



**Project “Consolidating Costa Rica’s Marine Protected Areas” (MPAs)**

**PIMS 00078129**

## **FINAL PROJECT ASSESSMENT**

**“Consolidating Costa Rica’s Marine Protected Areas”**

**ATLAS ID 00061616**

**Duration of the Assessment: July 15 to October 15, 2016**

**FINAL REPORT DRAFT**

**Ronny Muñoz                      Kathia González**  
**International Consultant      National Consultant**  
**Team Leader**

**San José, September 30, 2016**

## CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
1. INTRODUCTION	14
1.1. ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES	14
1.2. SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY	14
1.2.1. SCOPE OF THE ASSESSMENT	14
1.2.2. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	14
2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTENT	16
2.1. PROJECT START AND DURATION	16
2.2. PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED THAT THE PROJECT CONSIDERED ADDRESSING	16
2.3. IMMEDIATE AND DEVELOPMENTAL OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT	16
2.4. KEY STAKEHOLDERS IN THE PROJECT	17
2.5. EXPECTED OUTCOMES	17
2.6. BASELINE INDICATORS	17
3. FINDINGS	19
3.1. PROJECT DESIGN	19
3.1.1. ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS FRAMEWORK AND LOGICAL FRAMEWORK MATRIX.	20
3.1.2. EXPECTED PARTICIPATION OF INTEREST GROUPS	21
3.1.3. LESSONS FROM OTHER RELEVANT PROJECTS INTEGRATED IN THE DESIGN OF THE PROJECT.	22
3.1.4. REPLICABILITY APPROACH	22
3.1.5. COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE OF UNDP	23
3.2. PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	23
3.2.1. PROJECT PRESENTED AN ADAPTIVE APPROACH DURING ITS IMPLEMENTATION.	23
3.2.2. LINKS AMONG OTHER PROJECT AND OTHER INTERVENTIONS IN THE AREA ACCORDING TO THE MANAGEMENT METHOD	24
3.2.3. PROJECT FINANCING	25
3.2.4. MONITORING AND EVALUATION	28
3.2.5. UNPD AND THE IMPLEMENTING/EXECUTION COORDINATION PARTNER AND THE OPERATIONAL IMPACT.	28
3.3. PROJECT OUTCOME	29

3.3.1.	OUTCOMES BY COMPONENT	29
3.3.2.	OTHER NON-PLANNED OUTCOMES	39
3.3.3.	RELEVANCE	40
3.3.4.	EFFICIENCY	41
3.3.5.	EFFECTIVENESS	42
3.3.6.	NATIONAL OWNERSHIP	43
3.3.7.	IMPACT	43
3.3.8.	INTEGRATION	45
3.3.9.	SUSTAINABILITY	45
3.3.9.1.	FINANCIAL RESOURCES	45
3.3.9.2.	SOCIAL-POLITICAL:	46
3.3.9.3.	INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND GOVERNANCE	46
3.3.9.4.	ENVIRONMENTAL	47
4.	LESSONS LEARNED	48
5.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS	49
6.	ANEXOS	54

## List of Tables.

Table N° 1: Baseline indicators for the Project

Table N° 2. Financial execution of GEF funding

Table N° 3. Resources provided by the Project's Co-financing

Table N° 4: Actions implemented to strengthen the COLAC fo the Cahuita National Park, Playa Hermosa-Punta Mala National Wildlife Refuge (RNVS PH-PM, for its acronym in Spanish) and the Santa Rosa National Park

Table N° 5. METTs estimate at Cahuita National Park, Santa Rosa National Park and Playa Hermosa-Punta Mala National Wildlife Refuge (RNVS PH-PM).

Table N° 6: Business plan and proposed mechanisms for Pilot MPAs.

Table N° 7: Surveys conducted at Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation.

Table N° 8: Local governance processes developed by the Project at the Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation.

Table N° 9: Project outcomes from the Theory of Change

## Acronyms

<b>ACOPAC</b>	Central Pacific Conservation Area
<b>ACOSA</b>	Osa Conservation Area
<b>ACT</b>	Tempisque Conservation Area
<b>PA</b>	Protected Area
<b>WB</b>	World Bank
<b>CBD</b>	Convention on Biological Diversity
<b>CI</b>	International Conservation
<b>CLAP</b>	Local Council on Protected Areas
<b>COCO</b>	Coordinating Committee for the assistance of the Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation and Marine Spatial Planning
<b>COLAC</b>	Local Council on Conservation Areas
<b>COLAC-RNVS-BC</b>	Local Council for the Barra del Colorado National Wildlife Refuge
<b>COLOPTO</b>	Local Council for the Tortuguero National Park Western Sector
<b>CONAC</b>	National Council on Conservation Areas
<b>CORAC</b>	Regional Council on Conservation Areas
<b>GEF</b>	Global Environment Facility
<b>IDA</b>	Agrarian Development Institute
<b>M &amp; E</b>	Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>MAG</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
<b>MPAs</b>	Marine Protected Areas
<b>METT</b>	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
<b>MIDEPLAN</b>	Ministry of Planning
<b>MINAE</b>	Ministry of Environment, Energy and Telecommunications
<b>NGO</b>	Non-governmental Organization
<b>PDF</b>	Project Development Funds
<b>NP</b>	National Park
<b>PNC</b>	Cahuita National Park
<b>PNSR</b>	Santa Rosa National Park
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Program
<b>PRODOC</b>	Project Document

<b>PIR</b>	Project Implementation Review
<b>NWR</b>	Wildlife Refuge
<b>SAP</b>	Protected Areas System
<b>SINAC</b>	National System of Conservation Areas
<b>SICOs</b>	Sites of Conservation
<b>UCR</b>	University of Costa Rica
<b>PMU</b>	Project Management Unit

## Executive Summary

<b>Project title:</b> “Consolidating Costa Rica’s Marine Protected Areas”				
GEF Identification:	3956		<i>At the time of approval (Millions in USD)</i>	<i>Upon completion (Millions in USD)</i>
UNPD Identification:	4529	GEF Funding:	1.212.027	1.139.033.39
Country:	Costa Rica	Forever Costa Rica Program:	11.412.500,00	N/A
Region:	LAC	SINAC:	6.449.000,00	N/A
Interest Area:	Biodiversity	Other:		N/A
Operational Program:	BD-SP2- Marine PA BD-SP1-PA Financing	Total of Co-funding:	17.861.500,00	N/A
Implementing Agency:	National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC)	Total Project Expenditures:	19,073,527	N/A
Other Partners involved:	-	Signing of the Project document (Project start date):		01/09/2011
		End date (Operational):	Budget: 01/09/2016	Actual: N/A

## Project Description

The project, “Consolidating Costa Rica’s Marine Protected Areas”, implemented by the Government of Costa Rica, through the Ministry of Environment and the National System of Conservation Areas, developed in collaboration with the Global Environment Facility (GEF), through the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), had as an objective “to consolidate the protected marine areas of the National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC). Three key expected results were: a) strengthening the institutional framework and improve the individual capacity to effectively manage the MPAs, b) increase and diversify the funding for the protected marine areas, and c) widen the coverage of the MPAs to improve ecological representativeness.

**Performance Evaluation  
 Rating Table**

<b>PROJECT PERFORMANCE RATING (SS)</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation (SS)</b>	<b>Ranking</b>	<b>2. Execution of the IA and EA (SS)</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Starting design of the M&E	S	Quality of the application by UNDP	VS
Execution of the M&E Plan	VS	Execution quality: executing entity	VS
Overall quality of the M&E	VS	Overall quality of application and execution	VS
<b>3. Outcome Assessment (SS)</b>	<b>Ranking</b>	<b>4. Sustainability (SP)</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Relevance	R	Financial resources:	SP
Effectiveness	S	Socio-political:	SP
Efficiency	VS	Institutional framework and governance:	SP
Overall rating of the Project outcomes	VS	Environmental:	SI
		Overall sustainable probability:	SP

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

### CONCLUSIONS

1. The design is satisfactory, presenting logical links among the expected outcomes and the Project design, the Project strategy and the components correspond to the challenges and threats, election of international partners, and locally satisfactory, organized systematic structure; assumptions or risks associated to the relevance of the project in general terms, which despite having some shortcomings through its adaptive implementation and execution, allowed to strategically lead the project to achieve the results.
2. Highly satisfactory results we obtained, which represent an important bases for the contribution of the project to improve **SINAC** institutional and operational capacities for an improved approach aimed at more effective management and conservation of MPAs. Through different technologies and tools developed for the project, SINAC's capacities were strengthened for better management of the financial gap of the MPAs and financial sustainability of the country's Protected Areas System. There was also remarkable progress in governance to achieve greater ecological representation in the MPAs, however, new or expanded MPAs were not established within the project framework due to changes in national policies which was an aspect that the project could not control.
3. The Project was relevant (R), considering **UNDP's GEF** policies, policies, needs and national goals, specifically in the consolidation of the MPAs and the resolution of barriers for the management of the sites of conservation importance.
4. The level of efficiency was very satisfactory (VS). It surpassed governance issues, they took advantage of synergies with other initiatives to utilize resources efficiently and where managed to obtain results. It had an adaptive management with the goal of surpassing the weakness of the original design and the limiting conditions of the context, in order to meet the needs of the MPAs. The management and financial control systems and the execution tools and financial verification were adequate. The PIR were precise and accurate and responded to the requirements. The framework was used and action plans and annual budgets were developed. Appropriate monitoring for the execution and verification of outcome quality was provided.
5. Effectiveness was satisfactory (S), it was effective in reaching the outcomes, including reaching other outcomes that were not expected without requiring additional resources. Risk and assumption management was addressed with great capacity. NGOs, the private sector and other donors maintained and/or improved investment and support to the MPAs. Mitigation strategies developed resulted appropriate and effective in overcoming contingencies.

6. The probability that the Project outcomes will contribute to the expected impact of the consolidation of the Marine Protected Areas of Costa Rica is very high, on the understanding that from the results and initial effects achieved so far are implemented and maintained by the National System of Conservation Areas (**SINAC**).
7. In the present context the sustainability of the Project results in financial, social-political, institutional framework and governance issues, represent moderate risks, therefore it is valued as somewhat probable. Hence, sustainability in "Environmental" terms, which is valued as "Somewhat Improbable", given that without the declaration of creation or extension of the new MPAs, conservation of the importance or empty sites identified by **GRUAS II** cannot be guaranteed.

## RECOMENDATIONS

1. Future project designs should contemplate the identified positive elements, and strengthen the adaptive management. Also, reflect and strengthen further in the actual capacity of the project to influence the achievement of results, the time and resources required to obtain them, as well as the relevance and quality of indicators.
2. The establishment or expansion of new MPAs within the framework of the sites of conservation importance (conservation gaps identified by *Gruas II*), turns out to be the immediate priority within **MINAE** future actions. In this case, the support by political authorities will be fundamental to achieve the processes and resources necessary. For **SINAC**, it will be important to keep the linking mechanisms among actors and the articulation of the necessary resources to achieve it. The CA and the PA must manage actions to maintain links and basic activities with the existing participating entities at a regional and local level.
3. From the results obtained, various processes were established and various technologies and tools were developed; also new needs were generated. These elements should be resumed and linked to the planning tools of **SINAC**, CA and the MPAs.
4. Given that the execution consumed the project's resources and future results maintenance actions should be conducted, as well as continuity activities in the new scenario where there are high value outcomes, **SINAC** and other partners linked to the consolidation of the MPAs should establish a five-year plan that financially supports the Coordinating Committee's follow-up tasks of supporting the Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation and Marine Spatial Planning (**COCO**) and future actions.

5. Effectiveness shall be maintained in the following activities carried out in the MPAs. The challenges facing efforts require efficient and effective participation of communities
6. To achieve the desired Project impact on the consolidation of the Marine Protected Areas of Costa Rica, the following direct actions should be carried out, to facilitate the implementation and maintenance of results and initial effects achieved so far:

**The Marine Sector Agenda (2016-2021) for the Implementation of the National Ocean Policy Costa Rica (2013-2028). The Viceministry of Water, Oceans, Coasts and Wetlands, of the MINAE, must:**

1. Efficiently seek that the International Cooperation Agreements binding to the thematic; both at a national and international level, enable direct actions implemented in the short and medium term strengthen national capacities to achieve the anticipated impacts of the project.
2. Strategically manage regional efforts to address marine issues. For example, existing regional programs and projects in the region. This way processes can strengthen and consolidate actions in marine matters related to the expected impacts on MPAs. Thus, strengthening dialogue and exchange, while strengthening skills, policy alignment and harmonization of processes for the sustainability of the MPAs.
3. Analyze planning and governmental implementation programs, creating a tailored program designed to achieve the political goals raised in an organized manner that seek to efficiently and effectively summarize public political strategies. Thus, the Viceministry must establish the action guidelines by which the Public Institutions can articulate and generate impact indicators at a medium-term through technical cooperation, investment and capacity building projects selected for short and medium term. Also, the activities that the project (Barreritas) has generated are presented as profiles that will serve as a base for pre-investment studies.
4. Develop a conceptual and practical methodological approach of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), adequate to meeting the needs of the programs and existing projects, both for the agenda and politics. This requires that it transcends both national and regional levels. This monitoring proposal is intended to be carried out on an annual basis, a systematic review of every executed activity by the Environmental Area within the framework of this Plan. To this end, a brief description (Strategic guidelines, goals, action program and actions) of these sectoral activities is proposed. The aim is that, the description and compilation of all the partially executed activities within this framework, complemented by obtaining data from monitoring indicators offer an approach to a degree of compliance with the objectives and actions of the Plan under public policy.

**The SINAC Executive Secretariat must:**

1. Search for actions and positioning mechanisms to formalize the products generated by the Project in the conservation areas with the possibility of replicating successful experiences in the System.
2. Also, the Secretariat must try to strengthen coordination and control processes, toward and from its allies or collaborators, in active projects seeking efficiency and effectiveness of their long-term results.
3. Support the implementation and effectiveness of a **SPECIALIZED COMMISSION**, internally at **SINAC** on marine issues, among others, by improving data and capacity information management, knowledge, communication and networking at a national and regional level.
4. Strengthen the National Marine Coastal Program together with other links of the Conservation Areas, resuming its importance in the organization structure of the SINAC, as well as supporting more resources to improving the management of Marine Protected Areas.

**The Coordinating Committee for the assistance of the Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation and Marine Spatial Planning called COCO: must:**

1. To promote and articulate a coastal marine support Scientific Committee to SINAC to oversee marine-coastal issues.
2. Implement an Information System to capture and store information on the country's marine-coastal issues that provide sufficient elements to the decision makers. And additionally it is interoperable with other national and regional Systems, both nationally and regionally.

**On SINAC's National Training Program on Ecological Monitoring, must:**

1. Design and implement a social-environmental monitoring system, to regularly evaluate the condition of the marine sites and the social and economic impact from the different management strategies.
2. Following the adoption of the 6 Protocols developed by the Project, its application, replicability at a national level and its continued improvement should be ensured.
3. Based on the project experience developing other standardized protocols for making parameter information to generate comparable and complementary data, to serve for a working synergy between the various governmental and non-governmental

**On the Protocol for the Evaluation and Selection of Diving Sites in Marine Protected Areas of Costa Rica, the SINAC must** institutionalize the protocols provided by project, work on the exchange and dissemination of the information.

**On the proposal for new tariffs and updating of existing tariffs, SINAC** should strengthen capacities and implement a system of management, supervision, control and monitoring.

**On Business Plans and Non-Essential Services (Proposal for Non-Essential Concession Services, such as mechanisms for payment of ecosystem services), SINAC should:**

1. Define a monitoring strategy for the plans and concessions already in place. Rescuing lessons learned to move towards new future and necessary processes.
2. It is important to consider and complement a risks/threat plan of the environment and of external risks. A risk analysis based on organization, financial, legislation and market.
3. Evaluate and adjust its medium-term implementation.

**Regarding the Cooperation Mechanisms between SINAC and INCOPECSA. SINAC should:** systematize the experience on the success of inter-institutional work for capacity building and to narrow the work through synergies and that can serve as an example for other processes.

**On Local Governance Processes at the Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation at Barra del Colorado, Southern Caribbean and Southern Pacific. SINAC should:**

1. Create an adaptive management strategy and action plan to improve the effectiveness and quality of governance over time. Through participation, innovation and access to benefits.
2. Implement participative monitoring programs.

## **LESSONS LEARNED**

1. A design which despite presenting some limitations can allow outcome management strengthened through informal coordinating mechanisms, such as **COCO**, and adaptive management strategies.
2. State policies must be strong and effective in order to ensure that projects are sustained over time and that risks are reduced by encouraging the involvement of stakeholders for a serious and dignified commitment for all the stages of the project.
3. Those projects in which the diagnoses and strategic approaches to the achievement of results are successful and manage to be linked to the conceptual and strategic framework of the national initiatives of the associated entities; the

programmatic proposals maintain, in the final stage, meaning and coherence with **GEF** policies of the **UNDP**, national policies, needs and national goals.

4. In projects with major challenges to face and relatively moderate budget, efficiency is a success factor with much weight for the success of the planned objectives. In this sense, the implementers and executors should insist on the implementation of results-based management models, adapted to governance issues and the needs of MPAs, as well as the use of appropriate management, monitoring and verification tools.
5. It has been interesting to define how effective participation from the Coordination and the Project Management Unit manages to makes its officials assume empowerment and awareness roles from the area to the communities, it is clear that being present from the first stage and providing a leading role to the community was a lesson learned in planning and implementation carried out in the length of the project.
6. The earlier community involvement is with the project and actions in conservation areas, the more clearly and timely the potential impacts will be identified in each of the sectors involved in the project.
7. Projects with a good quality in the design and an excellent quality in the implementation and management, there is a possibility that a high probability will be attained to achieve the expected impacts.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Assessment Objectives

The objective of the assessment was to evaluate the implementation in its final phase of the Project "Consolidating Costa Rica's Marine Protected Areas". Identifying lessons learned, as well as providing recommendations on specific actions to be taken to improve project implementation.

### 1.2. Scope and Methodology

#### 1.2.1. Scope of the Assessment

The **Final Assessment (FA)** was conducted according to **UNDP** and **GEF** policies, guidelines, rules and procedures; its implementation considered: criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. It also considered the evaluation of the following aspects:

- Assessing the extent to which the Project achieved impacts or was progressing towards achieving impacts. It includes verification of the status of ecological systems and the demonstrated progress towards the achievement of these impacts.
- The degree to which the project was integrated with other UNDP priorities. As well as those of SINAC, in the consolidation of Marine Protected Areas.
- The key financial aspects of the Project, including the scope of planned and realized co-financing. In addition to the differences between planned and actual expenses.
- Project performance, compared to the expectations set out in the Project logical framework and results framework.
- Project design versus achievements.

Also, the identification of lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations are included.

#### 1.2.2. Assessment Methodology

The final assessment should have answered the following general evaluation question.

**How did the Project contribute to the consolidation of the Marine Protected areas of Costa Rica?**

This question was a guideline for obtaining answers to the questions included in the evaluation matrix included in the Annex to the terms of reference (**See Annex No. 6**).

The evaluation included the historical analysis and the design and logical framework of the Project and the consistency between the project document and the documented results of the project; and Content Analysis of documents.

Field research, which included visits to project areas and interviews with key stakeholders for evaluation, in the Guanacaste, Central Pacific, Osa, Tortuguero and Amistad Caribbean Conservation Areas allowed, through individual and group interviews, To verify the visions of the various actors (community, public officials and civil society) involved in the development of the Project.

The performance evaluation was performed considering the **GEF** and **UNDP** criteria for this type of project, as well as the project performance rating table and the use of the scales described in TdRs.

The impact analysis, developed through the RoTI<sup>1</sup> method, considered the estimation of the degree to which the project achieved impacts or contributed to the achievement of impacts. This included the development of a detailed theory of changes from direct effects to impacts.

The analysis of integrality, analyzed the project with other **SINAC** and **UNDP** priorities, based on a comparative analysis based on implementation and results obtained, with national policies and priorities.

The analysis of financial aspects, analyzed the execution of the budget and co-financing.

The information was systematized and the Comprehensive Analysis was carried out, which included all the analyzes and the results of the field visits and the evaluation of the 5 evaluation criteria requested by **GEF**.

The list of documents consulted is included in Annex No 1. The log which includes the names of the persons interviewed is in Annex No 2. The structure of the report requested by the Terms of Reference, in Annex No 6.

---

<sup>1</sup> Review of Direct Effects and Impacts (RoTI)

## 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTENT

### 2.1. Project Start and Duration

The initial period of execution scheduled was 60 months. On the recommendation of the mid-term evaluation, this period was extended by an additional 12 months. Work commenced in September 2011 and the official closure was stipulated for September 2016, therefore its current final duration is estimated at 5 years.

### 2.2. Problems Identified that the Project Considered Addressing

The PRODOC identifies the following issues related to the direct and indirect pressures on biodiversity (threats), which the Project considered addressing:

- **Threats to marine ecosystems:** Gruas II also identified the main threats to marine ecosystems: habitat degradation, pollution, presence of exotic invasive species and climate change. Its causes are principally the non-regulated growth of coastal areas, the reduction in the presence of national authorities, non-adequate incentives for protection and conservation and the growth in urban areas.
- **Weakness in management and financial unsustainability:** Many MPAs are weakly managed and only a fraction have completed or updated their management plans. The financial sustainability of Costa Rican MPAs is very far from being achieved.
- **Loss of Biodiversity:** Fishing makes up for a very low percentage of the GDP. From 2000 to 2007, the share of the fishing sector in GDP fell by approximately 50%, from 0.31% to 0.20%. In terms of catch, between 1998 and 2001 the catch of the national fishing fleet reached 27 million kg, but in 2004 it was only 16 million kg.
- **Low socio-economic conditions of the Communities:** The socioeconomic conditions of communities around MPAs vary greatly, although some have impoverished conditions such as in the case of Barra del Colorado.

### 2.3. Immediate and Developmental Objectives of the Project

The project is located within the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area and in the country's GEF5 Program. Its goal is to conserve Costa Rica's marine and coastal biodiversity of global and national importance. The objective of the project was to consolidate Costa Rica's marine protected areas, increasing its ecological representation and ensuring its effective management and financial sustainability.

## **2.4. Key Stakeholders in the Project**

The main stakeholders integrated into PRODOC are:

- National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC), including the participation instruments defined by its legal structure.
- Municipalities
- Fishermen
- Local development organizations
- Universities and research centers
- Ministry of Environment and Energy (MINAE)
- Incopesca (INCOPECA)
- Ministry of Agriculture (MAG)
- Costa Rican Tourism Board (ICT)
- National Coastguard Service (SGC/MSP)
- United Nations Development Program (PNUD)
- Global Environment Facility (GEF)

## **2.5. Expected Outcomes**

The three main Project outcomes were:

- Strengthen the institutional framework and improve individual capacity for the effective management of the MPAs.
- Increase and diversify the funding for the marine protected areas.
- Widen the MPA coverage to improve ecological representativeness.

## **2.6. Baseline Indicators**

Baseline indicators are summarized in Table 1.

**Cuadro 1: Baseline indicators**

<b>Project objective:</b> To consolidate Costa Rica's MPAs by increasing their ecological representation and ensuring their effective management and financial sustainability	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>
Total marine area (km <sup>2</sup> ) under protection within the MPAs	– 5,398.34
Change in ecological representativeness (km <sup>2</sup> ) within ten coastal and marine sites	– Terrestrial: 465 – Coastal (0-30m): 327 – Neritic (30-200m): 859 – Oceanic (> 200m): 166
Change in PA management effectiveness as measured by METT scores for eleven (11) MPAs	– Santa Rosa NP : 72.6% – Corcovado NP: 71.6% – Cahuita NP: 70.6% – Marino Ballena NP: 67.7% – Isla del Caño BR: 63.7% – Isla del Coco NP: 63.5% – Gandoca – Manzanillo NWR: 55.9% – Playa Hermosa NWR: 54.9% – Cabo Blanco NR: 54.9% – Marino Las Baulas NP: 52.0% – Terraba Sierpe NW: 47.1%
Increase in MPAs' financial capabilities according to the average total score established in the UNDP/GEF Financial Sustainability Scorecard (FSS)	– Legal and regulatory framework: 19.2% – Business planning: 9.8% – Tools for generating income: 15.8% – Total: 15.3%.
<b>Outcome 1: Strengthened institutional framework and improved individual capacity for effective MPA management</b>	
Improvement in capacity development indicators for key stakeholders as per UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard: 85 MPA/SINAC officials trained in the development of management plans for MPAs marine ecological monitoring, and CC impact mitigation and adaptation (baseline and target to be defined during the first 6 months of the project)	– Capacities for engagement: X – Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge: X – Capacities for management and implementation: X – Capacities to monitor and evaluate: X
Change in management effectiveness for three (3) MPAs as a result of participatory management actions	– Santa Rosa NP: 72.6% – Cahuita NP: 70.6% – Playa Hermosa NWR Refuge: 54.9%
CC mitigation and adaptation strategy for MPAs	– Zero (0)
<b>Outcome 2: Increased and diversified funding for MPAs</b>	
Change in total annual central government budget allocated to MPA management	– \$614,476/yr (2009)

<b>Project objective:</b> To consolidate Costa Rica's MPAs by increasing their ecological representation and ensuring their effective management and financial sustainability	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>
Change in the amount of financial resources received annually from private sources for the MPAs	– \$964,305/yr (2009) (indicate by source)
Change in the financial gap to cover basic costs of management and investments of the MPAs	– \$6,775,877 (2009)
Number of business plans for the MPAs	– Zero (0)
Number of proposals for implementing PES schemes in MPAs	– Zero (0)
<b>Outcome 3: Expanded MPA coverage for improved ecological representation</b>	
Number of nests per breeding season for the Olive Ridley turtle ( <i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i> )	– Playa Hermosa NWR: 500 nests – Santa Rosa NP: 10,000 nests on average per month during the “arribada” months and 150 during the “non-arribada” months.
Number of neonates of the hawksbill sea turtle ( <i>Erectmochelys imbricata</i> ) that safely reach the ocean	– 5,000
Change in coral coverage (live)	– Santa Rosa NP: 71% (estimated for 1994; baseline will be confirmed during the first 6 months of the project) – Cahuita NP: 15% (estimated for 2008)
Change in biomass of seagrass ( <i>Thalassia testudinum</i> ) (g/m <sup>2</sup> )	– Cahuita NP: 737.5 g/m <sup>2</sup> (estimated for 2005)
Change in area of key ecosystems protected by MPAs	– Estuary: 8,979 ha – Mangrove: 20,154 ha – Coastal lagoon: 40 ha – Seagrass: 120 ha – Coral reef: 110 ha – Intertidal zone: 10 ha – Upwelling: 2,880 ha – Rocky beach: 37 km – Sandy beach: 131 km – Coastal cliff: 96 km – Mud sea bottom: 755 ha – Sand sea bottom: 284 ha – Hard sea bottom: 31 ha – Soft sea bottom: 161 ha
Number MPAs expanded/created	Zero (0)

Fuente: Tomado del PRODOC.

### 3. FINDINGS

#### 3.1. Project Design

The design is satisfactory. In general term, the PRODOC is presented with logical links among the expected outcomes and the Project design, if the following elements are considered.

### 3.1.1. Analysis of the Results Framework and Logical Framework Matrix.

1. The project strategy (**see Annex No 4**) and the components correspond to the problems and threats established in diagnostics, previous strategies, the CRXS program, on aspects that somehow still have technical, political and financial validity, specifically in the Need to improve the efficiency of MPA management, financial sustainability and ecological representativeness. With regard to the institutional framework, it intends to develop capacities to strengthen the management of MPAs
2. The choice of international and national partners was satisfactory, since commitments have been maintained and improved, to coordinate actions and provide support through various resources and support to decision-making for the strengthening of MPAs.
3. Presents a systemically organized structure, characteristic of the **GEF** project format, which was a limitation the absence of a technical committee, which was then solved with the implementation of a technical coordination group called the Coordination Committee (**COCO**).
4. With regards to the scope of the project, there were strong limitations to achieve some results, examples of this situation, the case of the declaration or extension of new MPAs, which was even identified as one of the risks; or the fund appertaining to CRXS. It is understood that the processes to increase ecological representativeness require greater efforts and longer terms. In addition, in the juncture where the project is inserted, it is placed as an instrument of the CRXS program, which was not enough to influence decisions on the financial fund designed for financial sustainability by the MPAs.
5. The Project managed to leverage the resources provided between GEF funds in addition to co-financed resources. However, on the resources provided in the PRODOC and assigned to the products, in some cases they were not enough to achieve them. Such is the case of the communication and information strategy and the climate change adaptation and mitigation management strategy for MPAs, forcing the project to seek strategic alliances to achieve them.
6. The duration of the project was insufficient to achieve the proposed results, due to this; it required an extension for an additional year, based on the recommendation of the mid-term evaluation, to achieve the proposed activities.

7. On the indicators, some were presented for which the criterion of relevance was not fulfilled. This and other elements are contributed to the matrix of the logical framework of the project, included in Annex No 3.
8. The identification of the assumptions or risks associated with the project, in general terms, was relevant. In particular, the one related to political support (***The policy will exist for the creation of new marine protected areas and the expansion of existing MPAs***), as the change in policy on this issue in the present administration affected the results related with the declaration of extension or of new MPAs. The assumption that indicated "Continuous support from the government and non-governmental companies for the management of MPAs" was also correct, as these supports were given to achieve several results
9. The design, in spite of presenting some deficiencies, allowed leading the project strategically to the achievement of the outcomes. Through its adaptive implementation and execution, consensual and appropriate strategies were developed to solve the difficulties related to design. Considering these elements, the design of the project is satisfactory.

### 3.1.2. Expected Participation of Interest Groups

Costa Rica is committed to achieving the goals set by the CBD's work program on Protected Areas, which sets targets for all nations to protect the world's biological diversity through the creation, management and funding of both land and marine protected areas in 2012. In order to achieve this goal, the country executes the Forever Costa Rica Program (CRXS); which is consistent with this initiative in achieving the goal for the MPAs. Finally, this project responds to the marine and coastal needs of the country, and includes an analysis of the conservation gap led by SINAC as part of **GRUAS II**, which is why Costa Rica drafts a territorial planning proposal for the conservation of the biodiversity

On the other hand, a good dose was incorporated in the coordination and exchange of lessons learned with GEF; for example, the Integrated Management of Coastal Marine Resources project in the Province of Puntarenas. This project aims to develop and promote the planning and integrated management of marine and coastal ecosystems in the Gulf of Nicoya and the South Pacific through multiple use marine areas to conserve biodiversity. And maintain environmental services, and provide a basis for sustainable socio-economic development. The benefits provided through this project will be planned mainly for areas outside the marine protected areas.

Likewise, other people or actors who may not have been involved since that stage were not involved in the project design; such as the inhabitants of the coastal areas, the fishermen, other institutions (local governments, INDER,

etc.). Precisely because they were affected by some of the outcomes and because they had a relevant role in achieving them, it was important to include them.

### 3.1.3. Lessons from other relevant Projects integrated in the Design of the Project.

The project was complemented by a project implemented almost simultaneously by the **GEF UNDP: *Removing barriers for the sustainability of the Costa Rican Protected Areas System***, whose main objective was "to overcome the main institutional and systemic obstacles to the sustainability of the Protected Areas System of Costa Rica. "This project aimed to provide benefits primarily at the Protected Areas level.

For this reason **SINAC** oversaw the execution of both projects, and their close coordination was guaranteed. During the start-up phase, meetings were held with the project coordinator to discuss areas and mechanisms for coordination among the projects, and the activities in the project included: a) communication mechanisms between the two projects' steering committees that will provide regular updated reports on development projects; b) creation of a work committee between **SINAC** marine program projects, project coordinators and key personnel of the joint planning project.

Lastly, the project also integrated lessons learned from the **UNDP's GEF: *improving management and conservation practices of the Cocos Island Marine Conservation Area***. This medium-sized project was based on the reduction of threats to Cocos Island marine and terrestrial biodiversity through the strengthening of the management of PAs and the regulation of local economic activities in a sustainable manner. It was hoped that this project would be complemented by the lessons in the Cocos Island project that will be incorporated with: a) the need for public participation to effectively define the limits of MPAs, as demonstrated in the case of Cocos Island MPA and the expansion process of marine zoning. And, b) clearly defined criteria for efficient resource management, resource allocation, and financial reporting and accountability to enhance MPA staff capacity for financial management. In addition, the methods used in the zoning of the marine areas and the MPA and the importance of the Expansion Plan for Cocos Island will be applied to the development of management plans once the project is implemented.

### 3.1.4. Replicability Approach

Under the conditions in which the Project was formulated, it can be replicated in:

1. An improvement in the cooperation mechanisms between SINAC and INCOPECSA that could be replicated in future initiatives on the sustainable use of the fishing resources in Costa Rica in the Pacific area.
2. At the site level, the project will implement specific actions in a limited number of protected areas to improve participatory management, business plan development, and monitoring of coastal and marine biodiversity.
3. Also, the development of ecological monitoring and
4. The tools for financial sustainability.

All of these actions described above may be replicated in the MPAs. It should be noted that the project has the potential to be replicated and provide lessons learned at an international level. Similar efforts to consolidate MPA systems are being carried out or are planned in several countries in Latin America and the Caribbean (e.g. Argentina and Colombia). However, Costa Rica is committed to increasing the coverage of MPAs and expanding its impact system, being an example to be followed in the region and around the world.

### **3.1.5. Comparative Advantage of UNDP**

This project truly adapts to **UNDP's** comparative advantage, selected as the executing agency of **GEF** by the Costa Rican government, because of its experience in developing the capacity of local governments (conservation of biological diversity and sustainable use of resources, as well as the generation, dissemination and adoption of best practices in biodiversity conservation, capacity development, and enhancement of the country's financial sustainability).

In addition, it has a programmatic approach at the country level for the consolidation and sustainability of its marine protected areas, placing it in a privileged position to ensure efficiency through the project.

Other cases where UNDP implementation has been successful, and therefore offers a comparative advantage from the perspective of previous experience and demonstrated management capacity with large and complex organizations with SINAC. Situation that was presented with the project cases of the COCO Island and the project *Barreras*, both executed by the SINAC

## **3.2. Project Implementation**

### **3.2.1. Project presented an Adaptive Approach during its Implementation.**

This capability was achieved with a holistic approach and vision, complemented by continuity from the outset both at the external coordination and with institutional coordination levels, aspects that were key in the development of the processes and therefore in the expected results of the project.

Some of the specific situations of adaptive management was to coordinate actions through the Coordinating Committee for the assistance of the Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation and Marine Spatial Planning (**COCO**) to use this analysis and action reflection platform in the environment, successfully link processes initiated by the project and direct them to other strategic referents of the **COCO**, to potentiate them to concrete actions and to visualize results in the short term. For example, with **BIOMARCC**, it was possible to strengthen the Climate Change Strategy, meaning, redefining how to leverage this action that was already under way in **SINAC**.

Furthermore, some additional actions were generated that strengthened institutional activities, such as the proposals for Non-Essential Service Concessions, as payment mechanisms for ecosystem services in wildlife protected areas in both Corcovado NP, Rincón de la Vieja NP and Cocos Island NP.

The "Tool for Estimating Funds Required for Protected Wildlife Areas Management" was established successfully. For each of these cases, there is now a structured and financial vision.

The proposal for adaptability in management is still adequate regarding the threats to be overcome, but the magnitude of the task transcends what was foreseen both by factors that are binding on the environment (**SINAC**) and the problems involved in coordinating with the actors involved.

These proposals consisted on the flexibility to measure and articulate with the different actors, meaning, the UGP had the capacity to adapt to the different levels both political and institutional, which provided a transparent and systemic action in the planning of its management.

### **3.2.2. Links among other Project and other interventions in the Area according to the Management Method**

The link with other projects from the adaptive modality for management was initially through the Coordinating Committee for the assistance of Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation and Marine Spatial Planning (**COCO**). However, it is through this modality that the different actors managed to add efforts for the adaptability of the processes, as a whole, both the management of **SINAC**'s Protected Areas, as well as the various Areas of Conservation; thus, the Marine Biodiversity and

Climate Change" (**BIOMARCC**) program, funded with resources from the German Ministry of Environment through **GIZ**, and the Association and the Forever Costa Rica Program creating an informally appropriate space but effective in participation and synergies.

It is worth noting the participation of several Non-Governmental Organizations NGOs, which provided in-kind services and resources for processes of great importance. Example of this, the survey of the information for the measurement of the indicators related to the populations of sea turtles, which was carried out by third parties.

### 3.2.3. Project Financing

The financial execution of the resources contributed by GEF, reached the sum of \$1.139.033.39<sup>2</sup>, which represent 94% of this fund. **See Table No. 2.**

Table 2. Financial Execution of the Resources provided by GEF. Reported to October 13, 2016.

Years	Executed (US \$)	Percentage (%)
2012	104649,78	9,19
2013	126376,9	11,10
2014	314299,2	27,59
2015	306265,51	26,89
2016	287442	25,24
Total	1139033,39	100,00

Source: Prepared based on information provided by the Project.

The co-financing of the project was met and exceeded expectations with a total amount of \$ 19,690,860, which represented 10% more of the planned financing. This is mainly due to the contribution of the Costa Rican government that exceeded by 26% what was planned and the contributions of the NGOs and the **BIOMARCC** Project and **BID Tourism**. In the case of the co-financing provided by CRXS, this was lower than expected which represents a reduction of 86% to what was proposed. See Table No. 3. However, it is important to note that once the new MPAs are declared, through

<sup>2</sup> Reported to October 13, 2016.

the alliance with CRXS, the financial contributions committed to these areas will be implemented.

**Table No 3. Resources provided by the Project's Co-financing.**

Co-financing (type/source)	Government Costa Rica (millions in USD)		Forever Costa Rica (millions in USD)		BIOMARCC (millions in USD)		BID Tourism (millions in USD)		ONGs (millions in USD)		Total (millions in USD)	
	Planned	Real	Planned	Real	Planned	Real	Planned	Real	Planned	Real	Real	Real
Subsidies												
Loans/concessions												
In-kind	6.449.000		11.412.500	1.609.878	-	3.934.574	-	5.300.925	-	683.181	17.861.500	19.690.862
Other												
Totals	6.449.000	8.162.304	11.412.500	1.609.878	-	3.934.574	-	5.300.925	-	683.181	17.861.500	19.690.862
Percentage (%)		126,56		14,10								110,24

Source: Prepared based on information provided by the Project.

### 3.2.4. Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation is rated "highly satisfactory". The project did not include a monitoring and evaluation specialist. These functions were developed by the Implementing Unit and the implementer. This was followed by UNDP standards and monitoring systems. On behalf of the EU, follow-up activities of the executed actions in the executive secretariat of SINAC, CAs and MPAs, were carried out through adapted instruments. As part of the monitoring model, annual reviews, a mid-term assessment and two audits were carried out. The information generated did not present deficiencies and allowed for decision making in a timely manner, with the purpose of improving its management

### 3.2.5. UNPD and the Implementing/Execution Coordination Partner and the Operational Impact.

Implementation has resulted as very satisfactory. It is important to point out that **UNDP**'s work during the project's implementation has been close to the UGP Coordinator, supporting and collaborating to streamline the processes and with this improve the required execution.

As a partner, management should not be left alone in the monitoring provided by the Environment Officers and the operational aspects of the dynamics and logistics required by the project (s) in question. The role of an administrator entails ensuring effectiveness in its implementation

The **UNDP** as a partner is called to have a leading role in the medium and long term in order to leverage processes with strategic actors in a more relevant role that can make sustainability operational, meaning that through its management, it is possible to form important and significant alliances with a network of environmental and related actors, with incidence, as it occurred with the project

UNPD's implementation. It allowed the project management to flow within the characteristics of SINAC's institutionalism, supported through its Environment Officer, as well as other departments: Project Officer, Procurement and Accountant, project management. This implementation considered a strong point for the success of the project, which was also possible due to the experience of UNDP in these issues and the clarity in the alignment of the project with the country program. Advice on various issues and the provision of services and instruments in technical and accounting matters was highly valued by the coordination of the project and by SINAC.

The role of SINAC as Project Associate, which in turn was transcendental and very dynamic, both in the execution and implementation. The project was implemented in the MPAs, so that the support of the managers of the CAs, MPAs, and the work teams was highly satisfactory and exceeded the expectations set out in PRODOC. Some of the tasks that the Institutional Agenda poses include: the formulation and execution of the projects in the context of achieving the mentioned indicators, which is why a general conceptualization about on the Project Bank is relevant: context, components and basic concepts associated with the issue. A journey through the life cycle of the project was able to determine aspects such as: identification, formulation, prioritization, evaluation and feasibility provided by the tools to make SINAC the best partner in the implementation.

### 3.3. Project Outcome

#### 3.3.1. Outcomes by Component

The expected outcomes are defined on pages 24 to 33 in the PRODOC. The outcomes obtained at a global level, are ranked by the present assessment as Very Satisfactory (VS). The outcomes are presented in detail for each one of the components.

#### **COMPONENT 1. STRENGTHENING OF THE INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY FOR THE EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT OF THE MARINE PROTECTED AREAS.**

*OUTCOME 1: Reforming and improving the legal and political framework of Costa Rica to ensure in the long-term effective management and financial and ecological sustainability of the PA system.*

This outcome considered as indicator goals: 1) improvement in the capacities as indicated in the ranking card for UNDP capacity development; 2) 85 SINAC MPA officials trained in the development of management plans for the ecological marine monitoring in the MPA and adaptation and mitigation of climate change impact; 3) change in the management effectiveness for three (3) MPA as a result of the participative management measures; 4) Adaptation and mitigation strategy to climate change for MPAs.

The results obtained by this component, are rated by the present evaluation as Very Satisfactory. The main achievements of the implementation of this component were:

**OUTCOME 1.1. Strengthened coordination and consultation between SINAC and agencies involved with fishing and tourism, through inter-institutional coordination tools within the general cooperation agreement as part of the national marine strategy**

The assessment of this outcome is valued as very satisfactory (VS). Support was given to the Sectorial Marine Agenda (2016-2021) for the Implementation of the National Policy of the Costa Rican Sea (2013-2028). This represents an important policy instrument promoted by the Vice Ministry of Water, Seas, Coast and Wetlands, which will facilitate interinstitutional coordination, management and advocacy of the National Marine Policy, through support in three important areas: 1) Governance towards The Integral Management of Marine Resources; 2) Maritime Safety and 3) Marine Spatial Planning.

**OUTCOME 1.2. Developed a communication and information strategy that promotes awareness among decision makers regarding marine conservation Marine Protected Areas and sustainable use of resources.**

The assessment of this outcome is valued as very satisfactory (VS). Support was provided for the communication of the efforts made by the project and the SINAC in the marine protected areas, through: 1) News and periodical notes; 2) Development of infographics on priority actions for adaptation and mitigation to climate change for MPAs and other issues related to their conservation; 3) Support to presentations at national and international conferences on topics related to the results of the project, 3) Support with TNC and Keto Foundation in the publication of scientific articles.

**OUTCOME 1.3. Training of Marine Protected Areas and the Coastal Marine Program officials for the development of management plans for the marine ecological monitoring of Marine Protected Areas, mitigation and adaptation of climate change.**

The assessment of this outcome is valued as very satisfactory (VS). A training program in management, ecological monitoring and strategies for adaptation and mitigation to climate change in the protected areas of the coastal marine area of Costa Rica for the training of officials was developed. It is a strategy to address these minimum capacities, in three major themes: Planning, ecological monitoring and climate change, whose beneficiaries are those who work, manage, manage and make decisions on MPAs. It is carried out through the course-workshop pedagogical strategy and through blended and classroom training modality as in the case of water immersions.

**OUTCOME 1.4. Increase of 20% in the effectiveness of management in the wildlife protected areas of Cahuita, Hermosa and Santa Rosa through shared management.**

The assessment of this outcome is valued as satisfactory (S). To achieve this, the project carried out actions in the Cahuita National Park, Playa Hermosa-Punta Mala National Wildlife Refuge (RNVS PH-PM) and the Santa Rosa National Park. They consist of support to develop the shared management of these MPAs, through: 1) Strengthening the institutional, management, instrumental and operational capacity of the COLACs. See Table 4, executed activities.

**Table No 4: Actions implemented to strengthen the COLAC for the Cahuita National Park, Playa Hermosa-Punta Mala National Wildlife Refuge (RNVS PH-PM) and the Santa Rosa National Park**

Local Council	Executed activities to strengthen the COLACs
<p><b>Cahuita National Park</b></p>	<p>Identification of crucial issues and priority activities for the Local Council and its reference in the existing planning documentation and tools</p> <p>Creation of a new Local Council for the Cahuita National Park for the membership</p> <p>Strategic and Normative Planning of the Local Council for the Shared Management of the Cahuita National Park</p>
<p><b>Playa Hermosa-Punta Mala National Wildlife Refuge (RNVS PH-PM)</b></p>	<p>Strengthening the management capacity within the immediate future of the Local Council of RNVS PH-PM</p> <p>Prioritization of activities through a Work Plan for the Local Council of the RNVS PH-PM</p> <p>Characterization of surfing activity in the RNVS PH-PM</p> <p>Facilitation for the development of a proposal of local support for shared management among surfers and the RNVS PH-PM administration</p> <p>Proposal for reforestation of degraded areas in the RNVS PH-PM</p>
<p><b>Santa Rosa National Park</b></p>	<p>Characterization of surfing activity in the Santa Rosa National Park</p>

	Bibliographic review of surfing activity in Costa Rica, with emphasis on Santa Rosa NP and RNVS PH-PM
--	---

Source: Preparation based on information from SINAC (2016)

In the time period of the management effectiveness according to the estimate made in Cahuita National Park, and in the Santa Rosa National Park and improvement in the National Wildlife Refuge Playa Hermosa-Punta Mala (RNVS PH-PM). Table No. 5

**Table No 5. METTs estimate at Cahuita National Park, Santa Rosa National Park and Playa Hermosa-Punta Mala National Wildlife Refuge (RNVS PH-PM).**

Protected Marine Area	2009		2014		2016	
	Score	%	Score	%	Score	%
Santa Rosa National Park	74	72.6	68	61.2	5	50.4
Cahuita National Park	72	70.6	57	51.3	5	50.4
Playa Hermosa-Punta Mala National Wildlife Refuge	56	54.9	29	26.1	6	57.6

Source: Preparation based on information from SINAC (2016)

**OUTCOME 1.5. Adaptation and mitigation strategy for marine protected areas climate change drafted**

The assessment of this outcome is valued as very satisfactory (VS). Priority actions were identified and proposed for priority mitigation and adaptation to climate change, for biodiversity and administrative and operational policies, applicable to the reality of marine protected areas of the Guanacaste Conservation Area, Cahuita National Park and Playa Hermosa - Punta Mala National Wildlife Refuge. Considering that these correspond to the management plans, are feasible in the short and medium term and promote good practices to reduce the carbon footprint. Following this prioritization, means were implemented.

Once priority actions were identified, identification and mapping of the activities and uses within the protected marine area were carried out at the Cahuita National Park in conjunction with local actors, to reduce the pressure of visitation in the already existing areas. At Santa Rosa National Park, ecological marine monitoring activities and ecological evaluations were conducted, which allowed to increase the knowledge to improve the management and the resilience of the coral reefs. The *Protocol for the Evaluation and Selection of Diving Sites in Marine Protected Areas of Costa Rica* is introduced as a tool for strengthening the management of recreational diving activity and as an input to favor the resilience of coral formations in the area

## **COMPONENT 2. MARINAS PROTEGIDAS INCREASED AND DIVERSIFIED FUNDS FOR THE MARINE PROTECTED AREAS**

### **OUTCOME 2.1: Reforming and improving the legal and political framework of Costa Rica to ensure long-term effective management and financial and ecological sustainability of the PA system.**

This outcome considered as indicator goals: 1) Change in the total annual central budget of the government that has been assigned to the management of MPAs; 2) Change in the amount of financial resources received annually from private sources for MPAs, 3) Change in the financial gap to cover MPA management and investment base costs; 4) Number of business plans for MPAs; 5) Number of proposals for the implementation of SE schemes in MPAs.

It includes executed actions that support the implementation of the SINAC Strategic Plan 2010-2015 policies, aimed at strengthening current sources of financing and generation of resources for MPAs, as well as the inclusion of new financial mechanisms.

The results obtained by this component, are rated by the present assessment as Very Satisfactory. The main achievements of this component were:

### **OUTCOME 2.2. Consolidated the Trust for Marine Protected Areas of the Forever Costa Rica Program**

The assessment of this outcome is valued as very satisfactory (VS). In 2012, an alliance with the Forever Costa Rica Association (ACRXS), a Plan for the 2010-2015 period and a fund of US \$52 million was established, which is consolidated with approximately US \$26,000,000 in funds of endowment and amortization for the consolidation of the marine protected areas of the National System of Conservation Areas (SINAC). The investment in marine protected areas by the Costa Rica Forever Trust in the 2010-2016 period was \$1,609,878. During the 2016-2017 period, an amount of \$560,000 will be placed for management effectiveness projects in 15 marine protected areas.

### **OUTCOME 2.3. Normative and operational guide for the allocation and distribution of financial resources for the Coastal Marine Program defined**

The assessment of this outcome is valued as very satisfactory (VS). With the support of Conservation International - Costa Rica, the Tool for the Estimation of Funds required for management in Protected Wild Areas was drafted. This tool facilitates budgeting and estimation of financial gaps in ASPs, preparing budgets for cooperative investments, designing budgets for ASPs Business Plans and the required financial analysis under articles 35 and 36 Of the Organic Law of the Environment and Ministerial Guideline for the creation of new Marine Protected Areas (Official DM-475-2015).

**OUTCOME 2.4. Updated the proposed fee collection for visitors in marine protected areas based on the management category, visitor profile and type of service provided**

The assessment of this outcome is valued as very satisfactory (VS). SINAC was supported in the elaboration and proposal of new tariffs and updating of existing tariffs. The updating of the entrance and service fees, currently in force, was made through the authorization decree submitted on November 1, 2014. In addition, a cost-based dive fee proposal was prepared for the marine sector of the Guanacaste Conservation Area, considering addition fees for entry, anchorage and use of submarine.

**OUTCOME 2.5. Updated the proposed fee collection for visitors in marine protected areas based on the management category, visitor profile and type of service provided**

The assessment of this outcome is valued as very satisfactory (VS). Based on the Guide for the Drafting of Business Plans in ASPs, developed in conjunction with SINAC, the II Debt Swap for Nature, managed by the Forever Costa Rica Association and the project. As part of this task, the Marine Ecosystem Services were identified, characterized and evaluated.

With the participation of the officials, three (3) Business Plans for the three project pilot MPA were drafted (Cahuita NP, Santa Rosa NP, Playa Hermosa-Punta Mala RNVS), which allowed for an increase in fundraising for the MPAs. See Table No.6.

**OUTCOME 2.6. An economic assessment of the ecosystem services of the marine protected areas that provide information to increase the funds of three MPAs.**

An economic assessment of marine ecosystem services was developed in the three pilot areas (Cahuita NP, Santa Rosa NP and Playa Hermosa - Punta Mala RNVS), with the purpose of integrating them in the visitation rates.

**Table No 6. Business plan and proposed mechanisms for Pilot MPAs.**

Marine Protected Areas	Proposed Mechanisms
Cahuita NP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concessions of Non-Essential Services</li> <li>- New trails established</li> <li>- Revision and updating of entrance fees</li> </ul>

<b>Playa Hermosa RNVS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concessions of Non-Essential Services</li> <li>- Agreement with the Central Pacific Tourism Chamber, Municipalities, and other institutions</li> <li>- Charging of entrance fees</li> <li>- Compensation program for the Regulation Ecosystem Service for Coastal Erosion</li> <li>- Turtle tracking and observation</li> </ul>
<b>Marine Sector of Santa Rosa NP</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concessions of Non-Essential Services</li> <li>- Fees for diving, anchorage and other services.</li> </ul>

Source: Preparation based on information from SINAC (2016)

### **COMPONENT 3. EXPANDING THE COVERAGE OF PROTECTED MARINE AREAS TO IMPROVE ECOLOGICAL REPRESENTATION**

This outcome considered as indicator goals: 1) Number of nests per growing season for the Lora tortoise (*Lepidochelys olivacea*); Number of hawksbill turtles (*Erectmochelys imbricata*) arriving safely in the ocean; 3) Change in coral cover (Viva).

SINAC initiated processes to improve the representativeness of marine ecology in the country within five of the sites of importance for marine conservation, among them are: South Pacific, Cabo Blanco, Santa Elena Bay, Barra del Colorado and Marine Areas Seamounts (AMM MS).

The assessment of this component is valued as satisfactory (S). The main achievements of this component were.

#### **Outcome 3.1. Expanded and/or created 10 Marine Protected Areas**

The assessment of this outcome is valued as somewhat satisfactory (SS). As part of this product, progress was made in the development of scientific studies on the status of coastal marine habitats, their connectivity and the socio-economic status of marine conservation gaps. The studies were carried out for the sites of Importance for the Marine Conservation of the Barra de Colorado, South Caribbean, Golfo Dulce, island of Chira Tempisque. See Table 7.

#### **Table No 7: Surveys conducted at Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation.**

<b>Site of Importance for Conservation</b>	<b>Study</b>
<b>Barra del Colorado</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Marine-Coastal Habitat and the Social-Economic Situation of the Barra del Colorado National Wildlife Refuge and the Tortuguero National Park</li> </ul>
<b>Southern Caribbean</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drafting of Basic Marine-Coastal scientific studies for the Southern Caribbean Conservation Gap</li> </ul>
<b>Golfo Dulce</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drafting of the supplement for the Tropical Biology Magazine: Marine Scientific Studies in the South Pacific of Costa Rica: Efforts toward Conservation</li> </ul>
<b>Chira Tempisque</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Socio-environmental diagnosis of the Chira Tempisque gap</li> <li>- Assessment of the fisheries in the interior of the Gulf of Nicoya</li> <li>- Characterization of the marine-coastal wetlands in the Chira-Tempisque, Culebra Estuary, Caballo-Venado conservation gaps and surroundings.</li> </ul>

Support was provided to MINAE for the definition of the following steps for the declaration of MPAs: 1) Physical identification of the site, 2) Collection of biological and social data, 3) Definition of threats, stakeholders and ecosystem services, 4) Dialogue with stakeholders, through alternative dispute resolution, 5) Development of management proposals for each stakeholder, 6) Validation of a final proposal through multiple multiparty sessions, 7) Evaluation of the final technical proposal by the state authorities and 8) Drafting of a decree for the creation of the agreed management model.

Although no MPAs had been declared or expanded, progress was made to the development of governance processes to achieve this, as well as the Barra de Colorado MPA statement. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the change in MINAE's policies for the declaration of new MPAs affected the achievement of this result. Precisely this was one of the risks indicated in the logical framework so that this result could be given.

**Outcome 3.2. Management plans developed for the new marine protected areas**

The assessment of this outcome is valued as very satisfactory (VS). The Project invested in improvement and strengthening process for local governance processes at Barra del Colorado, Southern Caribbean and South Pacific Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation. See Table No.8.

**Table No 8: Local governance processes developed by the Project at the Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation.**

<b>Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation</b>	<b>Study</b>
<b>Barra del Colorado</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategy to strengthen governance models for the implementation of the priority lines of action for the site of importance for conservation of the Barra de Colorado, applying a model of participatory management</li> <li>- Awareness-raising plan for the fisheries and tourism sectors on marine invasive species, sustainable production processes and marine protected areas</li> <li>- Strategic Plan of the Local Council (COLAC) Marine Coastal Barra del Colorado 2016- 2018</li> <li>- Characterization of fishing activities in Barra del Colorado, Northern Caribbean</li> <li>- Implementation of sustainable productive processes in Barra del Colorado - Responsible artisanal fishing</li> </ul>
<b>Southern Caribbean</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assistance Strategy for the site of importance for the coastal marine conservation of Caribbean South</li> </ul>
<b>South Pacific</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Drafting of an assistance strategy for the sites of importance for conservation Dominical-Sierpe, Caño Island and Corcovado (Sites of Importance for Conservation and Human Wellbeing Southern Pacific)</li> <li>- Utilization plans for officials on business and conflict management issues</li> <li>- Awareness-raising plan for the fishing, tourism and institutional sector son priority and relevant issues for</li> </ul>

	<p>marine conservation processes that ACOSA has in the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Characterization of extractive activities of <i>Plicopurpura pansa</i> (Muricidae), snail ink, at the Marino Ballena National Park, Osa.</li> <li>- Participatory monitoring plan of the snail <i>Plicopurpura pansa</i> within the Site of Importance</li> </ul>
--	--

Management plans for 2 of the four PCRX SICOs that are in the contracting stage by ACRXS, which, as an ally within this process, will continue the consolidation efforts in governance models consolidated by the project and by BIOMARCC.

This result was linked to the achievement of outcome 3.2., on the declaration of the extension or creation of new MPAs. As this result was not achieved, the project was able to adapt to a new MINAE policy on this topic.

**Outcome 3.3. Developed and articulated the ecological monitoring strategy with PRONAMEC**

The assessment of this outcome is valued as very satisfactory (VS). Training activities, technical tool development and the leadership promotion for the SINAC officials were carried out to implement the PRONAMEC consolidation activities:

- Workshop on the attitudinal profile of officials of SINAC Protected Marine Areas.
- Workshop on Improving Interpersonal Relationships.
- Photos and video training on the monitoring of nesting beaches of sea turtles and coral formations.
- Training and implementation of the protocols of conservation objects prioritized in the marine area of the Santa Rosa National Par.
- Training and implementation of the protocols of conservation objects prioritized in the marine area of the Cahuita National Park.
- Consolidation of a marine ecological monitoring program for sea turtle nesting beaches at the Playa Hermosa-Punta Mala National Wildlife Refuge.
- Joint Monitoring in the Southern Pacific Sea Turtle Conservation Network
- Protocol Implementation: Evaluation and Selection of diving sites in the marine sector of the Guanacaste Conservation Area, Murciélago Island.
- Monitoring of coral formations at the Caño Island Biological Reserve and Marino Ballena National Park.

- Evaluation and selection of tourist diving sites at the Caño Island Biological Reserve.
- PRONAMEC Protocol: Protocol for ecological monitoring of the coral formations.
- PRONAMEC Protocol: Protocol for ecological monitoring of marine turtle nesting beaches.
- PRONAMEC Protocol: Protocol for ecological monitoring of aquatic mammals.
- PRONAMEC Protocol: Protocol for ecological monitoring of rocky beaches.
- PRONAMEC Protocol: Protocol for ecological monitoring of sandy beaches.
- PRONAMEC Protocol: Protocol for ecological monitoring of Sandy beaches facing climate change: Playa Hermosa-Punta Mala National Wildlife Refuge case study.
- Strengthening of the marine ecological monitoring: support unit of conservation areas to marine ecological monitoring.

### **3.3.2. Other Non-Planned Outcomes**

The project collaborated with the strengthening of SINAC through the following mechanisms and products not expected in the project design:

- Development of Non-Essential Services Concession proposals, as payment mechanisms for cultural ecosystem services for recreation and ecotourism in protected wilderness areas in the Corcovado NP, Rincón de la Vieja NP and Cocos Island NP.
- Financial analysis of the sites of importance for conservation for Cabo Blanco, Santa Elena, and Barra del Colorado.
- A new tool was developed based on the "Tool for the Estimation of Funds Required for Management in Protected Wild Areas", which allows for the estimation of assigned funds by the government to the MPAs: Chauita NP, Santa Rosa NP, Playa Hermosa-Punta Mala RNVS, Cabo Blanco Absolute National Reserve, Caño Island Biological Reserve, Marino Ballena NP, Corcovado NP, Manuel Antonio NP, Marino Las Baulas NP, Tortuguero NP and the Gandoca-Manzanillo National Wildlife Refuge.
- Estimation of invested funds by private sources and international cooperation in the MPAs, including the development of a tool for data collection of financial investments carried out by each source.
- Creation of a SINAC Marine Unit and technical teams in the MPAs.

### 3.3.3. Relevance

The project is relevant (R), considering **UNDP GEF** policies, policies, national needs and goals. It is framed on the biodiversity focal area and GEF strategic priorities. It seeks to create national capacities and conditions conducive to environmental protection and sustainable development, to increase the capacities of SINAC for effective management and financial sustainability of the MPAs (outcome GEF 1.1) and to improve ecological representativeness (GEF outcome 2.1.) through conservation and management guidelines of areas of importance (conservation gaps).

In relation to the previous **UNDP** country program, the component is: "*Strengthening institutions and building capacities of relevant entities in the environmental and energy sector*". In the current **CPAP**, it is part of component 4.4., On Environment, climate change and risk management.

At the global level, the Earth Summit and the conventions deriving from it, and most recently the United Nations Millennium Declaration, stand out. For its part, the Millennium Declaration establishes one of its objectives "to guarantee environmental sustainability" and recommends that policies that promote environmental sustainability emphasize the importance of citizen participation in solutions. These and other initiatives of global scope have found echo in the Central American countries.

It also supports national environmental and development priorities with a view to meeting the goals of the United Nations Programme of Work for Protected Areas ("PTAP") of the Convention on Biological Diversity ("CBPP") in three of its four components: a) ecological representativeness; b) management effectiveness and c) climate change; fulfilling an instrumental function in the national program Forever Costa Rica. In addition, it corresponds to the fulfillment of the SINAC Strategic Plan, in its strategic actions: (1. Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity and Natural Resources; 2) Alliances and Participation with Society; 3) Institutional Management and 4) Development of Human Resources.

In the project design, several areas of SINAC, together with CRxS, participated with the support of UNDP Costa Rica and the GEF Secretariat. In SINAC, the Office of Cooperation and Projects (currently the Department of Technical and Financial Cooperation), the Management of Protected Areas, the Department of Financial Development and the conservation areas (CA) participated in the Executive Secretariat. The project also received approval from the National Council for Conservation Areas (CONAC), the

Regional Councils of Conservation Areas (CORAC) and Local Councils (COLAC) linked to the implementation of project actions.

The project was able to take into account the national realities (policy and institutional framework) both in its design and its implementation. From its design it was aligned to the policy of "Peace with nature," of the National Development Plan of Oscar Arias 2006-2010. Conservation goals were in line with the country's commitments under the Convention on Biological Diversity. To the National Development Plan of the Chinchilla government (2011-2014) María Teresa Obregón Zamora. These are aimed at better environmental management, in areas such as health, environment, air quality, water resources management, forest management, fishing, agriculture and climate change; and which together contribute to the positioning of the country as an environmental power, which is expressed, for example, in the national position in the Yale Environmental Performance Index, in which the country occupies position number 3. (MIDEPLAN, 2012).

#### **3.3.4. Efficiency**

The efficiency level was very satisfactory (VS). The project managed to obtain the expected outcomes. It also had adaptive management to overcome the weaknesses of the original design and context-limiting conditions in order to meet the needs of the MPAs. This application was possible in the following topics: 1) Management oriented to the achievement of the established results, based on work plans designed according to the requirements of UNDP established in the PWA, adjusted to the original design. The execution of the project in accordance to the annual planning carried out; 2) carrying out activities required by SINAC and products not included in the PRODOC, to meet the needs of other PAs: Rincón de la Vieja and Ostional; 3) Breaks were taken to refocus on the processes and in each one by conservation area; 4) Emphasize the participatory, favoring the encounter and the dialogue with all the parties involved.

The financial management and control systems and the instruments for implementation and financial verification were adequate, based on the resources provided by UNDP for these cases; STATA, annual PIR reports, and two accounting audits. The PIR were precise and timely, responded to requirements and included changes in adaptive management.

The logical framework was used and annual action plans and budgets were developed, followed up by its execution. And verification of the results, which are reported in annual progress reports, submitted to the authorities of the

project CD, to make decisions regarding the course of investments for each period.

The execution of the project was efficient, it had to deal with governance issues of the same project, with respect to variations in the senior management structure (board of directors, it should have included CRXS), as well as developing an execution budget and activities model, over which it had no control and which were developed by other initiatives that contributed to the co-financing: **CRXS and BIOMARC**.

Capacities were created within **SINAC** in all the processes involved in the project, for the products, the quality is verified with high quality standards and rigorous monitoring and verification processes.

Resources were used efficiently; synergies were exploited with other initiatives to maximize resource utilization. This was especially true of the in-kind contributions of the IDB Tourism and **BIOMARCC** projects. In addition, there was an important contribution from NGOs. See Table No. 3.

### 3.3.5. Effectiveness

The level of effectiveness was satisfactory (S). The project has been effective in achieving the results, it even managed to enter a strategic approach to achieve other unexpected outcomes, without requiring additional resources. Risk management and assumptions of the project were approached with great capacity. The Solis Administration (2014-2017), varied policy for creation, the project provided advice for the definition of new procedures for declaring PA. In relation to the other risks identified, there has been no change in governmental and non-governmental support for MPA management. National and international economic conditions have remained stable, however, the country's fiscal problems have increased, which restricts the allocation of higher budgets for the PA. The provision within the GoCR to increase funding for MPAs remains.

NGOs, the private sector and other donors maintain and / or improve investment and support to marine protected areas. Particularly CRXS, which consolidates a fund of 50mll for PAs. National institutions have the will to improve cooperation and exchange of information and knowledge, as well as the willingness of SINAC's staff to participate in training. Through the project, there is a record of private funding sources for the terrestrial or marine component. There is a prioritization of the marine protected areas available. The mitigation strategies developed were appropriate and effective in solving the contingencies presented during the execution, they consisted in broadening the participation of the actors in the decision making at the different levels of execution of the project, the flexibility and the adaptive

management of facilitating to the needs of SINAC, the transparency and accountability of the situation of the project.

In order to improve the achievement of the expected results, changes could have been made to improve the approximation of what was intended for each outcome, adjust the execution time and budgets and modify the indicators of the logical framework.

### **3.3.6. National Ownership**

The project has represented a turning point regarding the marine issue, in which it has gained importance in the SINAC culture, which previously provided greater efforts to the continental scope of PAs. The level of national ownership has been high, on the part of those involved and interested in the project and its results. In every case it shows a high level of interest in the results achieved, its implementation and continuation through and future actions. The high level of commitment shown by the CA and MPA officials involved was evident because the results of the project were achieved, including high quality standards. For the executive secretary of SINAC and the MINAE Vice-Minister of Seas, this result was also obtained. The technical and administrative and managerial teams appropriated the results and which are used in the development of plans and the management of MPAs.

### **3.3.7. Impact**

In the final phase the project it achieved very significant results (see point 3.3.1), from which it is expected that the Probable contribution of the expected impacts will be achieved in the future. In this sense, based on the analysis of the impacts obtained in the current state of the project, these are assessed as minimum (M). This situation is due to the fact that the project is in the first levels of the chain of results and that these require institutionalization, operationalization and application processes by the SINAC.

Due to the above situation the GEF analysis methodology is concerned with knowing about the progress of the results to reach the expected impacts. According to the RoTi analysis carried out (see Annex 5), of the thirteen results of the project, it is "very likely" that six results will be achieved and "probable" that the other seven will be achieved. Such that the probability of the results being achieved is high.



Graph 1: Probability of reaching Project impacts

According to the analysis, there is a high probability that the project will contribute to the consolidation of MPAs and the overall objectives for the project. From the analysis of the Theory of Change, the important direct effects (see Table No. 9) that can be achieved through proper implementation and efficient management that SINAC should realize are identified. These effects are presented below for each of the components:

**Table No 9: Project outcomes from the Theory of Change**

1. Component	2. Direct Effect
1. Institutional framework and individual capacity to effectively manage the marine protected areas	2. Marine policy is effectively implemented with actor participation 3. Positioning of the marine issue and civil society empowerment 4. Ecological monitoring information facilitates decision making on the MPAs 5. More effective management of the MPA and its resources 6. Measures are taken at the MPAs for CC mitigation
1. Funds for marine protected areas	1. Sustainable funding of the MPAs 2. Improvement of the MPAs financial management
3. Coverage of MPAs to improve ecological representation	1. Adequate representation and management of important sites (Conservation gaps)

	2. Decision-making on evidence-based MPAs
--	---

Source: Own development.

### 3.3.8. Integration

The project incorporates other **UNDP** priorities. It directly influences the participation process and governance in the design and management of MPAs, through the participation processes developed in the Cahuita National Park and Barra de Colorado and Playa Hermosa Refuges. It also is involved in the prevention and recovery of natural disasters, through studies and preparation of management proposals for MPAs. Human rights, gender and poverty are included in the planning and management tools of MPAs.

### 3.3.9. Sustainability

In general terms, the project's sustainability is assessed as "Somewhat likely" (SL), in the sense that it poses moderate risks, in order to achieve impacts. The following are the risks analyzed in four dimensions: sustainability of financial resources, socio-political, institutional framework and governance and environmental.

#### 3.3.9.1. Financial Resources

Financial sustainability is assessed as "Somewhat likely" (SL), in the sense that it poses moderate risks, in order to achieve project impact.

Revenue from contracting non-essential services, raising tariffs and providing new services is expected to reduce the financial gap and financial risks.

The project developed several financial instruments, technologies and processes, which will allow SINAC, greater capacities in the CAs, to manage the financial gap of the MPAs. Revenue from contracting non-essential services, raising tariffs and providing new services is expected to reduce the financial gap and financial risks.

In addition, there is a commitment through the cooperation agreement with the Forever Costa Rica Association. The CRXS financing, maintained in the future through a trust that is estimated to reach fifty million dollars. However, this fund is not flexible, as a requirement to define the investment it establishes the rule that the

MPAs must be declared, resulting in a significant exclusion criteria that prevents access to important sites or conservation gaps established in Grúas II. On the other hand, the available annual amounts represent a moderate sum that is around fifteen thousand dollars per MPA area.

In addition to the situation regarding the need to declare new MPAs; what also needs to be noted is the limited financing available to SINAC for the effective management of MPAs, thus a restrictive context that presents a greater allocation of resources from the national budget due to fiscal deficit, estimated at 6.2% of GDP for the present year.

#### **3.3.9.2. Social-Political:**

Sustainability in socio-political issues is assessed as "Somewhat likely" (SL), in the sense that it poses moderate risks, in order to achieve project impact.

The project addresses the strengthening of the institutional framework and capacities, however, risks are increased due to changes in the organizational structure, from which **SINAC's** Marine Areas Management was eliminated. Also as part of the policies of the current authorities, for the creation of new MPAs, the expected progress and sustainability of project results can be affected.

Positively, a high commitment is maintained at the political levels of MINAE to continue with the products and results derived from the project. Also, at the managerial level within the SINAC Executive Secretariat, the CAs and PAs guidelines.

As part of the innovations, the project strengthened and generated products on participation of diverse social actors, for decision making and collaborative management of the MPAs.

#### **3.3.9.3. Institutional Framework and Governance**

Sustainability on institutional framework and governance issues is assessed as "Somewhat likely" (SL), in the sense that it poses moderate risks, in order to achieve project impact. The MINAE, has a Vice Ministry of Waters and Tides, which supports this initiative.

The country is considering a change of political vision towards marine issues, particularly MPAs, and the importance of governance processes for their design and effective management. There is evidence that SINAC with the support of the CRXS Program will continue the activities beyond the completion of the project. However, there is no sustainability strategy aimed at the implementation of executed activities and ongoing processes.

#### 3.3.9.4. **Environmental**

Sustainability in the "Environmental" focus is valued as "somewhat improbable" (SI), in the understanding that it represents significant risks, to achieve project impact, since it was not possible to declare the creation or expansion of the MPAs.

Despite the above, the project managed to build a political - technical - administrative platform that provides the conditions to facilitate this declaration. Thanks to the project there are scientific studies, discussion tables, strengthened local councils and financial instruments.

The project through its results can contribute in part to the sustainability of the MPAs. For this various challenges will have to be overcome which are related to: 1) weak management of the MPAs governance process; 2) financial resources for monitoring equipment; 3) continuity of actions with a process already set out; 4) the reinvestment of the income obtained in the PAs; 5) the institutionalization of the processes, technologies and instruments developed; and (6) adequate implementation of marine policy.

#### 4. LESSONS LEARNED

1. A design which despite presenting some limitations can allow outcome management strengthened through informal coordinating mechanisms, such as **COCO**, and adaptive management strategies.
2. State policies must be strong and effective in order to ensure that projects are sustained over time and that risks are reduced by encouraging the involvement of stakeholders for a serious and dignified commitment for all the stages of the project.
3. Those projects in which the diagnoses and strategic approaches to the achievement of results are successful and manage to be linked to the conceptual and strategic framework of the national initiatives of the associated entities; the programmatic proposals maintain, in the final stage, meaning and coherence with **GEF** policies of the **UNDP**, national policies, needs and national goals.
4. In projects with major challenges to face and relatively moderate budget, efficiency is a success factor with much weight for the success of the planned objectives. In this sense, the implementers and executors should insist on the implementation of results-based management models, adapted to governance issues and the needs of MPAs, as well as the use of appropriate management, monitoring and verification tools.
5. It has been interesting to define how effective participation from the Coordination and the Project Management Unit manages to makes its officials assume empowerment and awareness roles from the area to the communities, it is clear that being present from the first stage and providing a leading role to the community was a lesson learned in planning and implementation carried out in the length of the project.
6. The earlier community involvement is with the project and actions in conservation areas, the more clearly and timely the potential impacts will be identified in each of the sectors involved in the project.
7. Projects with a good quality in the design and an excellent quality in the implementation and management, there is a possibility that a high probability will be attained to achieve the expected impacts.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMENDATIONS

### CONCLUSIONS

1. The design is satisfactory, presenting logical links among the expected outcomes and the Project design, the Project strategy and the components correspond to the challenges and threats, election of international partners, and locally satisfactory, organized systematic structure; assumptions or risks associated to the relevance of the project in general terms, which despite having some shortcomings through its adaptive implementation and execution, allowed to strategically lead the project to achieve the results.
2. Highly satisfactory results we obtained, which represent an important bases for the contribution of the project to improve **SINAC** institutional and operational capacities for an improved approach aimed at more effective management and conservation of MPAs. Through different technologies and tools developed for the project, SINAC's capacities were strengthened for better management of the financial gap of the MPAs and financial sustainability of the country's Protected Areas System. There was also remarkable progress in governance to achieve greater ecological representation in the MPAs, however, new or expanded MPAs were not established within the project framework due to changes in national policies which was an aspect that the project could not control.
3. The Project was relevant (R), considering **UNDP's GEF** policies, policies, needs and national goals, specifically in the consolidation of the MPAs and the resolution of barriers for the management of the sites of conservation importance.
4. The level of efficiency was very satisfactory (VS). It surpassed governance issues, they took advantage of synergies with other initiatives to utilize resources efficiently and where managed to obtain results. It had an adaptive management with the goal of surpassing the weakness of the original design and the limiting conditions of the context, in order to meet the needs of the MPAs. The management and financial control systems and the execution tools and financial verification were adequate. The PIR were precise and accurate and responded to the requirements. The framework was used and action plans and annual budgets were developed. Appropriate monitoring for the execution and verification of outcome quality was provided.
5. Effectiveness was satisfactory (S), it was effective in reaching the outcomes, including reaching other outcomes that were not expected without requiring additional resources. Risk and assumption management was addressed with great capacity. NGOs, the private sector and other donors maintained and/or improved investment and support to the MPAs. Mitigation strategies developed resulted appropriate and effective in overcoming contingencies.

6. The probability that the Project outcomes will contribute to the expected impact of the consolidation of the Marine Protected Areas of Costa Rica is very high, on the understanding that from the results and initial effects achieved so far are implemented and maintained by the National System of Conservation Areas (**SINAC**).
7. In the present context the sustainability of the Project results in financial, social-political, institutional framework and governance issues, represent moderate risks, therefore it is valued as somewhat probable. Hence, sustainability in "Environmental" terms, which is valued as "Somewhat Improbable", given that without the declaration of creation or extension of the new MPAs, conservation of the importance or empty sites identified by **GRUAS II** cannot be guaranteed.

## RECOMENDATIONS

1. Future project designs should contemplate the identified positive elements, and strengthen the adaptive management. Also, reflect and strengthen further in the actual capacity of the project to influence the achievement of results, the time and resources required to obtain them, as well as the relevance and quality of indicators.
2. The establishment or expansion of new MPAs within the framework of the sites of conservation importance (conservation gaps identified by *Gruas II*), turns out to be the immediate priority within **MINAE** future actions. In this case, the support by political authorities will be fundamental to achieve the processes and resources necessary. For **SINAC**, it will be important to keep the linking mechanisms among actors and the articulation of the necessary resources to achieve it. The CA and the PA must manage actions to maintain links and basic activities with the existing participating entities at a regional and local level.
3. From the results obtained, various processes were established and various technologies and tools were developed; also new needs were generated. These elements should be resumed and linked to the planning tools of **SINAC**, CA and the MPAs.
4. Given that the execution consumed the project's resources and future results maintenance actions should be conducted, as well as continuity activities in the new scenario where there are high value outcomes, **SINAC** and other partners linked to the consolidation of the MPAs should establish a five-year plan that financially supports the Coordinating Committee's follow-up tasks of supporting the Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation and Marine Spatial Planning (**COCO**) and future actions.

5. Effectiveness shall be maintained in the following activities carried out in the MPAs. The challenges facing efforts require efficient and effective participation of communities
6. To achieve the desired Project impact on the consolidation of the Marine Protected Areas of Costa Rica, the following direct actions should be carried out, to facilitate the implementation and maintenance of results and initial effects achieved so far:

**The Marine Sector Agenda (2016-2021) for the Implementation of the National Ocean Policy Costa Rica (2013-2028). The Viceministry of Water, Oceans, Coasts and Wetlands, of the MINAE, must:**

5. Efficiently seek that the International Cooperation Agreements binding to the thematic; both at a national and international level, enable direct actions implemented in the short and medium term strengthen national capacities to achieve the anticipated impacts of the project.
6. Strategically manage regional efforts to address marine issues. For example, existing regional programs and projects in the region. This way processes can strengthen and consolidate actions in marine matters related to the expected impacts on MPAs. Thus, strengthening dialogue and exchange, while strengthening skills, policy alignment and harmonization of processes for the sustainability of the MPAs.
7. Analyze planning and governmental implementation programs, creating a tailored program designed to achieve the political goals raised in an organized manner that seek to efficiently and effectively summarize public political strategies. Thus, the Viceministry must establish the action guidelines by which the Public Institutions can articulate and generate impact indicators at a medium-term through technical cooperation, investment and capacity building projects selected for short and medium term. Also, the activities that the project (Barreritas) has generated are presented as profiles that will serve as a base for pre-investment studies.
8. Develop a conceptual and practical methodological approach of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), adequate to meeting the needs of the programs and existing projects, both for the agenda and politics. This requires that it transcends both national and regional levels. This monitoring proposal is intended to be carried out on an annual basis, a systematic review of every executed activity by the Environmental Area within the framework of this Plan. To this end, a brief description (Strategic guidelines, goals, action program and actions) of these sectoral activities is proposed. The aim is that, the description and compilation of all the partially executed activities within this framework, complemented by obtaining data from monitoring indicators offer an approach to a degree of compliance with the objectives and actions of the Plan under public policy.

**The SINAC Executive Secretariat must:**

5. Search for actions and positioning mechanisms to formalize the products generated by the Project in the conservation areas with the possibility of replicating successful experiences in the System.
6. Also, the Secretariat must try to strengthen coordination and control processes, toward and from its allies or collaborators, in active projects seeking efficiency and effectiveness of their long-term results.
7. Support the implementation and effectiveness of a **SPECIALIZED COMMISSION**, internally at **SINAC** on marine issues, among others, by improving data and capacity information management, knowledge, communication and networking at a national and regional level.
8. Strengthen the National Marine Coastal Program together with other links of the Conservation Areas, resuming its importance in the organization structure of the SINAC, as well as supporting more resources to improving the management of Marine Protected Areas.

**The Coordinating Committee for the assistance of the Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation and Marine Spatial Planning called COCO: must:**

3. To promote and articulate a coastal marine support Scientific Committee to SINAC to oversee marine-coastal issues.
4. Implement an Information System to capture and store information on the country's marine-coastal issues that provide sufficient elements to the decision makers. And additionally it is interoperable with other national and regional Systems, both nationally and regionally.

**On SINAC's National Training Program on Ecological Monitoring, must:**

4. Design and implement a social-environmental monitoring system, to regularly evaluate the condition of the marine sites and the social and economic impact from the different management strategies.
5. Following the adoption of the 6 Protocols developed by the Project, its application, replicability at a national level and its continued improvement should be ensured.
6. Based on the project experience developing other standardized protocols for making parameter information to generate comparable and complementary data, to serve for a working synergy between the various governmental and non-governmental

**On the Protocol for the Evaluation and Selection of Diving Sites in Marine Protected Areas of Costa Rica, the SINAC must** institutionalize the protocols provided by project, work on the exchange and dissemination of the information.

**On the proposal for new tariffs and updating of existing tariffs, SINAC** should strengthen capacities and implement a system of management, supervision, control and monitoring.

**On Business Plans and Non-Essential Services (Proposal for Non-Essential Concession Services, such as mechanisms for payment of ecosystem services), SINAC should:**

4. Define a monitoring strategy for the plans and concessions already in place. Rescuing lessons learned to move towards new future and necessary processes.
5. It is important to consider and complement a risks/threat plan of the environment and of external risks. A risk analysis based on organization, financial, legislation and market.
6. Evaluate and adjust its medium-term implementation.

**Regarding the Cooperation Mechanisms between SINAC and INCOPECSA. SINAC should:** systematize the experience on the success of inter-institutional work for capacity building and to narrow the work through synergies and that can serve as an example for other processes.

**On Local Governance Processes at the Sites of Importance for Marine Conservation at Barra del Colorado, Southern Caribbean and Southern Pacific. SINAC should:**

3. Create an adaptive management strategy and action plan to improve the effectiveness and quality of governance over time. Through participation, innovation and access to benefits.
4. Implement participative monitoring programs.

## 6. ANEXOS

### ANEXO No1. Documentos consultados

- ❖ SINAC. Informe de la coordinación del Proyecto Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica. SINAC– PNUD- GEF. Set. 2016.
- ❖ GEF. GEF Secretariat review for full/medium-sized projects. [http://gefpiims.undp.org/documents/1/g4259/g2\\_17429/3956-2011-06-15-164411-ReviewSheetforGEFProject.pdf](http://gefpiims.undp.org/documents/1/g4259/g2_17429/3956-2011-06-15-164411-ReviewSheetforGEFProject.pdf). Consultado 9/24/16.
- ❖ GEF. Revisión de Efectos Directos a Impactos (RoTI). ROTI Handbook 2009
- ❖ SINAC. V Informe Nacional al Convenio sobre Diversidad Biológica Costa Rica 30 abril 2014. Costa Rica: MINAE/SINAC, 2014.
- ❖ PNUD. Plan de acción para el Programa País entre el Gobierno de Costa Rica y el Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo para el periodo de cooperación 2013-2017. Costa Rica: PNUD, 2013.
- ❖ SINAC. Informe “Aplicación de la herramienta de evaluación del financiamiento y efectividad de manejo en diferentes Áreas marinas protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: SINAC/GEF/PNUD, 2016.
- ❖ DESPACHO CARVAJAL & COLEGIADOS. Auditoría externa correspondiente a los periodos de 2012, 2013 y 2014, al Proyecto 00078129 Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas en Costa Rica, (Award ID 00061616), 2015.
- ❖ Gestión de la Cooperación Internacional- Documentos MIDEPLAN.
- ❖ Plan de Acción del Plan Estratégico SINAC 2013-2018.
- ❖ Convenio sobre Diversidad Biológica.
- ❖ PNUD. 2011. Project Document. Consolidating Costa Rica’s Marine Protected Areas (MPA).
- ❖ Directriz Ministerial para la creación de nuevas Áreas Marino Protegidas (Oficio DM-475-2015)
- ❖ Agenda Marina Sectorial (2016- 2021) para la Implementación de la Política Nacional del Mar Costa Rica (2013- 2028).

- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la consultoría. Caracterización de los humedales marino costeros en el vacío de conservación Chira Tempisque Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.
- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la consultoría. Sistematización de la información sobre pesquerías y oceanografía en la parte interna del Golfo de Nicoya. Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.
- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la consultoría. Elaboración de estudios científicos marinos costeros básicos para Barra del Colorado. Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.
- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la consultoría. Elaboración de estudios científicos marinos costeros básicos para Gandoca. Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.
- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la consultoría. Evaluación de experiencias de colaboración y coordinación entre el SINAC y actores relevantes. Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016
- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la consultoría diseño y elaboración de un programa de capacitación en temas de planificación de áreas silvestres protegidas con componente marino, monitoreo ecológico marino y adaptación y mitigación para el cambio climático en áreas marinas y costeras. Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.
- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la consultoría. La elaboración de una estrategia de atención al vacío de conservación marino costero de Barra del Colorado. Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.

- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la consultoría. La elaboración de una estrategia de atención al vacío de conservación marino costero de Caribe Sur. Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.
  
- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la consultoría. La elaboración de una estrategia de atención para los vacíos de conservación marino costero de Dominical-Sierpe, Isla del Caño y Corcovado. Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.
  
- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la consultoría. Valoración económica de los servicios eco-sistémicos marinos que ofrecen las áreas silvestres protegidas con componente marino de playa Hermosa, Santa Rosa y Cahuita. Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.
  
- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la consultoría. Dirigida a empresas para facilitar la consolidación de un modelo de gobernanza para el sitio de importancia para la conservación marina en Barra del Colorado. Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.
  
- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la consultoría dirigida a empresas para facilitar la consolidación de un modelo de gobernanza para el sitio de importancia para la conservación marina en el Pacífico Sur. Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016
  
- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la Consultoría dirigida a un(a) Consultor (a) para la Implementación de la Política Nacional del Mar Costa Rica 2013-2028. Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.
  
- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la Consultoría dirigida a empresas para Fortalecer el Programa de Monitoreo Ecológico Marino (PROMEC) a escala local en el Parque Nacional Santa Rosa (Sector Marino) y Parque Nacional Cahuita. Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.

- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la Consultoría para facilitar un proceso de planificación para el desarrollo de una propuesta de apoyo local a través del manejo compartido para el Refugio Nacional de Vida Silvestre Playa Hermosa Punta Mala. Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.
- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la Consultoría. Análisis de las capturas de la raya látigo, *Dasyatis longa*, (Myliobatiformes: Dasyatidae) en las pesquerías artesanales de Golfo Dulce, Costa Rica. Proyecto “ Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.
- ❖ SINAC. Informe Final de la Consultoría documento para identificar acciones de mitigación y adaptación del cambio climático, tanto a nivel de biodiversidad como de políticas administrativas, aplicables a la realidad de las áreas marinas protegidas de Costa Rica, específicamente el Parque Nacional Santa Rosa, Cahuita y Playa Hermosa (Pacífico Central). Proyecto “Consolidación de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas de Costa Rica”. Costa Rica: Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, 2016.

## Anexo 2:

### Entrevistas e Instituciones consultadas

**Misión de Campo**  
**Evaluación Proyecto Consolidación de las áreas marinas protegidas del SINAC: Agosto**  
**–Setiembre 2016**

Sede/lugar	Entrevistados	Temas principales tratados en la entrevista
SINAC	Damián Martínez	Revisión general del Estado de las artes del Proyecto Programación de Misión Agosto
SINAC	Lesbia Sevilla	Cooperación Internacional Antecedentes del proyecto. Diseño
SINAC	Sandra Jiménez	Coordinación Institucional Proyecto Fortalecimiento Financiero SINAC
SINAC	Jenny Asch	Revisión general del Estado de las artes del Proyecto
SINAC	Damián Martínez	Coordinación del Proyecto Resultados Obtenidos Análisis de la gestión
SINAC	¿	Temas Legales Procedimientos Ley Biodiversidad Servicios No esenciales
Coordinador Programa Costa Rica por Siempre	Marco Vinicio Araya	
Asociación Costa Rica por Siempre	Pamela Castillo	Cofinanciamiento
MINAE(Viceministro aguas costas y humedales)	Fernando Mora	Agenda Marina y políticas marinas. Visión general del proyecto
Director de Cooperación del MINAE	Rubén Muñoz	Revisión de la historia del proyecto Análisis de productos logrados Papel del Punto Focal del FMAM y el proyecto

<b>Sede/lugar</b>	<b>Entrevistados</b>	<b>Temas principales tratados en la entrevista</b>
Oficial de Desarrollo Sostenible y Resiliencia del PNUD	Kifah Sasa	Visión de PNUD sobre el proyecto y su ejecución

Fuente : Elaboración propia, según trabajo de campo.

### Anexo No 3. Marco Lógico Comentado

<b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP:</b> Coordination and leadership of the environmental sector
<b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators:</b> Normative framework of the Ministry of the Environment and Energy reworked and institutional reform 100% completed
<b>Primary applicable Key Environment and Sustainable Development Key Result Area:</b> Biodiversity BD-1 (Improve sustainability of protected area systems), BD-2 (Mainstreaming biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes, seascapes and sectors)
<b>Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:</b> Build national and regional capacities and enabling conditions for global environmental protection and sustainable development.
<b>Applicable GEF Expected Outcomes:</b> <u>Outcome 1.1:</u> Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas. <u>Outcome 2.1:</u> Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.
<b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b> <u>Indicator 1.1:</u> Protected area management effectiveness score as recorded by Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool. <u>Indicator 2.1:</u> Landscapes and seascapes certified by internationally or nationally recognized environmental standards that incorporate biodiversity considerations (e.g. FSC, MSC) measured in hectares and recorded by GEF tracking tool.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions	Comentarios de la evaluación final
<b>Project objective:</b> To consolidate Costa	Total marine area (km <sup>2</sup> ) under protection within the MPAs	- 5,398.34	- 12,235.34	- Official gazette - GIS data and maps	- Political will exists for the creation of new	Indicador, riesgos y supuestos pertinentes.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions	Comentarios de la evaluación final
Rica's MPAs by increasing their ecological representation and ensuring their effective management and financial sustainability					MPAs and the expansion of existing MPAs	El indicador es logrado como producto de iniciativas anteriores p.e. El proyecto de conservación de la Isla del Coco, también financiado con fondos del GEF.
	Change in ecological representativeness (km <sup>2</sup> ) within ten coastal and marine sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Terrestrial: 465</li> <li>- Coastal (0-30m): 327</li> <li>- Neritic (30-200m): 859</li> <li>- Oceanic (&gt; 200m): 166</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Terrestrial: 872</li> <li>- Coastal (0-30m): 1,861</li> <li>- Neritic (30-200m): 5,331</li> <li>- Oceanic (&gt; 200m): 588</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GIS data and maps</li> <li>- Technical and scientific reports/publications</li> </ul>		<p>Indicador, riesgos y supuestos pertinentes.</p> <p>Efectivamente los cambios en las políticas para la creación o ampliación de la AMPs, afectaron el logro de este indicado</p> <p>.</p>
	Change in PA management effectiveness as measured by METT scores for eleven (11) MPAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Santa Rosa NP : 72.6%</li> <li>- Corcovado NP: 71.6%</li> <li>- Cahuita NP: 70.6%</li> <li>- Marino Ballena NP: 67.7%</li> <li>- Isla del Caño BR: 63.7%</li> <li>- Isla del Coco NP: 63.5%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Santa Rosa NP : 92.6%</li> <li>- Corcovado NP: 81.6%</li> <li>- Cahuita NP: 90.6%</li> <li>- Marino Ballena NP: 77.7%</li> <li>- Isla del Caño BR: 73.7%</li> <li>- Isla del Coco NP: 73.5%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- METT scorecards updated</li> <li>- Project evaluation reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continued government and non-government support for MPA management</li> </ul>	<p>Indicador, riesgos y supuestos pertinentes.</p> <p>No obstante, el resultado y su medición es factible en el mediano plazo, para lograr observar os cambios generados por el proyecto. Las estimaciones a través del METT,</p>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions	Comentarios de la evaluación final
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gandoca – Manzanillo NWR: 55.9%</li> <li>- Playa Hermosa NWR: 54.9%</li> <li>- Cabo Blanco NR: 54.9%</li> <li>- Marino Las Baulas NP: 52.0%</li> <li>- Terraba Sierpe NW: 47.1%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gandoca – Manzanillo NWR: 75.9%</li> <li>- Playa Hermosa NWR: 74.9%</li> <li>- Cabo Blanco NR: 74.9%</li> <li>- Marino Las Baulas NP: 72.0%</li> <li>- Terraba Sierpe NW: 67.1%</li> </ul>			<p>requieren de una preparación de las APs en su conjunto y de la capacitación del personal responsable de su estimación.</p> <p>Según las estimaciones el PN Santa Rosa y el PN Cahuita desmejoran en este indicador y Santa Rosa mejora. Para los dos primeros do casos se debe revisar sobre la calidad de la estimación</p>
	Increase in MPAs' financial capabilities according to the average total score established in the UNDP/GEF Financial Sustainability Scorecard (FSS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legal and regulatory framework: 19.2%</li> <li>- Business planning: 9.8%</li> <li>- Tools for generating income: 15.8%</li> <li>- Total: 15.3%.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legal and regulatory framework: 39.2%</li> <li>- Business planning: 29.8%</li> <li>- Tools for generating income: 35.8%</li> <li>- Total: 35.3%</li> </ul>	- FSS updated	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stable national and international economic conditions</li> <li>- Willingness within the GoCR to increase funding for MPAs</li> <li>- NGOs, private sector, and other donors maintain and/or improve investment and support for MPAs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Indicador, riesgos y supuestos pertinentes.</li> <li>- No obstante, el resultado y su medición es factible en el mediano plazo, para lograr observar los cambios generados por el proyecto</li> </ul>

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions	Comentarios de la evaluación final
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Strengthened institutional framework and improved individual capacity for effective MPA management	Improvement in capacity development indicators for key stakeholders as per UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard: 85 MPA/SINAC officials trained in the development of management plans for MPAs marine ecological monitoring, and CC impact mitigation and adaptation (baseline and target to be defined during the first 6 months of the project)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capacities for engagement: X</li> <li>- Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge: X</li> <li>- Capacities for management and implementation: X</li> <li>- Capacities to monitor and evaluate: X</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capacities for engagement: X</li> <li>- Capacities to generate, access and use information and knowledge: X</li> <li>- Capacities for management and implementation: X</li> <li>- Capacities to monitor and evaluate: X</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Capacity Development Scorecard update</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Willingness of national institutions to improve cooperation and exchange of information and knowledge</li> <li>- Willingness of SINAC staff to participate in training</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Indicador, riesgos y supuestos pertinentes.</li> <li>- El resultado es positivo , las capacidades son mejoradas</li> </ul>
	Change in management effectiveness for three (3) MPAs as a result of participatory management actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Santa Rosa NP: 72.6%</li> <li>- Cahuita NP: 70.6%</li> <li>- Playa Hermosa NWR Refuge: 54.9%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Santa Rosa NP: 92.6%</li> <li>- Cahuita NP: 90.6%</li> <li>- Playa Hermosa NWR: 74.9%</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- METT scorecards for three pilot MPAs</li> <li>- Project evaluation reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Indicador, riesgos y supuestos pertinentes.</li> <li>- No obstante, el resultado y su medición es factible en el mediano plazo, para lograr observar os cambios generados por el proyecto</li> <li>- Según las estimaciones el PN Santa Rosa y el PN Cahuita desmejoran en este indicador y Santa Rosa mejora. Para los dos primeros dos casos se debe revisar sobre la calidad de la estimación</li> </ul>	

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions	Comentarios de la evaluación final
	CC mitigation and adaptation strategy for MPAs	– Zero (0)	– One (1) strategy implemented in 3 MPAs (i.e., Santa Rosa NP, Cahuita NP, and Playa Hermosa NWR) by year three.	– Strategy document – National Council of Conservation Areas (CONAC) Agreement approving the strategy		– Resultado logrado – Indicador pertinente.
<b>Outputs:</b>						
<p>1.1. Inter-institutional coordination tools within the General Cooperation Agreements (INCOPECSA, the SNG, and the ICT) allow the strengthening of coordination and consulting among the SINAC and agencies dealing with fishing, control and protection, and tourism, as part of the NMS of Costa Rica.</p> <p>1.2. A communication and information strategy promotes awareness among policy- and decision-makers regarding marine conservation, MPAs, and sustainable resource use.</p> <p>1.3. Officials from MPAs and the PNMC are trained in the development of management plans for MPAs marine ecological monitoring, and CC impact mitigation and adaptation.</p> <p>1.4. Participatory management arrangements in three (3) existing MPAs increase management effectiveness by 20%.</p> <p>1.5. CC mitigation and management adaptation strategy for MPAs.</p>						
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Increased and diversified funding for MPAs	Change in total annual central government budget allocated to MPA management	– \$614,476/yr (2009)	– \$780,517/yr (2014) /yr (increase of up to 21.3%)	– Budget appropriations – Annual financial and expense reports – Financial Sustainability Scorecard update	– The GoCR has the will to increase budgetary allocation for the MPAs – Stable national and international economic conditions – A registry of the private funding sources for the terrestrial or marine component exists	Indicador, no pertinente. El SINAC y el proyecto no tienen control sobre esta variable.  Se supera el valor del indicador esperado hasta en un 300%.
	Change in the amount of financial resources received annually from private sources for the MPAs	– \$964,305/yr (2009) (indicate by source)	– \$1,919,702/yr (increase of up to 99%)	– Letters/agreements of financial commitment – Budgetary and accounting registries/databases – Financial Sustainability Scorecard update		Indicador, no pertinente. El SINAC y el proyecto no tienen control sobre esta variable.  Se triplica hasta en un 300% el valor esperado para el indicador al

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions	Comentarios de la evaluación final
						finalizar el proyecto.
	Change in the financial gap to cover basic costs of management and investments of the MPAs	- \$6,775,877 (2009)	- \$5,775,877 (14.8% reduction in the financial gap in existing MPAs)	- Financial Sustainability Scorecard update - Annual financial statements - Project M&E reports		Indicador, no pertinente. El SINAC y el proyecto no tienen control sobre esta variable. Se logra reducir la brecha financiera en cerca de un 20% menos de lo esperado al finalizar el proyecto.
	Number of business plans for the MPAs	- Zero (0)	- Three (3) approved by year 2	- Business plan documents - Databases with MPAs' financial information	- Prioritization of the MPAs available	Indicador, riesgos y supuestos pertinentes. El indicador fue cumplido
	Number of proposals for implementing PES schemes in MPAs	- Zero (0)	- Three (3)	- Ecosystem services valuation document - Databases with economic valuation information - Draft of proposals	- Selection of MPAs by SINAC and the Costa Rica Forever Project is made available - Timely and reliable information exists	Indicador, riesgos y supuestos pertinentes. El indicador fue cumplido
<p><b>Outputs:</b></p> <p>2.1. MPA Trust Fund for FCR is consolidated.</p> <p>2.2. Normative and operational guidelines are defined for the allocation of financial resources for the PNMC.</p> <p>2.3. Visitors' fee proposal updates MPAs' fees based on management category, visitor profile, and type of service provided.</p> <p>2.4. Business plans for three existing MPAs developed.</p> <p>2.5. Economic valuation of MPAs' ecosystem services provides information for increased funding for three MPAs.</p>						

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions	Comentarios de la evaluación final
Outcome 3: Expanded MPA coverage for improved ecological representation	Number of nests per breeding season for the Olive Ridley turtle ( <i>Lepidochelys olivacea</i> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Playa Hermosa NWR: 500 nests</li> <li>Santa Rosa NP: 10,000 nests on average per month during the “arribada” months and 150 during the “non-arribada” months.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Playa Hermosa NWR: 500 nests</li> <li>Santa Rosa NP: 10,000 nests on average per month during the “arribada” months and 150 during the “non-arribada” months.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field surveys and inventories</li> <li>Monitoring databases</li> <li>Project technical reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sampling efforts are optimal.</li> <li>Environmental changes (including CC) within their natural variability</li> </ul>	Indicador, no pertinente. El SINAC y el proyecto no tienen control sobre esta variable. Además, el presupuesto del proyecto no contempla recursos para su estimación. No se alcanzó el valor del indicador
	Number of neonates of the hawksbill sea turtle ( <i>Erectmochelys imbricata</i> ) that safely reach the ocean	– 5,000	– 5,000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Field surveys and inventories</li> <li>Monitoring databases</li> <li>Project technical reports</li> </ul>		Indicador, no pertinente. El SINAC y el proyecto no tienen control sobre esta variable. Además, el presupuesto del proyecto no contempla recursos para su estimación. Se superó el valor del indicador .

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions	Comentarios de la evaluación final
	Change in coral coverage (live)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Santa Rosa NP: 71% (estimated for 1994; baseline will be confirmed during the first 6 months of the project)</li> <li>- Cahuita NP: 15% (estimated for 2008)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Santa Rosa NP: 71% (estimated for 1994)</li> <li>- Cahuita NP: 15% (estimated for 2008)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Field surveys and inventories</li> <li>- Monitoring databases</li> <li>- Project technical reports</li> </ul>		Indicador, no pertinente. El SINAC y el proyecto no tienen control sobre esta variable. Además, el presupuesto del proyecto no contempla recursos para su estimación. Logrado para Cahuita, pero no para Santa Rosa.
	Change in biomass of seagrass ( <i>Thalassia testudinum</i> ) (g/m <sup>2</sup> )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cahuita NP: 737.5 g/m<sup>2</sup> (estimated for 2005)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cahuita NP: 737.5 g/m<sup>2</sup> (estimated for 2005)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Field surveys and inventories</li> <li>- Monitoring databases</li> <li>- Project technical reports</li> </ul>		Indicador, no pertinente. El SINAC y el proyecto no tienen control sobre esta variable. Además, el presupuesto del proyecto no contempla recursos para su estimación. Indicador superado.
	Change in area of key ecosystems protected by MPAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Estuary: 8,979 ha</li> <li>- Mangrove: 20,154 ha</li> <li>- Coastal lagoon: 40 ha</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Estuary: 10,634 ha</li> <li>- Mangrove: 35,281 ha</li> <li>- Coastal lagoon: 40 ha</li> <li>- Seagrass: 320 ha</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remote sensing data and maps</li> <li>- Field verification data and notes</li> <li>- Project technical reports</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Political will exists for the creation of new MPAs and the expansion of existing MPAs</li> </ul>	Indicador, riesgos y supuestos pertinentes.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions	Comentarios de la evaluación final
		– Seagrass: 120 ha – Coral reef: 110 ha – Intertidal zone: 10 ha – Upwelling: 2,880 ha – Rocky beach: 37 km – Sandy beach: 131 km – Coastal cliff: 96 km – Mud sea bottom: 755 ha – Sand sea bottom: 284 ha – Hard sea bottom: 31 ha – Soft sea bottom: 161 ha	– Coral reef: 490 ha – Intertidal zone: 230 ha – Upwelling: 13,550 ha – Rocky beach: 62 km – Sandy beach: 269 km – Coastal cliff: 327 km – Mud sea bottom: 4,263 ha – Sand sea bottom: 1,524 ha – Hard sea bottom: 155 ha – Soft sea bottom: 560 ha	– GEF Tracking Tool update		
	Number MPAs expanded/created	– Zero (0)	– 10 MPAs expanded/created (number of expanded and created MPAs will be defined during the first six months of project implementation)	– MPA proposals for expansion and/or creation – Official gazette		Indicador, riesgos y supuestos pertinentes. No se logró el indicador
	Number of updated management plans for the MPAs in accordance with 10 priority sites	– Zero (0)	– Eleven (11)	– Approved management plans		Indicador, riesgos y supuestos pertinentes. No se logró el indicador
<b>Outputs:</b> 3.1. Ten (10) expanded and/or created MPAs are gazetted. 3.2. Management plans for expanded and/or newly created MPAs are develop and published.						

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Verification Mechanisms	Risks and Assumptions	Comentarios de la evaluación final
3.3.	Marine ecology monitoring strategy is developed and articulated with the Costa Rica's Ecological Monitoring of Protected Areas and Biological Corridors (PROMEC-CR).					

## Anexo No 4 Estrategia del proyecto

<b>Componentes</b>		
C1. Fortalecido el marco institucional y capacidad individual para el manejo efectivo de las áreas marinas protegidas	C2. Incrementado y diversificado los fondos para las áreas marinas protegidas	C3 Expandida la cobertura de las áreas marinas protegidas para mejorar la representación ecológica
<b>Resultados</b>		
R1.1. Fortalecida la coordinación y consulta entre SINAC y agencias involucradas con pesca y turismo, mediante herramientas de coordinación interinstitucional dentro del acuerdo de cooperación general como parte de la estrategia nacional marina	R2.1 Consolidado el Fidecomiso para áreas marinas protegidas del Programa Costa Rica Por Siempre	R3.1 Expandidas y/o creadas 10 Áreas Marinas Protegidas
R1.2 Elaborada una estrategia de comunicación e información que promueve la concientización entre tomadores de decisiones con respecto a la conservación marina Áreas Marinas Protegidas y uso sostenible de los recursos.	R2.2 Definida la guía normativa y operacional para la asignación y distribución de recursos financieros para el Programa Marino Costero	R3.2 Planes de manejo desarrollados para las nuevas áreas marinas protegidas

<b>Componentes</b>		
C1. Fortalecido el marco institucional y capacidad individual para el manejo efectivo de las áreas marinas protegidas	C2. Incrementado y diversificado los fondos para las áreas marinas protegidas	C3 Expandida la cobertura de las áreas marinas protegidas para mejorar la representación ecológica
R1.3 Entrenados oficiales de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas y el Programa Marino Costero para el desarrollo de planes de manejo para el monitoreo ecológico marino de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas, mitigación y adaptación del cambio climático	R2.3 Actualizada la propuesta de cobro de tarifa a visitantes en las áreas marinas protegidas basado en la categoría de manejo, perfil de visitante y tipo de servicio provisto	R3.3 Desarrollada y articulada la estrategia de monitoreo ecológico con el PRONAMEC
R1.4 Incrementado un 20% la efectividad de manejo en las áreas silvestres protegidas de Cahuita, Hermosa y Santa Rosa mediante manejo compartido.	R2.4 Desarrollados tres planes de negocio para las áreas marinas protegidas existentes	
R5 Elaborada la estrategia de manejo de adaptación y mitigación al cambio climático para áreas marinas protegidas	R5 Elaborada una valoración económica de los servicios ecosistémicos de las áreas marinas protegidas que provean información para incrementar los fondos de tres AMPs.	

## Anexo No 5 Análisis RoTI de los resultados del proyecto

Salidas	Resultados	Puntaje del resultado	Estado Intermedio	Puntaje de IS	Impacto	Puntaje del impacto	Promedio
	R1.1. Fortalecida la coordinación y consulta entre SINAC y agencias involucradas con pesca y turismo, mediante herramientas de coordinación interinstitucional dentro del acuerdo de cooperación general como parte de la estrategia nacional marina	B	La política marina es implementada efectivamente con la participación de los actores	B	+	BB	+BB
	R1.2 Elaborada una estrategia de comunicación e información que promueve la concientización entre tomadores de decisiones con respecto a la conservación marina Áreas Marinas Protegidas y uso sostenible de los recursos.	B	Posicionamiento del tema merino y el empoderamientos de la sociedad civil	B	+	BB	+BB
	R1.3 Entrenados oficiales de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas y el Programa Marino Costero para el desarrollo de planes de manejo para el monitoreo	B	Información de los monitoreos ecológicos facilitan la toma de decisiones sobre las AMPS	A	+	BA	+BA

	ecológico marino de las Áreas Marinas Protegidas, mitigación y adaptación del cambio climático						
	R1.4 Incrementado un 20% la efectividad de manejo en las áreas silvestres protegidas de Cahuita, Hermosa y Santa Rosa mediante manejo compartido.	D	Una gestión más efectiva de las AMPS y sus recursos	B	+	DB	+DB
	R5 Elaborada la estrategia de manejo de adaptación y mitigación al cambio climático para áreas marinas protegidas	B	Se toman medidas en las AMPs para la mitigación del CC	B	+	BB	+BB
	R2.1 Consolidado el Fidecomiso para áreas marinas protegidas del Programa Costa Rica Por Siempre	B	Financiamiento sostenido de las AMPS	A	+	BA	+BA
	R2.2 Definida la guía normativa y operacional para la asignación y distribución de recursos financieros para el Programa Marino Costero	B	Mejoramiento de la gestión financieras de las AMPs	A	+	BA	+BA
	R2.3 Actualizada la propuesta de cobro de tarifa a visitantes en las áreas marinas protegidas basado en la categoría de	B	Mejorados los ingresos generados por las AMPs.	A	+	BA	+BA

	manejo, perfil de visitante y tipo de servicio provisto						
	R2.4 Desarrollados tres planes de negocio para las áreas marinas protegidas existentes	B	Mejorados los ingresos generados por las AMPs.	A	+	BA	+BA
	R5 Elaborada una valoración económica de los servicios ecosistémicos de las áreas marinas protegidas que provean información para incrementar los fondos de tres AMPs.	B	Mejorados los ingresos generados por las AMPs.	B	+	BB	+BB
	R3.1 Expandidas y/o creadas 10 Áreas Marinas Protegidas	D	Adecuada representación y gestión de sitios de importancia	B	+	DB	+DB
	R3.2 Planes de manejo desarrollados para las nuevas áreas marinas protegidas	B	Adecuada representación y gestión de sitios de importancia	B	+	BB	+BB
	R3.3 Desarrollada y articulada la estrategia de monitoreo ecológico con el PRONAMEC	B	Toma de decisiones sobre las AMPs basadas en la evidencia	A	+	BA	+BA

Fuente: Elaboración propia

