Additionally, all the museums and visitors' centres in each PA should have a standardized exhibition on the nation's PAs with information on how and where to find information on the highlights and the logistics of the PAs; pamphlet with the website should be available and a book on the PAs of Mexico should be for sale. The printing of pamphlets on PAs should be related to the frequency of visitation in such a way that the entry fees can pay for a new edition each time they are finished.**

To reduce costs, it is recommended that the project buys a complete installation⁸ to produce interpretative signs and experiment with the mass production of signs, and search for the most economic production methods. Once discovered, it is recommended to buy the necessary equipment to outfit each regional office with a workshop to print its own signs for each of its PAs and to hire a designer for each region exclusively in charge of the production of signs. In the beginning it is important to focus on the mass production so that in few years all the PAs have their base interpretation material in the field – even if it at times, one must compromise on quality. It is more important at first to have at least basic materials, while in the course of the years, one can improve the quality.

In order to be useful in the promotion of visitation to the PAs, the CONANP webpage needs a complete re-design with a national map with each PA being “clickable”, with standardized pages for all the PAs (the sub-page of the RBGC it is a good example) including maps, travel routes, nearest airports and flight itineraries of airlines with their main connections and services of car rental, etc. Especially the listing in different languages is important, and the following languages should be considered: English, German, Italian, French, Japanese, Portuguese and Dutch. A specialist in web pages should review the sub-pages of each of the PAs to improve their visibility in Google.com. The file-sizes of the pages should be small, preferably in htm (Java Script is much slower) so that the pages can also be viewed with slow telephone lines.

⁸ Including a 36 inch plotter, different kinds of paper on the roll, design programmes, etc.

The DGDIP has just published a nice looking and useful book on many the PAs of SINAP, but due to its design, the reprinting costs are inhibitative. It is recommendable to develop a cheaper version dealing with all PAs and to sell it through the intervention of an ONG from the bookstores and gas stations of the country as well as popular web-based bookstores, like Amazon.com, in such a way that the sales revenues refinance the next editions, including its updating.

2.8 ON THE COLLECTION OF ENTRY FEES AND VISITATION MONITORING: In coordination with Canada and the USA, CONANP is currently preparing national system to charge entry fees to become effective in 2006 with a differentiated pricing considering factors as age, student status, groups, local inhabitants, foreigners, visit frequency, etc. As part of this from 2006 onward, CONANP is introducing the “Conservation Passport”, an annual entry pass similar to the Golden Eagles pass for National Parks in the USA together with a conservation promotion kit. Fro children, one can think of a “Rangers passport” that gives out a different stamp or sticker for each area visited. The evaluators consider this initiative a major success for promoting visitation to the PAs.

In almost all the PAs, visitation data are incomplete and essential data are not being collected systematically. In some areas visitation data are collected on the basis of sampling (example: Cuatrociénegas), which produces momentary impressions. In other areas there is information based on ticket sales, but that only informs one on tickets sold, not on the total number of visitors and their basic characteristics. For example, children that don't pay are not counted. Visitation is one of the most important products of a PA system and it is crucial to know with the greatest possible detail how many people visit each PA every year and to be informed on the main characteristics of the visitors. **The consultants advise that a counting system be developed to collect entry fees and that systematically gives a pamphlet to each visitor by category, indiscriminately if he/she pays or not, differentiating among other things for:**

- **Age (for example children up to 12 years, schoolboys, academic students, adults, officials, etc.);**
- **Local inhabitant;**
- **Foreigners;**
- **Participants in educational groups.**

If the quantities of the pamphlets are well registered, one can thus obtain much more reliable figures on visitation frequency and the characteristics of the visitors. Such information would allow the specific management and promotion responses by the managers. **Particularly during the peek days, this system should be complemented with periodic revisions to supplement the figures with qualitative information, just as:**

- **Means of transportation;**
- **The visitors' origin;**
- **Age, composition of groups (family, tourist groups or of education institutions, etc.;**

- **Activities in the PAs;**
- **Degree of satisfaction, etc.**

2.9 ON MONITORING, EVALUATION & INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE:

With regard to the monitoring of species of special concern, the evaluators observed that an interesting and growing list of species exists, that is being monitored between the DES and the CC. However, in each PA, the methods of data collection vary largely in terms of scientific rigor and periodic consistency. **Best practices need to be identified and shared to optimize monitoring protocols and to promote a better monitoring commitment in all PAs. The rangers of each PA should be strongly involved in this activity in order to develop their observation and analysis capacities** (See Vreugdenhil et al 2003).

The evaluators pointed out an apparent deficiency in the complete cycle of the process of “monitoring, evaluation and institutional response”. An example could be the monitoring of the pavón (*Oreophasis derbianus*) an endangered species in AP el Triunfo. After two years of monitoring, the number of observations suddenly fell to 80%. Being alert to abrupt data fluctuations should be institutionalized in order to trigger off an immediately alarm. Such decrease should have triggered a documented response answer including:

1. Verification of protocol consistency;
2. Contracting of an emergency assessment of the current population's state and potential cause of its decrease;
3. An action plan to be implemented, based on the study.

The evaluators recommend that the process M&E be expanded with a third step in the routine to ‘monitoring, evaluation and institutional response’ in such a way that CONANP can duly respond to anomalies discovered by the system of “ME&IR”.

The evaluators recommend that each PA of the project as well as the regional and national GIS offices be equipped with licenses of a very low cost and user-friendly GIS programme that combines raster and vector – preferably ILWIS – and that a course be taught in its application. The course should be integrated in such a way that it combines the training in monitoring, protected areas planning and that the members of the course prepare an up-to-date ecosystems map of their own PA and learn how to make their own relevé of a permanent plot. The course should ideally be consistent with the methodology in development for the InterAmerican Biological Network (IABIN).

Given the tasks of both DES and CC, the evaluators recommend that an integral harmonization be institutionalized both by monitoring routine and by theme. It is suggested that the units develop a coordination routine that involves three-monthly meetings and mutual information through email copies of communication related to monitoring.

Themes to elaborate include:

- An analysis of methodological differences in biological monitoring between SIMEC and the monitoring programme of FANP;
- Based on this analysis, the elaboration of a programme to maximise synchronization of (i) methodology, (ii) data and their collection and (iii) reporting in agreement with

the needs of CONANP, without neglecting the cases in which additional information is needed in the PAs for project purposes;

- The identification of elements that cannot be harmonized and agree on their specific collection and reporting needs;
- Collaboration in methodological improvement and the collection of reliable data;
- Staff training in data collection.

At the IABIN coordinates a project to harmonize biological information gathering and storage in the Americas, executed by the Organization of American States (OAS) and financed by the GEF. Six Coordination Institutes will coordinate different topics for the American hemisphere, of which the topics “Protected Areas” and “Ecosystems” are the most relevant in the context of M&E. **For the conceptual development of these topics, it is recommended that both DES and CC participate in this effort to share the valuable experiences of Mexico so that CONANP and FANP may benefit from and contribute to this high-level hemispheric dialogue. A good number of the key questions will be dealt with and there will be the opportunity to present topics of interest and concern. When collaborating jointly in the IABIN project, DES and CC will develop new methods in a coordinated way.**

Annex 7. Biological richness of the three protected areas included in the fourth tranche.

Protected area	La Sepultura	El Ocote	Mapimí
Number of vegetation types	10	10	7
Number of identified vascular plant species	407	705	350
Number of identified vertebrate species	406	646	270
Number of threatened species	136	144	6