

PROMOTING ECOTOURISM TO STRENGTHEN THE FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY OF THE GUATEMALAN PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM (SIGAP)

**PROMOVIENDO EL ECOTURISMO PARA FORTALECER
LA SOSTENIBILIDAD FINANCIERA DEL
SISTEMA GUATEMALTECO DE ÁREAS PROTEGIDAS (SIGAP)**



PRM Todos Santos Cuchumatán

TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Sílvia R. Ziller, Forester, M.Sc. Dr.
International Evaluator

OCTOBER 27, 2017

SUMMARY

Title of project supported by the UNDP and financed by GEF	i
Executive summary.....	ii
Project summary table	ii
Brief description of project.....	iii
Evaluation ratings table	iii
Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned	iv
1 General conclusions.....	iv
2 Conclusions and recommendations on the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project	iv
Conclusions on project design	iv
Recommendations on project design	iv
Conclusions on project implementation.....	iv
Recommendations on project implementation	iv
Conclusions on monitoring and evaluation	v
Recommendations on monitoring and evaluation	v
3 Conclusions and recommendations to follow-up or reinforce initial benefits from the project .. v	
Conclusions.....	v
Recommendations.....	v
4 Conclusions and recommendations for future directions underlining main objectives	vi
Conclusions.....	vi
Recommendations.....	vi
5 Summary of best and worst practices	vi
Best practices	vi
Worst practices.....	vii
6 Summary of lessons learned.....	vii
Abbreviations and acronyms.....	viii
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Purpose of the evaluation	1
1.2 Scope and methodology	1
1.2.1 Revision of documents and inception report	1
1.2.2 Mission to Guatemala: information gathering, interviews and field visits	2
1.2.3 Information analysis, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.....	2
1.2.4 Final reports in Spanish and English	3
1.3 structure of the evaluation report.....	3
2 Project description and development context.....	4
2.1 Project start and duration.....	4
2.2 Problems the project sought to address.....	4
2.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project	4
2.4 baseline indicators established.....	5
2.5 Main stakeholders	5
2.6 Expected results.....	5

3 Findings	7
3.1 Project design / formulation.....	7
3.1.1 Analysis of Logical Framework.....	7
3.1.2 Assumptions and risks	8
3.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects	8
3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation.....	9
3.1.5 Replication approach	10
3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage.....	10
3.1.7 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector.....	11
3.1.8 Management arrangements.....	12
3.2 Project implementation.....	13
3.2.1 Adaptive management	13
3.2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation: design at entry and implementation *.....	15
3.2.3 Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.....	16
3.2.4 Partnership arrangements	17
3.2.5 Project finance	17
3.2.6 UNDP and Implementing partner implementation*, coordination and operational issues.....	22
3.3 Project results	23
3.3.1 Overall results (attainment of objectives) *	23
Result 1	23
Result 2	25
Analysis of Logical Framework.....	26
3.3.2 Relevance *	32
3.3.3 Effectiveness and efficiency *	32
Effectiveness.....	32
Efficiency	33
3.3.4 Country ownership	34
3.3.5 Mainstreaming.....	35
3.3.6 Sustainability *	37
Financial sustainability.....	38
Socioeconomic sustainability.....	38
Sustainability of institutional framework and governance.....	39
Environmental sustainability	40
3.3.7 Catalytic role	40
3.3.8 Impact.....	42
4 Conclusions, recommendations and lessons.....	45
4.1 General conclusions.....	45
4.2 Conclusions and recommendations on the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project	45
Conclusions on project design	45
Recommendations on project design	45
Conclusions on project implementation.....	46
Recommendations on project implementation.....	46
Conclusions on monitoring and evaluation	46
Recommendations on monitoring and evaluation	47

4.3 Conclusions and recommendations to follow-up or reinforce initial benefits from the project.....	47
Conclusions.....	47
Recommendations.....	47
4.4 Conclusions and recommendations for future directions underlining main objectives	48
Conclusions.....	48
Recommendations.....	48
4.5 Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success	49
Best practices.....	49
Worst practices.....	50
4.6 Lessons learned	50
5 Annexes	53
5.1 Evaluation consultant code of conduct agreement form	54
5.2 Evaluation criteria matrix from Tor (Spanish).....	55
5.3 Terminal evaluation terms of reference (Spanish)	59
5.4 Questionnaire used and summary of results.....	67
5.5 List of documents reviewed.....	73
5.6 Travel itinerary.....	75
5.7 List of persons interviewed.....	76
5.8 Summary of field visits.....	79
5.9 Newspaper article published during the mission to Guatemala.....	81
5.10 Summary table of Management Effectiveness (METT) analysis.....	83

TITLE OF PROJECT SUPPORTED BY THE UNDP AND FINANCED BY GEF

“PROMOTING ECOTOURISM TO STRENGTHEN THE FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY OF THE GUATEMALAN PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM (SIGAP)”

UNDP Output ID: 81367

PIMS N°: 3374

GEFSEC ID: 4191

Evaluation period: August – October 2017

Date of Terminal Evaluation report: 27 October 2017

Region and countries included: Guatemala

GEF Operational Program: Biodiversity

Stakeholders and other partners: CONAP – Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas

Evaluation team: Silvia R. Ziller, international consultant

Acknowledgements: The UNDP Office in Guatemala City was key in supporting and providing guidance and information for the development of this terminal evaluation and for facilitating meetings with the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor and the GEF Focal Point; the Project Management Unit organized all the logistics of travel to project sites and meetings for data collection; the authorities and technical staff were very generous in allowing me time for consulting with them about the project and their impressions, experience and activities. I would like to thank INGUAT representatives and private sector entrepreneurs for having received me and reported their experience with the project. The Coordinator Alejandro Calvente accompanied me to all project sites and meetings to introduce the evaluation process and could not have been more dedicated in providing information, documents and clarifications throughout the evaluation process. I would like to thank all the people who contributed time and information to the evaluation, especially those who are only indirectly participating in project activities, such as tour operators and beneficiaries of the Impulsa Program. I thank all the people interviewed for their honesty and openness, which have facilitated the evaluation process, ensured transparency and allowed me to draw potentially useful conclusions and recommendations for future projects.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project title:	Promoting ecotourism to strengthen the financial sustainability of the Guatemalan Protected Area System (SIGAP)			
GEFSEC Project identification number:	4191		<i>Committed at the moment of project approval by GEF (Millions of US Dollars USD)</i>	<i>At the end of project (Millions of US Dollars USD)</i>
UNDP Project identification number:	81367 / PIMS N° 3374	GEF financing:	1,295,455	1,295,455
Country:	Guatemala	UNDP support:	0	0
Region:	Latin America and the Caribbean	Government support:	1,050,000	1,097,854.87
GEF Focal area:	Biodiversity	Other stakeholders:	971,851.79	2,390,021.82
GEF focal area objectives (Operational program/ Strategic Priority):	GEF 4 BD-SP1 Financing; BD-SP3 PA Networks	Total co-financing:	2,021,851.79	3,575,073.56
Executing agency:	National Protected Area Council (CONAP)	Project total cost:	3,317,306.79	4,783,331.69
Other stakeholders:	Instituto Guatemalteco de Turismo (INGUAT); Municipalidades de Sibinal, Todos Santos Cuchumatán, San Marcos, San Pedro y Santiago Atitlán; Asociación de Agricultores Ecológicos (ASAECO); Asociación Agropecuaria y Artesanal para el Desarrollo La Guadalupeana; Ministerio de Economía (MINECO); Ministerio de Cultura (MICUDE); ONGs (Helvetas, TNC, Rainforest Alliance, FCG, Asociación Vivamos Mejor, FUNDAECO).	Project Document signature (Project start date):		22-Jan-2013
		(Operational) Project end date:	End date at beginning of project: 22-Jan-2017	End date after extension: 31-Oct-2017

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

The overall aim of the project is to contribute to the conservation of biological diversity of global importance in Guatemala. The objective is to strengthen the financial sustainability of the Guatemalan Protected Area System (SIGAP) by developing new financial mechanisms in the tourism industry while ensuring that the objectives of ecotourism are aligned with those of environmental conservation.

In order to fulfill these objectives, the following operational strategies were designed: (i) review and strengthen legal regulations at the national level to develop ecotourism as part of a strategy to promote the sustainability of the Guatemalan Protected Area System (SIGAP); (ii) improve the institutional framework to manage ecotourism in protected areas, including a pilot program for implementing ecotourism in seven protected areas in the Western Highlands; (iii) strengthen institutional capacity at the national, municipal and local levels in protected area management.

The expected results have all been achieved. The legal and institutional frameworks were improved to favor the development of ecotourism, and an alliance between CONAP and the Guatemalan National Tourism Institute (INGUAT) involving the private sector was consolidated. Documents and guides for the application of legal regulations, management, public use, and business plans were developed for the seven protected areas in the pilot program. A proposal to harmonize legal documents and regulations was produced to consolidate a reference framework for the development of tourism based on environmental sustainability criteria. This legacy has started to be applied in the seven pilot areas, but extends to the entire SIGAP and will serve as a model for future projects in Guatemala and beyond.

EVALUATION RATINGS TABLE

Criteria:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	Rating	2. IA and EA execution:	Rating
Overall quality of M&E	S	Implementing Agency execution - UNDP	HS
M&E design at project startup	S	Executing Agency execution - CONAP	HS
M&E plan implementation	HS	Overall quality of project implementation/execution:	HS
3. Outcomes		4. Sustainability	
Overall quality of project outcomes	HS	Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability	ML
Relevance	R	Financial resources	L
Efectiveness	HS	Socio-economic	ML
Efficiency	S	Institutional framework and governance	L
5. Impact		Environmental	L
Environmental status improvement	M		
Environmental stress reduction	M		
Progress towards stress/status change	M	6. Overall project results	S

Note: Ratings are: Highly Unsatisfactory (HI), Unsatisfactory (U), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Satisfactory (S) and Highly Satisfactory (HS).

Relevance ratings are: Relevant (R) or Not Relevant (NR).

Sustainability ratings are: Unlikely (U), Moderately Unlikely (MU), Moderately Likely (ML) and Likely (L).

Impact ratings are: Significant (S), Minimal (M) and Negligible (N).

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

1 General conclusions

The general objective of the project was achieved because the financial sustainability of SIGAP was effectively strengthened by the establishment of new financial mechanisms and ways of promoting ecotourism in Guatemala in alignment with the conservation of biodiversity of global importance.

Result 1 was fully achieved and left an array of policies, regulations and additional products (manuals, guides, regulations, a proposal for harmonizing other legal documents) that consolidate an important base for the development of tourism in Guatemala.

Although **Result 2** only partially achieved some of the indicator goals in the logical framework, as these were dependent upon external cooperation, the accomplishment and products generated are considered excellent. Among the products are 21 plans for the seven pilot protected areas which are being implemented and serve as reference for the entire SIGAP and beyond.

2 Conclusions and recommendations on the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project

Conclusions on project design

The lack of written memory and register of decisions made in the design phase of the project required adaptations and corrections during implementation, but did not jeopardize the achievement of results.

Recommendations on project design

- (1) **Compile a registry of references used in project design and compare activities with existing projects to avoid duplication of efforts.** Especially register the data used to define the baseline of indicators and other information that supports project goals.
- (2) **Identify needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries during project design and include funds to support feasible activities in the budget.** Even if modest investments are made, supporting the development of activities of special interest increases cooperation with project activities and goals.

Conclusions on project implementation

Project implementation was considered Highly Satisfactory (HS), especially considering the need for adaptive management in recalculating indicator baselines, reduction of CONAP personnel due to budgetary losses and political instability. The coordination between CONAP and the UNDP on operational issues was considered Highly Satisfactory (HS). No major issues that would have required an intervention from the UNDP at higher levels occurred during project implementation.

Recommendations on project implementation

- (3) **Projects must invest efforts and resources in establishing institutional cooperation** in order to share benefits as well as responsibilities for the sustainability of activities. The goals of this project were achieved mainly through cooperation agreements with relevant partners, which compensated for political instability and institutional difficulties.

Conclusions on monitoring and evaluation

Project monitoring and evaluation used all tools available except for co-financing activities and values, which ended with an incomplete follow-up.

Monitoring and evaluation were considered Satisfactory (S). The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan was satisfactorily designed. Although a specific M&E plan was not developed beyond what is described in the PRODOC, several mechanisms were in place. Apart from the Coordinator's routine responsibilities, quarterly meetings with the UNDP and one annual meeting of the tripartite commission were held. GEF monitoring instruments were thoroughly used: AOP, QPR, PIR, annual reports, reports on steering committee and co-financing partner meetings, as well as the Tracking Tools for Institutional Capacity, Financial Sustainability and Management Effectiveness (METT).

The lack of written memory and register of decisions made in the design phase of the project required adaptations and corrections during implementation, but did not jeopardize the achievement of results. Follow up of cofinancing activities was not satisfactory mainly due to a specific context of the project. Due to the time elapsed between project design in 2010 and start in 2013, part of the plans for the joint implementation of activities were lost, as organizations implemented their projects before the project started. This was compensated by instating other partner organizations. Although the activities of co-financing partners contribute to the general project objective and were implemented in the same region, most of these were not directly linked to specific project objectives.

Recommendations on monitoring and evaluation

(4) Ensure follow up of partner co-financing commitments.

3 Conclusions and recommendations to follow-up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

Conclusions

The replication potential of the main project activities is ensured by the vast reference documentation developed and available. The project is mostly at the **replication level**, as policies and regulations are approved to support the development of ecotourism in Guatemala. These legal documents ensure the replication of benefits applied to the seven pilot protected areas to other areas within SIGAP and can be used as models for similar legislation in other countries where ecotourism is a development priority.

The sustainability of the most relevant project activities and products is sufficiently ensured to promote the development of ecotourism in Guatemala. Formal agreements that ensure the continuity of project results and, in many cases, assure financial sustainability were signed: Impulsa Program (CONAP, INGUAT), Q-Green Certification Program (CONAP, INGUAT, Ministry of Culture and Sports), and Monitoring Program (CONAP, municipalities and community associations managing pilot protected areas).

Recommendations

(5) CONAP and INGUAT must ensure continuity of the development of ecotourism with sustainability criteria in Guatemala and apply the products generated by this project throughout SIGAP, expanding biological monitoring and the monitoring of impacts from tourist visitation.

CONAP must develop an online tool for the calculation of visitor entry fees based on operational costs of protected areas so it is widely available to SIGAP and beyond Guatemala.

- (6) CONAP technical staff must **follow up and support the implementation of management plans, public use and business plans in the pilot protected areas benefitted by the project, including biological monitoring and monitoring of impacts from tourist visitation.**
- (7) **CONAP must define a continued capacity building strategy** with support from people who were capacitated as facilitators through this project to ensure the maintenance and increase of technical capacity at the regional level.

4 Conclusions and recommendations for future directions underlining main objectives

Conclusions

The project consolidated the legal and institutional frameworks for the development of ecotourism in Guatemala. More concrete results will be visible as policies, regulations and models of public use and business plans are extended to other protected areas within SIGAP.

The lack of professional experts in sustainable tourism is a relevant limitation in Guatemala.

The loss of technical staff by institutions due to political changes negatively affects the continuity of activities initiated through projects and contributes to the loss of capacity improved through project workshops.

Recommendations

- (8) **CONAP should reconsider the complexity of approval of legal and technical documents** such as management plans and public use plans, which have to be submitted to repeated analysis at different institutional levels that take long and cause delays in the implementation of projects.
- (9) **INGUAT should consider offering second time participants in the Impulsa Program private tutoring instead of generic capacity building.** Beneficiaries are interested in having support to develop specific issues in their businesses.
- (10) **CONAP and INGUAT must design and disseminate more tourist destinations that include protected areas** to promote visitation and support the development of ecotourism.
- (11) **An effort to regulate access of tour operators to protected areas through CONAP is important** to avoid unregistered services without adequate safety conditions and qualified guides for tourists.
- (12) **As possible, CONAP should hire tourism experts for the Regional Offices** to promote the development of tourism activities with sustainability criteria and social participation.
- (13) Future projects must **secure strong involvement of NGOs and research / education institutions** for ownership of project knowledge and products as well as sustainability.

5 Summary of best and worst practices

Best practices

Consolidating ecotourism in the agenda of CONAP, associations and municipalities as a financial mechanism for the maintenance of protected areas and the conservation of biological diversity.

Promoting tourism with sustainability criteria including monitoring of biological indicators and impacts from visitation as essential components to prevent the degradation of natural conditions and generate data.

Involving the private sector in the development of ecotourism and maintenance of protected areas.

Participation of personnel from the 10 CONAP Regional Offices in capacity building workshops.

The commitment by Central CONAP to develop an online tool for calculating visitor entry fees in protected areas.

Capacity building and involvement of park rangers and regional technical staff in biological monitoring.

Not treating the project as though it were an institution, always acknowledging activities and products to the executing agency and stakeholders.

Worst practices

The lack of memory of data used in project design.

6 Summary of lessons learned

Institutional coordination is essential for best results in the development of tourism with environmental sustainability criteria in protected areas.

It is very important to adjust projects to institutional capacities of the executing agency.

An assessment of stakeholder priorities is key to facilitate project ownership and achievement of goals.

It is important to involve CONAP directors and technical staff of CONAP Regional Offices from the design phase of projects so they can contribute to concepts and provide notions of regional reality.

Involvement of the private sector increases the sustainability of project activities and programs.

The implementation of monitoring of biological indicators and impacts of visitation in protected areas must be adjusted to local capacity.

It is important that the increase in capacity to perform **evaluations of impact caused by tourist visitation** is followed by increased knowledge in possible mitigation alternative.

Municipalities and associations demonstrate better ability to participate in processes and projects and, in second place, to generate, access and use information and knowledge to develop strategies, policies and legislation, while **capacity for management and implementation of activities and for monitoring and evaluation are significantly lower.**

Capacity building workshops should include open hours to allow participants to exchange information and experience.

Local capacity building workshops are more effective for addressing particular needs of a region or protected area.

Avoid disseminating a perception of tourism as the great economic solution for the surroundings of protected areas and to work within the reality that it can create additional income opportunities for some people, communities and the private sector as well as for the maintenance of protected areas.

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

Abbreviation/acronym	Description
AGN	Guatemalan News Agency
AOP	Annual operational plan
ASAECO	Laguna Chicabal Ecological Farmers Association
ASOCUCH	Association of Cuchumatanes Organizations
CAMTUR	Guatemala Tourism Chamber
CECON	Conservation Studies Center
CONAP	National Protected Area Council
FCG	Guatemala Foundation for the Conservation of Natural Resources and Environment
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
FONACON	National Conservation Fund
FUNDAECO	Foundation for Ecodevelopment and Conservation
IDAHE	Anthropology and History Institute
IDB	Interamerican Development Bank
INAB	National Forest Institute
INGUAT	National Guatemalan Tourism Institute
MAGA	Ministry of Agriculture, Cattle farming and Food
MARN	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
METT	Management effectiveness tracking tool
MICUDE	Ministry of Culture and Sports
MIPYMES	Micro, small and medium-size enterprises
MTR	Mid-term Review
OCRET	State Territorial Reserves Control Office
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PBZ	Permanent Ban Zone
PA	Protected Area
PIF	Project identification form
PIR	Project implementation report
PNUD	United Nations Development Program
PPG	Project Preparation Grant
PRM	Municipal Regional Park
PRODOC	Project Document
PROSOL	Project for the Development of Sololá
Q	Quetzales, the currency in Guatemala
QPR	Quarterly Progress Report
RNP	Private Natural Reserve
RUMCLA	Lake Atitlán Multiple Use Reserve
SEGEPLAN	Presidency General Secretary for Planning and Programming
ToR	Terms of Reference
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
PMU	Project Management Unit
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

The main objectives of the Terminal Evaluation are:

- verify if there were design flaws, especially in the formulation of objectives, results and logical framework indicators, and how they affected implementation;
- assess general implementation and achievement of results as planned in the Project Document and recommendations in the mid-term review (MTR);
- assess the pertinence and relevance of the project regarding national priorities, as well as strategic objectives of GEF and UNDP;
- assess effectiveness and efficiency in project implementation;
- assess project accomplishments and outcomes according to logical framework indicators and GEF Tracking Tools;
- critically assess project implementation and management;
- assess financial execution and compare co-financing arrangements with original planning;
- assess the sustainability of project actions in financial, socio-economic, environmental, governance and institutional terms;
- document achievements and limitations, impacts, lessons learned, best and worst practices, and products generated in terms of project design, implementation and management;
- assess potential replication of best practices and lessons learned to other projects in the country and beyond.

The evaluation is based on criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact, according to the Project-Level Evaluation Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects. The documentation of findings is based on (a) project documents and products, from the PRODOC to Tracking Tools (METT, financial sustainability and institutional capacity scorecards) and products generated; (b) interviews with stakeholders and (c) visits to pilot areas benefitted by the project. All procedures and interviews conducted at the highest ethical levels, in accordance with the principles established in the Ethical Guidance for Evaluations of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). All information received during interviews and meetings arranged for the purpose of this evaluation was declared confidential at the beginning of every meeting. The Consultant Agreement Form and Acceptance of the Code of Conduct are included in the evaluation report (Annex 5.1).

1.2 SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

1.2.1 Revision of documents and inception report

The initial fifteen (15) days of work, between August 2nd and 18, 2017, were used for the review of main project documents and evaluation questions (Annex 5.2) in the Terms of Reference (Annex 5.3), design of questions for the interviews on the mission to Guatemala (Annex 5.4) and preparation of the inception report. The list of documents is available in Annex 5.5 and includes products and other materials reviewed during and after the mission. Initial meetings were held via skype with the project Coordinator, Alejandro Calvente, and with the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor, Santiago Carrizosa. The list of people to be interviewed on the mission as well as the agenda for the field visits were consolidated.

1.2.2 Mission to Guatemala: information gathering, interviews and field visits

The mission to Guatemala lasted 21 days, between August 20 and September 09, 2017. The visit began with a welcome meeting at the UNDP Office, after which the Coordinator provided a detailed account of the project endeavors based on the logical framework, indicators and expected outcomes. On the second day, the UNDP Office staff was interviewed about the project and their role as implementing agency.

The field trip began with a meeting that convened the three CONAP Regional Directors along with technical staff in San Pedro Sacatepéquez. Six of the seven pilot protected areas were visited. Interviews were arranged with managers, rangers and other staff, as well as municipal authorities and counsellors and farmer associations in charge of two protected areas.

After the field trip, work was concentrated in Guatemala City for meetings and interviews with stakeholders, especially with CONAP and INGUAT authorities and technical staff, the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (GEF Focal Point) and the UNDP. Work was carried out in narrow collaboration with the project Coordinator to ensure that all relevant documents were reviewed and all relevant stakeholders were consulted. Three key employees (Secretary General, Technical Director and Chief of Ecotourism and Cultural Heritage Section) who worked at CONAP when the project was designed and approved were also interviewed, as well as representatives of the private sector benefitted by the Impulsa Program and tour operators who signed agreements with pilot protected areas. On the last day of the mission, a presentation of initial findings was made to the UNDP Office staff and the project Coordinator to expose the most relevant issues and seek feedback on points of view, clarifications, and considerations to refine the final report.

The travel itinerary, the list of persons interviewed and the summary of field visits are respectively available in Annexes 5.6, 5.7 and 5.8.

The methodological choice of closed interviews, preferably with a few people at a time, is due to the perception that people feel more at ease to make truthful comments and express their impressions, expectations and frustrations, which are important reference material for the evaluation and for future projects. The fact that all information is declared confidential also facilitates the expression of realistic data. The questions prepared during the initial days of work were adjusted according to the background of the interviewees, but repeating content is important to derive the most relevant issues from the whole of participants. Frustrations and private interests also become visible in the interviews, as well as the difficulty of most people in understanding the structure and lack of flexibility of GEF-funded projects in terms of budget allocations to activities that may seem highly desirable to participants.

1.2.3 Information analysis, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned

All information gathered in interviews, meetings and field visits was organized on a daily basis, except for a few very long travel days. The information received from participants was compared to information in project documents and products. As days went by and the number of people interviewed increased, the most relevant concerns, positive results, expectations and frustrations stood out by repetition. General impressions about outcomes, limitations, expectations and best practices that were more relevant to the majority of stakeholders was registered in this way.

Once the mission to Guatemala ended, the information gathered was carefully inserted in the respective topics in the Evaluation Report in two weeks, from September 11 to 22nd, 2017. The

Management Effectiveness Tracking Tools (METT), institutional capacity and financial sustainability scorecards, and especially the evaluation rankings were analyzed as the last elements to add to the report to ensure that all other documents had been reviewed and that the deepest level of knowledge of the project had been achieved before a decision could be made on the requested rankings. The draft Terminal Evaluation report was submitted on September 22nd, 2017.

1.2.4 Final reports in Spanish and English

The UNDP staff and Project Management Unit sent the draft report with comments back to the evaluator on October 11, 2017. The comments were used to improve the report, and suggestions were incorporated and explanations registered as responses to issues raised. The Spanish and English versions of the Terminal Evaluation Final Report were sent to the UNDP on October 18, 2017. Minor changes were made from new comments received from the UNDP and the Coordinator, and the final reports in both languages were submitted on October 27, 2017, four days before project termination.

1.3 STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

The Terminal Evaluation report is structured to contain a complete overview of the project, from the design phase to project termination.

An Executive Summary is included in the beginning of the report, including the Rankings Table of UNDP-supported, GEF-funded projects.

The first section of the report covers project objectives, scope and methodology. The second part includes a brief description of the logical framework indicators and project context.

Evaluation findings are detailed in the third section, organized by (a) project design and formulation, (b) execution, (c) results and (d) conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. Annexes include the Consultant Agreement Form, Terms of Reference, evaluation questions, matrix of interview questions, list of documents reviewed, travel itinerary and the list of people interviewed. A newspaper article about the Impulsa Program found by chance during the mission was included, as well as a summary table compiled to facilitate the assessment of management effectiveness for the seven pilot protected areas.

2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

2.1 PROJECT START AND DURATION

The project proposal was initially written in 2010, during GEF phase 3, when ecotourism was an unusual topic in GEF projects. The initial proposal was not approved and had to be redesigned from a budget of about US\$ 10 million to about 10% of the amount (US\$ 1,295,455). This second proposal was approved and the project was initiated in January, 2013, during GEF phase 4.

The delay between the initial proposal and project start interfered mainly with co-financing arrangements made with NGOs in 2010, as the funds could not stay unused. The project did not include specific gender or climate change concerns because these were not GEF requirements at the time.

Because most of the outcomes of this project are changes in policies and regulations that require long processes for approval, and to ensure that the pilot areas were able to start implementation of the plans developed, a ten-month extension was recommended in the Mid-Term Review. The project was therefore operative between 22nd January, 2013, until 31st October, 2017, completing 4 years and 10 months of implementation. The extension was sufficient to grant the approval of legal documents and nearly all plans, consolidate partnerships that will continue implementing activities initiated during the project and begin implementing management, public use and business plans in the seven pilot protected areas benefitted by the project.

2.2 PROBLEMS THE PROJECT SOUGHT TO ADDRESS

The project aimed to develop ecotourism as a financial mechanism for the sustainability of the Guatemalan Protected Area System (SIGAP). This was a new approach in Guatemala, especially in the protected areas addressed by the project, managed by local stakeholders (five municipalities and two associations).

The project objective contributes to GEF Strategic Program 1: Financial Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at the national level; and to Strategic Program 3: Strengthen Terrestrial Protected Area Networks. It also contributes to the financial sustainability of SIGAP by consolidating tools and a legal and institutional framework for the development of tourism in Guatemala with the higher goal of conservation of the biological diversity of global importance.

This project was mainly focused on preparing a legal and institutional framework for CONAP to increase the opportunities of developing ecotourism in protected areas and in other areas relevant for the conservation of biological diversity. Regulations were reviewed or created to improve management options, include environmental sustainability criteria to monitor impacts of tourist visitation and generate more work and income opportunities at the local and regional levels.

2.3 IMMEDIATE AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

The goal of this project is to conserve biological diversity of global relevance in Guatemala. The immediate objective is to strengthen SIGAP by developing ecotourism as a financial mechanism to contribute to biodiversity conservation.

2.4 BASELINE INDICATORS ESTABLISHED

The Logical Framework contains 15 indicators organized by objective (4 indicators), results from strengthening the legal and political framework for ecotourism development (4 indicators) and results from improvements in the institutional framework at the national level for ecotourism management, including capacity building and implementation in seven pilot areas (7 indicators).

The main indicators measure progress on the increase of protected areas (in hectares) and the registry of new protected areas in SIGAP, which implies an increase in the level of protection of relevant areas for the conservation of biodiversity; on changes in legal regulations at the national level to create a favorable development context for ecotourism based on criteria of environmental sustainability; on the engagement of the private sector in developing tourism in protected areas; on the increase in technical capacity in CONAP, INGUAT, municipalities and other organizations involved in protected area management; on the decrease of the financial gap of CONAP to cover basic management costs in protected areas; and to improved management of pilot protected areas with application of entrance fees, implementation of management plans and public use plans that include monitoring of biological diversity and impacts of visitation, and business plans.

2.5 MAIN STAKEHOLDERS

The main stakeholders included in the project design were **CONAP**, as executing agency, working with support from the **UNDP** as implementing agency; **INGUAT**, at first mainly for interest in implementing the Unified Registry of Visitors (URV) in the pilot protected areas and developing programs that benefit SIGAP; and the **municipalities** and **associations** in charge of managing the seven protected areas selected by the project.

The **NGOs** Helvetas Guatemala, The Nature Conservancy, Asociación Vivamos Mejor, USAID - Counterpart International and Fondo de Conservación de Bosques Tropicales signed agreements for co-financing project activities with which their work had synergies.

2.6 EXPECTED RESULTS

The outcomes expected to contribute to the **general objective** of biological diversity conservation were the development of new tourism routes in protected areas with low levels of visitation, the increase in protected areas with ecotourism benefits in the Western Highlands, the definition of species to be used as biological monitoring indicators and an improvement in the financial capacity of SIGAP measured by the GEF financial sustainability scorecard.

The **results** are organized in two components. The **first result** includes reviewed policies and legal regulations that were not considered functional for the development of tourism in the country, as well as new regulations to fill legal gaps. The policy on tourism activities, the policy of co-administration in protected areas, the regulations on the concession of services for visitors within SIGAP and CONAP regulations for the control of entrance fees were listed for review. There is one additional generic item that refers to “ecotourism management instruments within SIGAP”, which was not clearly defined in the original project design, and was subdivided into several complementary documents among regulations and practical manuals.

The **second result** refers to an improved institutional framework within CONAP for the management of ecotourism in protected areas. Activities included capacity building on ecotourism for protected

area managers and other professionals, visitor attention and monitoring ecotourism impacts based on biological indicators and records of impacts, the inclusion of ecotourism in management plans as part of their financial strategies, testing the entrance fee system in pilot areas, and the development of management, public use and business plans for the seven pilot protected areas.

3 FINDINGS

3.1 PROJECT DESIGN / FORMULATION

3.1.1 Analysis of Logical Framework

As noted in the MTR, the time used in project planning and design exceeded the regular deadline of 18 months. More than three years passed between project design and project start.

The project results were, in general, well devised, and fit the GEF “**SMART**” criteria (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and limited in time). The flaws in indicators in the logical framework were not due to difficulty of measurement, but due to lack of reference, errors or changes in the values assigned as baselines.

As the **logical framework** is the main monitoring and evaluation tool of the project, it is important to note that there were flaws in the baseline of 6 of the 15 indicators, partially for calculation errors, but mainly due to the **lack of reference** of how these baselines were calculated during project design. A brief analysis of the indicators that required revision is presented below.

Indicator 2 (total of protected areas in the Western Highlands with benefits from ecotourism) was redefined during project implementation because the expansion of some of the protected areas was modified when CONAP reviewed SIGAP data (especially affecting the volcanoes Permanent Ban Zones) and because updates in management plans developed by the project identified and corrected errors for some protected areas, therefore changing the total number of hectares for the Western Highlands. A consultant was contracted to reevaluate the number of hectares consolidated as protected areas and a new baseline was established for comparison with progress in project implementation. The concept of the baseline in **Indicator 14** (SIGAP financial gap) was adjusted by recommendation of the MTR, in which this indicator was considered unrealistic. The original indicator was set for a 15% reduction in the national financial gap of SIGAP, while the revised indicator considered the Western Highlands, the project main region of influence. A consultant was contracted to perform the calculation.

Other three indicators (**indicator 6**, which refers to the number of protected areas implementing public use plans; **indicator 7**, which refers to the number of protected areas applying the URV; and **indicator 10**, which refers to the number of protected areas in the Western Highlands registered in SIGAP) were adjusted because the values in the respective baselines were not clear or contained errors. These changes did not alter the goals of adding a number of protected areas to the baseline, as only the absolute numbers were changed. Although the value of **indicator 12** (change in income) was not changed, it was considered difficult to achieve, as of the 22 protected areas analyzed, 15 were not directly contemplated by the project. Even with evidence of positive impact on this indicator due to changes in national policies and regulations, a 30% increase was considered unrealistic especially as the repercussion of updated policies and regulations will take longer than the project expense of time for implementation.

It is also relevant to register that the description of results in the PRODOC includes the development of economic incentives (“68. To encourage investment in the PAs, economic incentives will be developed through the project for the private sector and PA administrators.”), but no indicators were included in the logical framework. Management plans and business plans are listed as products of Result 2 in the logical framework, again without respective indicators.

The lack of clarity or precision in these indicators led the project management unit to invest in redefining baselines and carefully assess other values, which implied the use of resources that had not been allocated for this purpose, as well as the use of extra time. All the changes in indicators were approved by the Steering Committee. Four of the indicators were revised in accordance with recommendations made in the MTR.

3.1.2 Assumptions and risks

Risk analysis was well developed during project design, as the major weakness that influenced the implementation of the project was correctly identified. It is the same weakness that poses risk to project sustainability, and refers to political changes. Political changes in 2015 led to the loss of CONAP employees, affecting project implementation and disconnecting staff who had received training in tourism management through the project. These changes also affected CONAP regional offices, in turn resulting in difficulties to support municipalities, associations and communities which manage protected areas. This context has not improved since project start and there is not a positive tendency for improvement of the CONAP budget in the near future nor any perspective of better representation at the regional level, which creates further financial risks for the institution. These changes do not imply lack of support to the project on the part of CONAP, but institutional frailty and lack of personnel.

The risks and impacts of global climate change in the region are part of a global risk that aggravates the pressure on endangered species and fragile or fragmented ecosystems as well as on populations that are strongly dependent upon natural resources and water sources without supply services. This risk, although identified in the initial analysis, was not a requirement of the GEF at the time of project design, and was not directly approached in the project. All activities that contribute to the conservation of natural areas also contribute to the stability of climate, but the project did not include specific actions to improve such results.

The risk of lack of consensus within the Guatemalan government about reinstating visitor entry fees was not confirmed, and the regulations for the management of visitor activities in the SIGAP were approved in 2013.

In the risk analyses conducted by the UNDP, the risk of lack of support for implementing Result 1 was considered low in 2012. No changes were made to the attribution of risks from climate change; the lack of consensus about reinstating visitor entry fees actually caused a delay in approval of the policy; and the institutional representation of CONAP at the regional level did not improve. No changes were made to these risks when the analysis was updated in 2015. This shows that the initial risk analysis was realistic and coherent, having correctly identified the main factors that could have affected project implementation and results.

3.1.3 Lessons from other relevant projects

The project indirectly exchanged experiences with other initiatives in biodiversity conservation. It was apparently designed as a continuity to the project “Consolidation of a system of Regional Municipal Parks in the Guatemala Western Highlands” (Probosques, Helvetas), terminated in 2009. Lessons about creating incentives were taken from the project “Establishing National Priorities”. Some workshops on monitoring protocols and tools were planned and conducted with the project “Sustainable forest management with multiple global environmental benefits”.

This project filled a gap left by the GEF - IDB project “Improving management effectiveness in the Maya Biosphere Reserve”, which did not include legal reviews of regulations for income generation from tourism to enforce their reinstatement for use in protected areas. No other activities were developed with this project because they were implemented in geographically separate regions.

The GEF-UNDP regional project “Central American markets for Biodiversity (CAMBio): Mainstreaming conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity within micro, small and medium-sizes enterprise development and financing”, mentioned in the PRODOC, aimed to concede credit through intermediary financial institutions. It had an agricultural focus in Guatemala, but included tourism services and businesses in other countries, generating useful conclusions for the design of the Impulsa Program. Although the alternative of credit was offered to entrepreneurs who enrolled in the Impulsa Program, the requirements were perceived as too high for small companies, and none have applied for credit so far.

The design of tourist destinations by INGUAT and Helvetas for San Marcos, San Pedro Sacatepéquez and Sibinal were used as a basis for the destinations produced by this project. As FUNDAECO staff had developed the management plan for the Todos Santos Cuchumatán RMP, it was contracted by the project to design the public use plan and ensure coherence with conservation measures already defined.

3.1.4 Planned stakeholder participation

CONAP was the main institution involved in the project from the design phase, also to make adaptations to the original proposal which had not been accepted by the GEF. The project management unit was coherently established in the CONAP Central Office in Guatemala City at the beginning of implementation.

The seven protected areas participating in project implementation are restricted to two categories within SIGAP (Regional Municipal Park and Private Natural Reserve) and one Permanent Ban Zone (which is not considered a management category within SIGAP despite being a protected area in the system), none of them directly managed by CONAP.

Several organizations mentioned in the PRODOC as partners for implementation and co-financing were never directly involved (SEGEPLAN, IDAEH, MAGA, MARN, CECON, INAB, OCRET, CAMTUR, as well as the NGOs The Nature Conservancy, WWF, Counterpart International – USAID, PROSOL, ASOCUCH). The delay between initial project design in 2010 and project start in 2013 explains these losses in partnerships, as funds could not be reserved and were spent as planned. Counterpart International supported workshops and developed manuals in 2012, during the PPG, before the official project start.

As implementation progressed, other more relevant partners with common objectives were identified. The role of INGUAT as partner gradually gained importance; the Ministry of Economy contributed seed funding to the Impulsa Program, and the Ministry of Culture and Sports is involved in the development of sustainability based certification, both working with INGUAT. These partners, at project termination, represent the best guarantee of sustainability for the actions initiated during the project for the development of ecotourism in protected areas, especially due to the success of the Impulsa Program and the development of the Q-Green Certification Label. The involvement of tourism entrepreneurs in the private sector, although not exactly project partners, was essential for

the practical application of the regulations updated and approved by the project, which offer new alternatives to facilitate the development of tourism.

3.1.5 Replication approach

The expected results of the project consolidate a legal and institutional framework that serves as reference for the development of ecotourism in Guatemala. They are also useful as models within SIGAP and other countries or regions. A detailed replication plan was not developed in the project, but the potential of replication was made clear by the potential extrapolation of the benefits of reviewing legal regulations and policies for application to protected areas in SIGAP with tourism potential and replication of knowledge gained in capacity building workshops and programs.

The changes and improvements in legal regulations represent an opening of new opportunities in protected area management, especially for the reinstatement of revenues from visitor entry fees and the possibility of shared management. The technical reference documents such as the manual for the management and reinstatement of visitor entry fees in protected areas managed by CONAP, the tool for assessment of tourism potential, the guide for designing public use plans, the guide for defining visitation fees, the guide for designing business plans and the protocols for monitoring the impacts of tourism and biological monitoring compose an important set of references for the development of ecotourism beyond the seven pilot protected areas in the Western Highlands.

A specific budget for press releases and dissemination of results from capacity building workshops, approval of regulations and policies, activities developed in pilot areas, best practices and lessons learned was included in project design. Other networks, publications and documents produced by the UNDP and GEF were also considered to help disseminate best practices and lessons learned from the project for use in the design and implementation of future ecotourism projects in Guatemala and in other countries.

3.1.6 UNDP comparative advantage

The UNDP provides assistance to the Government of Guatemala in promoting, designing and implementing activities in the GEF mandate and national sustainable development plans. The office in Guatemala City is well structured, with personnel and experience in the implementation of large projects as well as in supporting the executing agency in case of problems that arise during implementation. The UNDP maintains a network of offices specialized in technical assistance projects. Considering GEF strategic priorities, the global networks of the UNDP are also relevant for their role in disseminating results, best practices and lessons learned for their use in new projects and regions beyond the influence of each project.

Stakeholders were consulted during the mission about the UNDP performance as implementing agency. The UNDP staff experience and capacity in project implementation, support in case of problems and efforts to promote continuity are well acknowledged from the national to the regional level. Although, in the case of this project, no extreme situations arose that required UNDP interventions at higher levels, the staff was constantly available to help and ensure the activities were carried out and reports were timely produced. UNDP staff played a relevant role in keeping the Steering Committee informed, requesting reports as required by GEF and supporting administrative processes, as well as communicating with the GEF focal point, the Vice-Minister of Natural Resources and Climate Change of the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, and the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor, Santiago Carrizosa.

The UNDP also had the role of communicating with public authorities in the main agencies involved in the project about GEF project requirements and criteria for their understanding and support to the project, functioning as mediator from a higher level to ensure correct implementation at the local level. This is especially relevant given that environmental responsibilities are scattered in the government structure, with the GEF focal point in the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources and protected area management distributed between CONAP and other organizations in charge of historic heritage sites (Ministry of Culture and Sports, Institute of Anthropology and History) and forest areas (National Forest Institute).

3.1.7 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

At the international level, the project is part of **GEF Fourth Operational Phase**. Strategic priorities, especially Results 1 and 2, contribute to improving the management of protected areas registered in national systems by communities and the sustainable use of biological diversity in productive landscapes, including innovative approaches and marketing mechanisms which, in the case of this project, refer to ecotourism.

The project also contributes to the **GEF Program in the Fifth Operational Phase**, as Strategic Objective 1 for Biodiversity specifically proposes improving the financial sustainability of protected area systems, which is maintained as a priority in the **Sixth Operational Phase**. Lessons learned from this project will also contribute to Objective 4, to mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in productive landscapes and sectors. This is the reality in two of the seven pilot protected areas selected in the project, where the managers are agricultural associations with a drive for nature conservation.

The project **contributes to the programmatic area of Inclusive and Sustainable Development of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2015-2019** for investing in “policies and investments that promote and are responsible for the protection, use and conservation of natural resources, especially in the areas of biodiversity, climate change, water management and energy.”

The project contributes to the integrity of the **Mesoamerican Ecological Corridor** and uses lessons learned from the GEF-UNDP project “**Consolidation of a municipal park system in the Guatemala Western Highlands**”, executed by the NGO Helvetas Guatemala. It indirectly complemented the GEF-IDB project “**Improving management effectiveness in the Maya Biosphere Reserve**” for proposing to review and update policies and regulations on tourism, which was considered a gap in that project. It also contributes to the GEF-UNDP project “**Establishing national priorities and assessing needs to build capacity on biodiversity in Guatemala**”, especially for promoting numerous technical capacity building workshops.

The UNDP Office, in its role as implementing agency, promotes **meetings for the exchange of experiences and lessons learned between project coordinators**. The UNDP had 12 projects in development during this period. Although none of the other projects were set in the Western Highlands, these meetings were considered useful especially for the exchange of experiences and lessons learned about difficult processes such as the approval of policy documents and regulations and other bureaucratic issues.

3.1.8 Management arrangements

The UNDP was defined as the **implementing agency** and CONAP as **executing agency** of the project in the design phase. The UNDP Environment and Energy Official, the Finance Official and the M&E Official provided technical, financial, administrative and management support for the project. All payments were made directly by the UNDP. Annual audits were arranged by the UNDP to ensure transparency and verify the efficiency of financial management.

Given the limitations of CONAP in terms of personnel, an external coordinator was hired to enable full time dedication to the project, as well as an administrative assistant, which formed the **Project Management Unit**, allocated in the CONAP Central Office in Guatemala City. The PMU worked with support and total integration with CONAP technical and administrative personnel.

The project **Steering Committee** was formed by the CONAP Executive Secretary and the UNDP Country Director. Although the guidelines established for the composition of this committee in the design phase of the project were not followed, the adaptations did not affect project development. The Committee has the role of making decisions about the project based on the consensus of its members and considering criteria of investment, equity, integrity, transparency and effective international competence. In situations when no consensus is reached, the final decision lies with the UNDP. In the case of this project, annual meetings were held to present project results of the former year and the Annual Operational Plan (AOP) for the following year and grant approval. Additional meetings were arranged for decisions on other relevant issues such as the changes made to logical framework indicators and project extension by recommendation of the MTR. In order to avoid conflicts of interest, the PMU decided not to appoint one representative of the municipalities nor of the NGOs because there were no other opportunities for these stakeholders to meet in order to discuss project matters. To compensate for their absence in the Steering Committee, the project Coordinator established a routine of annual visits to all municipal authorities via Municipal Councils and held meetings with the NGOs which compromised co-financing funds to the project to make progress reports based on the AOP, gather opinions and ensure that all stakeholders were well informed. This arrangement facilitated good relations and the integration of stakeholders. During the interviews with the several stakeholders from the national to the local level, no complaints ever arose about the Coordinator or lack of information about the project. The Coordinator was repeatedly acknowledged for his availability and willingness to interact and respond to any demands or doubts about project activities.

The project **Advisory Committee** was formed by co-financing partners, NGOs for the most part (Helvetas Guatemala, The Nature Conservancy, Vivamos Mejor, Rainforest Alliance and INGUAT). Follow-up meetings were held every three months, but because the NGOs were not directly involved in project activities, their representatives often did not attend. So, the PMU scheduled shorter and less frequent meetings to increase participation, and included the NGOs in the periodic field visits to ensure they were kept well informed. Whenever changes in planned activities were necessary, the Advisory Committee made recommendations for decisions by the Steering Committee.

The **GEF Focal Point**, Vice-Minister of Natural Resources and Climate Change, as well as the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor, were systematically informed about progress on project activities by the UNDP Project Official in Guatemala.

The fact that there was no mention of lack of information or communication with the project Coordinator during the mission and interviews with stakeholders shows that these management

arrangements were efficient. The Coordinator ensured good communication by visiting partners periodically and sharing annual progress reports.

3.2 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

3.2.1 Adaptive management

The first adaptive management exercise in the project occurred in the phase of project design. It is registered in the PRODOC that the goal formerly included in the PIF which aimed to change Decree 4-89 was adjusted for updating internal CONAP procedures and regulations for co-administration of protected areas. This change favored the achievement of project goals, as the former proposal would entitle submitting a legal proposal to the National Congress of Guatemala, which might have taken longer to approve than the project timeframe would allow. Another adaptive management issue came along as the project Coordinator was replaced during the first year of execution, when only 70% of the planned expenses were fulfilled. After this period, both technical and financial execution were timely and no other delays were registered.

The organizational structure and internal processes established by CONAP for the approval of documents such as policies, regulations, management plans and the registration of new areas in SIGAP required adaptive management capacity of the PMU. CONAP is managed by a Council represented by several institutions with diversified interests. As the Council is in charge of final decisions, this heterogeneity can entail extensive negotiations for the approval of regulations and policies. Moreover, the approval of management plans, public use plans and the registry of new protected areas in SIGAP undergoes revision by seven different departments (technical and legal at the regional and central levels of CONAP) before it is granted by the CONAP Executive Secretary. The main outputs of this project are policies, regulations and management instruments, such as plans for protected areas, and the registry of two new protected areas in SIGAP (PNR Corazón del Bosque and Mirador Rey Tepepul RMP). The registry of Mirador Rey Tepepul RMP is especially relevant as the process was initiated in 1993 and, despite efforts organized by different institutions at different times, it had not been concluded due to various technical and political issues.

The fact that none of the seven pilot protected areas were directly managed by CONAP, but by municipalities subject to political changes and interests, and associations, demanded more flexibility and negotiation skills of the Coordinator in establishing sufficient agreements and cooperation to reach the expected results.

The original objective, goals and products were maintained along project implementation. Restructuring at this level was not necessary, but some of the indicators in the logical framework were recalculated or adjusted. A generic item listed as part of Result 1, "SIGAP ecotourism management instruments updated", was divided in several additional products that had not been anticipated.

Some non-structural changes were made by recommendation of the MTR. A formal agreement was signed between CONAP and INGUAT to ensure the continuity of the Impulsa Program and the certification program for sustainability (Q-Green Certification Label) with support from the Ministry of Culture and Sports. The logical framework indicators 2, 6, 7 and 14 were adjusted to reflect the reality of the project and the feasibility of achieving established goals.

The MTR recommended a ten-month extension to ensure that some activities underway could be completed before the project ended. This was especially important to grant approval of legal documents and for the registry of Mirador Rey Tepepul RMP in SIGAP, as well as to have more time to initiate the implementation of public use plans in the seven pilot protected areas. The extension allowed the PMU to better conclude the activities initiated and ensure the sustainability of some of the project initiatives by formalizing institutional agreements. The PMU was able to follow-up on the application of approved regulations, guides and manuals produced by the project in pilot areas, consolidate more alliances with tour operators, confirm ownership of tourism development in municipalities which hired staff to implement tourism activities and manage protected areas, and consolidate an agreement between CONAP and INGUAT. The extension granted benefitted the project because more solid arrangements were made to ensure sustainability of several of the activities.

The recommendations in the MTR were taken into account and implemented and registered as management responses. Only recommendation number 2, which referred to supporting the construction of basic infrastructure in the pilot protected areas, was not viable due to governmental agreements approved in 2016, after the MTR. The Governmental Agreement 137-2016 and Ministerial Agreement 199-2016 established that any intervention in protected areas requires payment of a warrant and a license by the administrative institution (Q 5,000 every 3 years). These new regulations have handicapped small interventions in protected areas such as the construction of visitor entry booths or birdwatching trails, especially in small Regional Municipal Parks and private reserves. Recognizing these measures as counterproductive for the development of sustainable tourism in protected areas the PMU, guided by the CONAP Planning Department, requested the agreement to be repealed, causing it to be revised by the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources. The institutions in charge of the pilot protected areas were informed about the process and all agreed that small investments in basic infrastructure will entail more loss than gain while the regulations are not revoked. They also agreed that if the regulations are not revoked it is only worth investing in more significant infrastructure that enables opportunities for new tourist services or a significant improvement of existing services, which were out of reach of the project.

Fiscal incentives and a CONAP **certification label** had been included in project design as mechanisms to promote ecotourism. Considering the low rate of tax revenue by the government of Guatemala and the vulnerability of CONAP in terms of ensuring sufficient funding from the federal government, it was decided that these strategies would not be viable for development by CONAP. The implementation of such a system requires a significant budget and technical staff fully dedicated to its development. CONAP does not have this capacity, especially as technical staff were dismissed in 2015 and the budget was significantly reduced. Establishing collaboration with other stakeholders better equipped to develop these initiatives became more important and a strategic solution for the process to be viable. The project established an alliance with INGUAT, which had better conditions of investing in new strategies. The **Impulsa Program** was designed to replace the strategy of fiscal incentives and offer support and seed funds to entrepreneurs providing tourist services with positive impact on the conservation of protected areas, and the certification of natural areas was included in the certification program that INGUAT was already developing (**Q- Green Certification Label**). In addition to tourist services in protected areas, a specific label was designed for tourist destinations, so protected areas following sustainability standards for tourist visitation can be certified. Had the certification been developed exclusively by CONAP, this would not have been feasible, as the

institution would have become its own judge. Part of this product added to the project and not included in the PRODOC creates incentives not only for the private sector, but also to protected area managers for the development of sustainability strategies in the development of tourism. This strategy had excellent results and ascertained the continuity of the programs after project termination. Moreover, the concept of certification is part of the Guatemala Master Plan for the Development of Sustainable Tourism 2015-2025. An agreement was reached between CONAP, the Ministry of Culture and Sports and INGUAT, compromising funds from INGUAT for the development of the certification system. The agreement was signed on 27 September, 2017, International Day of Sustainable Tourism, strengthening interinstitutional cooperation.

In 2015, due to the change of national government, **CONAP underwent budget cuts** of US\$ 1 million, which resulted in relevant losses in technical staff and changes in former priorities and commitments. The CONAP Executive Secretary, who had strong ownership of the project, was dismissed. This change required adaptive management measures of the PMU to establish more cooperation outside CONAP to make up for lost personnel and improve the chances of project sustainability. Learning how to approach the private sector to sign agreements with tour operators has increased the level of support to protected areas. With the perspectives of reinvestment of visitor entry fees and the opportunities of shared management introduced in the Co-Administration Policy more resources will be made available to improve the structure and tourist services of protected areas, generating a positive retro-feeding cycle and a favorable environment for economic development.

Nevertheless, the agreement to be signed between CONAP, CECON, the Ministry of Culture and Sports, INAB and INGUAT for the implementation of the UVR had not been signed at the time of this terminal evaluation. The Ministry of Culture and Sports had officially nominated the General Director of Cultural and Natural Heritage who is in charge of signing the agreement. Expectations were that the agreement and joint work evolved quickly so that the UVR slips can be processed within INGUAT, where there is enough capacity and structure for the work to be done.

3.2.2 Monitoring and Evaluation: design at entry and implementation *

SATISFACTORY¹

The **Monitoring & Evaluation plan was generally well conceived** as activities included the inception workshop; Steering Committee meetings; annual external audits; the Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation of the project and these were properly budgeted (US\$ 104,525).

The plan also reserved funds for reports on specific aspects or areas of the project, compilation of best practices and lessons learned and the final report. The budget lacked funds for the closing workshop, which are especially needed to support attendance of stakeholders, including travel and lodging, in one of the municipalities. Funds not used for workshops budgeted for the MTR and TE were relocated to cover the costs of the closing meeting.

Although a specific M&E plan was not developed beyond what is described in the PRODOC, several mechanisms were in place. Apart from the Coordinator's routine responsibilities, quarterly meetings with the UNDP and one annual meeting of the tripartite commission were held. GEF monitoring instruments were thoroughly used: AOP, QPR, PIR, annual reports, reports on steering committee

¹ According to the Guide for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP supported projects financed by GEF, M&E must be qualified according to a set of six ratings: Highly satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately satisfactory, Moderately unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory and Highly unsatisfactory.

and co-financing partner meetings, as well as the Tracking Tools for Institutional Capacity, Financial Sustainability and Management Effectiveness (METT). Consultants were engaged to carefully review the criteria and fill out the scorecards at the beginning, mid-term and for the terminal evaluation so progress could be clearly measured. This ensured that sufficient funding and time were dedicated to generate consistent analyses. Another consultancy verified the number of hectares with ecotourism benefits implementing visitor entry fees in the Western Highlands and the increase of income in 22 protected areas.

As mentioned before in section 3.1.1, the analysis of indicators in the logical framework required some adaptive management as some of the baselines needed to be redefined. This required redirecting funds, although not significantly, and the use of extra time for work that had not been planned, including for consultants, to ensure that the baselines would be comparable with updated values as the work progressed.

3.2.3 Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

At the administrative level, considering that CONAP is a Council formed by institutions in the environment, historic heritage, agriculture and forestry, the PMU had to exercise adaptive management in order to explain and grant approval of the many documents produced by the project. The Coordinator's communication abilities and UNDP support contributed to maintain the Council informed and to obtain approval of legal and technical documents. Relevant adaptive management decisions, such as revision of indicators, project extension, changes of strategy to ensure the sustainability of incentives (Impulsa) and certification programs were taken by the Steering Committee with information provided by the Advisory Committee.

Political changes required strong adaptive management capacity of the PMU, as staff losses within CONAP reduced the pace of project implementation. The nine technical positions in the Department for the Development of SIGAP at the project start were reduced to five (formerly Protected Area Department, in charge of providing support to the project). In addition, none of the current employees of this department worked there at the beginning of the project due to high employee rotation and replacement. The reduction of staff in the area of tourism is especially relevant, as only one out of three employees is left. Therefore, the time needed for CONAP staff to review and technically approve products increased significantly. In order to ensure enough time to complete project activities and as a management response to MTR recommendations, an extension was requested to present the project to the new authorities and gain their support; finish the activities that were delayed due to loss of personnel; support the implementation of management and public use plans; and consolidate commitments for project sustainability. The ten-month extension was sufficient for project activities to be completed despite the changes incurred.

Another source of delay in the implementation of activities refers to the lack of experts in ecotourism in Guatemala, as **some of the consultancy contracts had to be cancelled** because the products were not properly delivered, and the hiring process had to start over. These delays did not affect the project in terms of the delivery of expected results because the processes were well managed. According to some of the interviewees, consultancies were better fulfilled by ex-CONAP employees who were already familiar with protected area management and the regional context of the Western Highlands.

3.2.4 Partnership arrangements

None of the seven protected areas chosen as pilot areas for the project are under direct management by CONAP. They are managed by five municipalities and two associations. These are the stakeholders more directly involved and benefitted by project activities and results. Cooperation agreements were signed between CONAP and six of the seven pilot protected area managers, with the exception of Todos Santos Cuchumatán, to ensure the continuity of biological monitoring.

The most significant collaboration established between national institutions refers to the agreement reached between CONAP and INGUAT. Cooperation before the project was restricted to punctual issues, while during the project INGUAT became a strategic partner to CONAP, coordinating the implementation of strategic joint activities. INGUAT increased its support to CONAP not only by promoting tourism in protected areas but also by providing funds for the continuity of two project initiatives, the Impulsa Program and the Q-Green Certification Label for Protected Areas. This does not only ensure the financial sustainability of part of the project results, but also strengthens and increases their potential impact. In both cases, formal interinstitutional agreements were signed and are valid until 2019.

The Impulsa Program is coordinated with other two institutions, the Ministry of Economy and the Guatemala Tourism Chamber. The Ministry plays a relevant role in economic development, in which tourism is gaining importance, and the Chamber is the highest representation of the private sector to which the program is directed. Coordination of the certification system involved the Ministry of Culture and Sports, in charge of archeological sites contained in several protected areas of high interest for public visitation.

Collaboration and co-financing agreements were signed during the phase of project design. As formerly explained, due to the time elapsed between project design (2010) and start (2013), part of the plans for the joint implementation of activities were lost. The NGOs therefore contributed with activities of common interest in the Western Highlands, but these were not directly related to the project. Experts from The Nature Conservancy contributed in designing biological monitoring protocols; Asociación Vivamos Mejor contributed in the process of registry of the Mirador Rey Tepepul RMP in SIGAP, and by rebuilding the main trail in the park; Helvetas Guatemala will provide support for the implementation of the management plan and public use plan at the Sibinal RMP, and Rainforest Alliance has been promoting the Impulsa Program. An intent of further collaboration with Helvetas Guatemala did not come through because their project in the Tacaná area was cancelled by the funding agency.

Although the number of stakeholders involved in the project is not high, they are relevant in the Western Highlands. The NGOs are not affected by political changes in the municipalities, therefore ensuring the continuity of knowledge and capacity developed through the project. They also become a source of access to the products developed by the project.

One of the merits of the project mentioned by some interviewees was to approach conservation and protected area experts with ecotourism experts, resulting in mutual benefit.

3.2.5 Project finance

The funds provided by GEF (US\$ 1,295,455.00) to the project were complemented by government funds (US\$ 779,786.41 in *cash* and US\$ 318,068.56 in *kind*), totaling US\$ 1,097,854.87 as CONAP co-financing to the project on 31 October, 2017. The amount initially planned for expenses in developing

Result 1, basically for the review of policies and legal regulations, was 14.1%; 76.8% were allotted for Result 2, which included work in the pilot protected areas; and 9.1% for project administration. These percentages changed during project implementation. By the end of the project, 36.3% had been used for Result 1, 56.4% for Result 2 and only 7.3% for administration.

Financial execution started with lower expenses than planned in 2013. Project activities during the first year were focused on updates of legal documents, which entailed relatively low expenses. Financial execution from the second year of implementation was highly satisfactory, so it is highly likely that 100% of the budget will be used by the project termination date of 31 October, 2017. At the time of terminal evaluation, all remaining funds had been committed for expenses on (a) a new server for CONAP; b) the terminal evaluation; c) publication of materials developed by the project; d) expenses for the closing meeting in Quetzaltenango.

Project expenses according to annual budget.

Year	Annual budget	Executed budget	Annual execution %
2013	140,065.00	97,699.16	70
2014	290,482.00	278,902.89	96
2015	374,325.00	383,461.36	102
2016	315,737.10	315,467.34	99.9
2017 - 16 oct.	219,739.76	187,259.51	85.5

Audit reports do not include findings that pose problems to the transparency or competence of financial execution. Only two issues were reported. The first one refers to four invoices that were paid after their expiry date in 2014. As a response, the PMU defined verification measures to ensure no expired invoices were paid. In 2016, the audit observed the lack of register of the dates on which consultancy products were delivered. The PMU responded by requesting consultants to submit work plans that included deadlines and by keeping email messages sent along with products to ensure the registry of delivery dates.

The **co-financing** initially planned was partially lost. The partners that signed co-financing commitments in 2010 implemented their projects before project start in 2013. Counterpart International contributed with the SIGAP Joint Administration and Shared Management Policy and Regulations by promoting workshops and by developing the "Evaluation, prevention and monitoring impacts of tourism in protected areas tool" during the project preparation phase (PPG) in 2012. When the project started, in 2013, the office in charge of projects on tourism had been closed in Guatemala. This is registered in the first QPR of the project, as well as the co-financing commitment of INGUAT and FUNDAECO as new partners, and the renewed commitment of Helvetas Guatemala and FCG, which supported the Sibinal RMP with infrastructure and technical assistance for sustainable tourism. Rainforest Alliance supported commitments between the private sector and protected area managers. FUNDAECO provided support for the development of ecotourism in Todos Santos Cuchumatán. As the management plan had been prepared by the Foundation, it was contracted by the project to develop the public use plan. Asociación Vivamos Mejor renovated the visitor trail at Mirador Rey Tepepul RMP, supported the process of registration in SIGAP and the development of a nursery at the Corazón del Bosque NPR. The Nature Conservancy contributed with experts in the development of biological monitoring protocols.

Although not all of these activities were directly related to the specific objectives of the project, they were considered as co-financing and contributed to the overall goal of biodiversity conservation. This situation explains the difficulty of the PMU in following up with co-financing values, as expenses were

made in parallel projects with common conservation objectives in the Western Highlands, but not directly linked to the project. The co-financing table shows that the initial amount was nearly doubled, showing a significant investment in the region and the pilot protected areas, even making up for the lack of project funds allotted for the development of basic infrastructure.

The amount of funding contributed by Counterpart International during the PPG phase in 2012 was not registered at the time. It was not included in the co-financing table because the organization was unable to report on specific expenses at the end of the project, as five years later there were changes in personnel and the records were not easily available.

Although INGUAT was not initially listed as a co-financing partner in the project design, it gradually became the most relevant organization for securing the continuity of several activities initiated by the project. For this reason, the table includes INGUAT as co-financing institution, as well as FUNDAECO. Considering these additional institutions, a total co-financing of US\$ 2,390,021.82 was achieved apart from CONAP, more than twice the original planning.

The activities designed were carried out and generated the expected results as planned, with relatively small differences in numerical goals (around 20%) of three of the fifteen logical framework indicators. **The project can therefore be considered as efficient as initially planned, or even more,** for having produced nine extra reference documents that had not been anticipated. Besides, the numerical goals were surpassed in six of the fifteen logical framework indicators.

Some **additional resources** can be considered as assigned as a result of the project. Three of the municipalities benefitted by the project hired staff to oversee the development of tourism (Todos Santos Cuchumatán, Santiago Atitlán and Sibinal, the last one hiring a person on occasion for specific events) and as managers to protected areas (Todos Santos Cuchumatán, San Pedro Sacatepéquez and Santiago Atitlán).

Detailed project co-financing table								
Co-financing organization	Amount confirmed by CEO at moment of inclusion in the project (US\$)	Cofinancing 2013 – 2015 (Mid-Term Review)			Cofinancing 2016 – 2017 (Terminal Evaluation)		Total co-financing executed (US\$)	% contribution to date compared with expected amount
		Co-financing type	Amount contributed to date of MTR (US\$)	% contribution to date compared with expected amount	Co-financing type	Amount contributed to date of TE (US\$)		
CONAP	840,000.00	Cash	530,824.07	63%	Cash	248,962.24	779,786.31	92.8%
CONAP	210,000.00	In-kind	248,094.26	118%	In-kind	69,974.30	318,068.56	133.3%
The Nature Conservancy	45,000.00	Cash	45,000.00	100%	-	0	45,000.00	100%
Helvetas Guatemala	240,000.00	Cash	178,803.00	74%	Cash	128,600.66	307,403.66	128%
Fondo para la Conservación de Bosques Tropicales	338,000.00	Cash	93,607.00	28%	Cash	1,040.00	94,647.00	28%
USAID - Counterpart International*	144,700.00	-	-	-	Cash			
Asoc. Vivamos Mejor	104,151.79	-	-	-	Cash	116,586.00	116,586.00	111.9%
Rainforest Alliance	100,000.00	Cash	256,671.00	257%	Cash	217,674.00	474,345.00	474.4%
INGUAT**	-	Cash	349,968.00	-	Cash	1,002,072.16	1,352,040.16	-
Fundación para el Ecodesarrollo y la Conservación - FUNDAECO - **	0.00	Cash	66,796.87	-	Cash	20,400.00	87,196.87	***
TOTAL	2,021,851.79		1,769,764.20	87%			3,575,073.56	176.82%

* The co-financing committed was executed before project start due to delay in final approval. There are records of Counterpart International support to activities related to the project objectives in 2012, but it was not possible to locate official verifiers of expenses made by the organization on behalf of the project.

** Organizations that were not included as co-financing organizations in project design, but gained relevance during implementation, especially INGUAT.

*** As these organizations were not included as co-financing organizations, there is no initial amount compromised for comparison with the final amount to generate a percentage of execution.

Project co-financing summary table								
Co-financing (type/sources)	IA - UNDP own financing (USD)		IE - Government funds (CONAP) (USD)		Other sources (USD)		Total financing (USD)	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grants	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Credit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
In-kind	-	-	210,000.00	318,068.56	65,830.36	0	275,830.36	318,068.56
Cash	-	-	840,000.00	779,786.31	906,021.43	2,477,218.69	1,746,021.43	3,257,005.00
Non-grant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	-	-	1,050,000.00	1,097,854.87	971,851.79	2,477,218.69	2,021,851.79	3,575,073.56

3.2.6 UNDP and Implementing partner implementation*, coordination and operational issues

HIGHLY SATISFACTORY ²

Project implementation became excellent and worked according to planning, which is corroborated by all results being achieved. Initial difficulties and other issues were overcome, especially the partial use of funds in the AOP and replacement of the project Coordinator in the first year; the redefinition of baselines of some logical framework indicators, which involved unplanned consultancies; and reduction in the pace of project implementation due to loss of CONAP technical staff and significant budgetary reduction from political changes.

It is important to register that the success of the project depended on the formal approval of many documents, from management plans, public use plans and business plans to legal regulations and policies (updated and new). This could easily cause implementation delays and affect the outcomes, especially because of the many decision makers involved in the process of approval. At the moment of this terminal evaluation, practically all documents had been approved, even the policies and regulations which depend on higher levels. Municipal approvals were pending for plans of two protected areas. These are ready for use, but lack formal approval in the minutes of a Municipal Council meeting, after which they have to be sent to the regional CONAP office for approval, then to the Central CONAP Office for final approval. The PMU is following the process, but it does not require external support (financial or technical), so even if the project is terminated, the municipalities will be able to go through with it independently.

Financial audits were conducted in 2015 for the years 2013-2015 and in 2016. The 2017 audit is pending and will be conducted after project termination, covering the full expanse of the project. The reports requested by GEF were generated and delivered accordingly. An AOP was prepared at the beginning of every year since 2013, with one revision for adjustments per year, except for 2015, when no revision was necessary. The PIR were written between June and July since 2014 and include comments by the project Coordinator, the UNDP Project Officer and the UNDP Regional Technical Advisor. Four QPR were developed per year since 2013. The Tracking Tools were used to verify progress during implementation based on indicators of institutional capacity, management effectiveness and financial sustainability. An additional report was written by the Coordinator at the end of each year to register progress and inform project participants.

There were no major difficulties or obstacles during project implementation that required interventions of the UNDP at higher levels. Project management was well harmonized between the UNDP and CONAP – PMU, with an excellent level of collaboration towards project objectives and results. None of the interviewees in the terminal evaluation had any negative comments about the Coordinator and his abilities, respect, attention, dedication and capacity to reach agreements that suited all parties involved. A person with such qualities creates an enabling environment to facilitate achievements – a conciliatory profile might, in this case, be more important than specialized technical knowledge, so finding someone who combines these abilities may in practice ensure the success of a project.

² According to the Guide for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP supported projects financed by GEF, implementation by the IA and EA must be qualified according to a set of six ratings: Highly satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately satisfactory, Moderately unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory and Highly unsatisfactory.

During the terminal evaluation, both the UNDP staff and the project Coordinator were keen to provide information and documents with transparency and objectivity, impartially explaining positive and negative processes and situations to contribute to a realistic TE report that may be useful as a reference for future projects in terms of lessons learned, mistakes and successes. This is reflected in the project reports, from the PIR and QPR to annual reports voluntarily written by the Coordinator to facilitate information on project advances to stakeholders.

3.3 PROJECT RESULTS

3.3.1 Overall results (attainment of objectives) *

HIGHLY SATISFACTORY ³

The general objective of the project was achieved because the financial sustainability of SIGAP was effectively strengthened by the establishment of new financial mechanisms and alternatives for promoting ecotourism in Guatemala in alignment with the conservation of biodiversity of global importance. One of the interviewees perceived the inclusion of ecotourism as a line of work inside CONAP as one of the most important outcomes of the project. **A strong link was established between the objectives of tourism and biodiversity conservation** with the definition of bioindicator species for each of the seven pilot areas.

One of the initial goals was to develop **two new tourist destinations** that included protected areas in the Western Highlands. In collaboration with INGUAT, six new destinations were designed with a focus on natural areas the cultural heritage of Guatemala, available online at **www.turismo-sigap.com**. The CONAP website was redesigned between 2016 and 2017 to include information on these destinations. To add to these efforts, INGUAT recently approved funds to manufacture and install road signs indicating the way to the pilot protected areas, which should contribute to increase visitation.

The **SIGAP financial sustainability assessment** based on the GEF Tracking Tools shows a general increase from 26.4 to 41.3%. This is due to improvements in the legal and institutional framework, the consolidation of business plans and diversification of income alternatives developed through the project. The last one is a consequence of approval of the regulations that reinstate revenues from visitor entry fees to protected areas, of more flexibility in management arrangements granted by the regulations on co-administration and to the Impulsa Program, which engages the private sector.

Result 1

The **legal base** for the development of ecotourism using environmental sustainability criteria was strengthened due to the review and creation of the following national policies and regulations, which were approved at the national level:

- Co-Administration and Shared Management Policy (with supporting regulations as an additional product). The most important point is the inclusion of the concept of shared management, which did not formerly exist in the country and now also applies to other areas of relevance for biodiversity conservation that are not protected areas, reaching beyond the

³ According to the Guide for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP supported projects financed by GEF, the overall objectives must be qualified according to a set of six ratings: Highly satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately satisfactory, Moderately unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory and Highly unsatisfactory.

SIGAP network. New work opportunities have been created and the potential for generating income from ecotourism was increased;

- Policy on Visitation Activities in Protected Areas, in which the principles of sustainability, distribution of benefits and equitable participation were included;
- Management Regulations for Visitation Activities in SIGAP. These regulations are innovative especially for Articles 20 and 21, which ensure the reinstatement of revenues from visitor entry fees to protected areas, as well as for defining rules for the distribution and administration of these funds. This is an achievement of high relevance because, as much as reinstating such funds may seem logical and fair, it is rarely the case anywhere in the world. Visitor fees are most often deposited in a common governmental fund and used for other priorities that are not related to protected areas or biodiversity conservation. Reinstating these funds implies providing means of improving infrastructure, maintenance and services for visitors, which in turn tends to increase visitation, generating economic benefits at all levels and a positive retro-feeding cycle. The only limitation is that this policy is only valid for protected areas managed by CONAP, which in number are just under 20% of the 337 protected areas in SIGAP, but represent 88.74% of the protected territory in Guatemala;
- Regulations for the concession of visitor services in SIGAP. These regulations were approved at the beginning of the project, before the Law on Contracts was changed. Once this change became effective, the regulations became limiting, as all contracts have to be approved by National Congress and small services are not seen as priorities, so such processes can take very long or not even be voted. INGUAT and CONAP are now working on an alternative proposal for small concessions to be viable in the future, such as tourist services providing food, bike rentals, internal transport in protected areas, souvenir shops and other small businesses.

Sustainability-based environmental standards were included in the certification process by INGUAT for services inside protected areas and for protected areas as a whole. These are organized in four axes: administrative, protected areas and archeological parks, occupational security, and sustainability. These standards form the base of evaluation for INGUAT to confer the Q-Green Certification Label to protected areas. Although no area has been granted the label so far, expectations are that the Natural Monument Yax-há, Nakum, Naranjo will be the first to receive it and will then be advertised as a model for other areas.

In addition to the cited documents, which were listed as project outputs, an important legacy of complementary documents was produced to facilitate the application of policies, regulations and plans for the development of ecotourism in protected areas. These must be considered as added-value products that increase project sustainability:

- update of internal regulations of the Technical Committee for Tourism in Protected Areas (COTURAP);
- tool for the evaluation of tourism potential in protected areas;
- guide for designing public use plans for SIGAP;
- guide for designing business plans for SIGAP;
- practical guide for defining visitor entry fees in protected areas. Due to the relevance and usefulness of this guide a commitment was made by CONAP for developing an online version so that all protected areas have access to the tool and are able to calculate their operational costs as the base for estimating visitor fees;

- analysis of legal instruments that regulate the development of ecotourism in protected areas;
- harmonization strategy of legal instruments that regulate the development of ecotourism in protected areas;
- proposal for modifications in current legal regulations that regulate tourism in protected areas.

Public use plans have been developed for the seven pilot protected areas and were approved for five of them (pending approval for Mirador Rey Tepepul RMP and Todos Santos Cuchumatán RMP). This has led to an increase in the number of protected areas implementing management and public use plans from 4 to 11, while the implementation of the UVR increased from 2 to 5 protected areas. The pilot areas where approval is pending are using the plans as management guidance, but they acknowledge that better opportunities for implementation will be available once these instruments have legal value.

Increased coordination between the private sector through INGUAT generated a highly satisfactory result due to increased interest in the **Impulsa Program**, which was extensively announcing a call for new projects during the terminal evaluation (Annex 5.9), and for settling **nine agreements with tour operators** for birdwatching and visits to Volcán Chicabal. Some of the pilot protected areas have more potential for local tourism, so at least for now not all of them were benefitted with agreements to receive tourists coming from farther destinations. As the knowledge imparted by the project on improving visitor attention services and offering complementary aspects of tourist interest such as cultural heritage, and as at least some of the sustainability criteria developed for the Q-Green Certification Label are applied, more opportunities for these protected areas to be included in tourist destinations should arise.

Result 2

All the expected products were generated. The capacity building goal was surpassed, with 524 participants registered in 11 of the main capacity building workshops. CONAP staff from the ten regional offices participated in some of the workshops, significantly enhancing project benefits as tourism experts are most often not part of the staff. Positive feedback was received from most interviewees, who said they were grateful for all the new knowledge they gained, especially as most of them did not have any background on tourism management. The opportunities granted to a few people to be certified as birdwatching guides and park rangers were highly valued. Children of ASAECO (the association which manages the NPR Corazón del Bosque) associates participated in workshops, which helps to pass on current knowledge and involve the younger generation in the management of the area. People working in protected areas that formerly received visitors acknowledged the opportunities to improve the quality of their services due to project workshops. A Capacity Building Manual for Managers and Technical Staff and a Facilitator Guide on Tourism and Protected Areas were developed as support tools for future workshops that will extend the benefits of the project to more protected areas.

In addition to **guides for the development of public use and business plans, 21 plans** developed for the pilot areas (including management plans) remain as models. The management plan for Todos Santos Cuchumatán RMP had been initiated in 2004, concluded by the project and approved in 2015, before the change of municipal administration. The fact that these documents have legal value

increases opportunities for investment and implementation, also granting judicial certainty to the areas and preventing advances from agricultural or forest extraction activities.

Biological monitoring protocols were adjusted to each of the seven pilot areas. Protocols to **monitor impacts of visitation** were also developed for the seven areas. Monitoring routines were established and implemented in the seven areas.

Business plans began to be implemented in all seven pilot areas. Examples of action taken are (a) implementing visitor entry fees in RMP Quetzalí (former Astillero I and II) in San Pedro Sacatepéquez, promoting the park and finding local partners for maintenance and improvement, as well as planning for better infrastructure; (b) visitor entry fees implemented at San Marcos RMP and improvements to the infrastructure were approved by the municipality; (c) revised fees have been approved at Volcán Chicabal and new agreements were signed with tour operators; the association distributed small profits among associates for the first time in 2016; (d) the PNR Corazón del Bosque revised visitor entry fees and managed to pay off a pending debt to the Tax Administration; (e) a technical expert on tourism was hired for Mirador Rey Tepepul RMP, where visitor fees are about to be approved and a visitor entrance booth to be built; (f) an increase in the visitor entry fees of Sibinal RMP was approved, the park secured funding to build a restaurant, and a person is hired on occasion to promote visitation; (g) in Todos Santos Cuchumatán one person was hired by the municipality to promote visitation.

The SIGAP **financial gap** was reduced by 18.67% in the Western Highlands, a positive indicator of change due to the increase of ecotourism services.

The **Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT)** shows that all seven pilot areas reached the highest score for legal status, while 4 of 7 reached the highest score for definition of objectives and design that favors species conservation. All seven are implementing management plans, but only two achieved the highest score. Local participation of indigenous communities and others also reaches high scores in the areas where this is relevant.

The only indicator in which all pilot areas remain at the intermediate level refers to adequate infrastructure for visitors. Most of the areas are in intermediate condition for most indicators: protection, management plans, management of resources, staff number and capacity, management of current budget, equipment and maintenance, planning for water and resource use, visitor entry fees, some level of benefit to communities, monitoring and evaluation processes, infrastructure for visitors and good conservation of attributes. The indicator of education and public awareness, current budget and research are less developed (4/7), followed by maintaining regular work plans (see the summary of the analysis in Annex 5.10).

Analysis of Logical Framework

The logical framework is presented below with comments from the Terminal Evaluation and rankings according to the results achieved.

The GEF ranking scale has 6 points: HS – Highly Satisfactory; S - Satisfactory; MS – Moderately Satisfactory; MU – Moderately Unsatisfactory; U - Unsatisfactory, and HU – Highly Unsatisfactory.

The color scale is: green - complete, the indicator was successfully achieved; yellow – the indicator shows that the action tends to be completed by the end of the project; red - the indicator shows scarce results, and is unlikely to be completed by the end of the project.

Objectives / results	Indicator	Baseline	Goal (of indicator)	Terminal Evaluation comments	Ranking																																																																
Project Objective: Strengthen the financial sustainability of the Guatemalan Protected Area System (SIGAP) by developing new financial mechanisms in the developing ecotourism sector, at the same time ensuring the alignment of ecotourism with biodiversity conservation objectives	1 Number of tourist destinations in five pilot landscapes in the Western Highlands (RUMCLA - Lake Atitlán, Todos Santos Cuchumatán, Tacaná Volcano, Tajumulco Volcano, and Volcano and Lake Chicabal) that contribute to the conservation of 152,146 hectares with biodiversity of global importance.	– Five (5)	– Seven (7)	Achieved 300% - surpassed. Two new destinations were expected, while six were designed. Six new tourist destinations were designed in collaboration with INGUAT based on natural and cultural attractions. Information is available from the CONAP tourism website, which was redesigned between 2016 and 2017. The destinations are: The three volcanoes, Guate-avatar, Authentic communities, Adventure and scenic visits, The best of Cuchumatanes and Weekends and Family camping.	HS																																																																
	2 Total area (ha) under protection in the Western Highlands with ecotourism benefits.	– 7,255.4 hectares (RMP Todos Santos Cuchumatán)	– 12,972.60 hectares	Achieved 127.75%. Estimates are that 16,573.43 ha in the Western Highlands are benefitted by ecotourism. This indicator was recalculated due to updates in the SIGAP registry and to the management plans developed by the project, which led to corrections in area of protected areas. The Mirador Rey Tepepul RMP and the PNR Corazón del Bosque amount to 3,518.85ha. The complementary number of hectares considers other 14 protected areas that have implemented visitor entry fees and another 13 with income generated by services (food, tours, lodging, recreational activities).	HS																																																																
	3 Number of key species per biological group (mammals, birds and plants) in seven pilot protected areas: 1. RMP Todos Santos Cuchumatán; 2. RMP Astillero Municipal 1 y 2 de San Pedro Sacatepéquez; 3. RMP Astillero Municipal de San Marcos; 4. RMP Canjulé Tocapote, Los Maijones; 5. PNR Parque Ecológico Corazón del Bosque; 6. RMP Mirador Rey Tepepul; 7. PBZ Volcán Chicabal.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>PA</th> <th>Mammals</th> <th>Birds</th> <th>Plants</th> <th>PA</th> <th>Mammals</th> <th>Birds</th> <th>Plants</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>5</td> <td>1.</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>5</td> <td>2.</td> <td>4</td> <td>3</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>3.</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.</td> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>4.</td> <td>5</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>5</td> <td>5.</td> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>6.</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> <td>6.</td> <td>4</td> <td>4</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7.</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> <td>5</td> <td>7.</td> <td>4</td> <td>2</td> <td>5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PA	Mammals	Birds	Plants	PA	Mammals	Birds	Plants	1.	4	3	5	1.	4	3	5	2.	4	3	5	2.	4	3	5	3.	4	4	5	3.	4	4	5	4.	5	4	5	4.	5	4	5	5.	3	2	5	5.	3	2	5	6.	4	4	5	6.	4	4	5	7.	4	2	5	7.	4	2	5		Achieved 100%. Biological monitoring protocols were defined in accordance with the biological diversity of each of the seven pilot protected areas. A set of species was identified for each area as bioindicators.	HS
PA	Mammals	Birds	Plants	PA	Mammals	Birds	Plants																																																														
1.	4	3	5	1.	4	3	5																																																														
2.	4	3	5	2.	4	3	5																																																														
3.	4	4	5	3.	4	4	5																																																														
4.	5	4	5	4.	5	4	5																																																														
5.	3	2	5	5.	3	2	5																																																														
6.	4	4	5	6.	4	4	5																																																														
7.	4	2	5	7.	4	2	5																																																														

	4 Change in the financial capacity of SIGAP based on the average score in the UNDP – GEF Financial Sustainability Scorecard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Legal and institutional framework: 39.2% – Business planning: 11.5% – Tools for revenue generation: 24.6% – Total: 26.4% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Legal and institutional framework: 51.6% – Business planning: 23.7% – Tools for revenue generation: 42.3% – Total: 41.3% 	<p>Achieved.</p> <p>This indicator was adjusted by recommendation of the MTR because the original values referred to SIGAP at the national level. It now considers the Western Highlands only because it is the region where the project implemented practical action and generated direct benefits.</p> <p>Financial capacity was improved because the legal and institutional frameworks were reviewed and complemented, alternatives for income generation were created, business plans were developed for the seven pilot areas, the Impulsa Program benefitted the private sector and agreements with tour operators were signed.</p>	HS
Result 1: Legal and policy framework strengthened for the implementation of ecotourism as part of a strategy to promote the financial sustainability of SIGAP	5 Change in legal and policy framework at the national level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Policy on Tourist Activities in Protected Areas – Policy of Co-administration in Protected Areas – Regulations for the Concession of Services for Visitors in SIGAP – Management instruments for ecotourism in SIGAP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Policy on Tourist Activities in Protected Areas reviewed – Policy of Co-administration in Protected Areas reviewed – Regulations for control of revenues updated – Regulations for the Concession of Services for Visitors in SIGAP updated – Environmental standards for the certification label designed. 	<p>Achieved 100% and surpassed.</p> <p>Besides granting approval for all legal documents, which is relevant especially due to the long chain of approvals required, additional products were developed that increase potential replication to other areas and the sustainability of these models. Nine (9) additional products were developed: (a) Supporting regulations to the Policy of Co-administration and Shared Management in Protected Areas; (b) update of the internal regulations of the Technical Committee of Tourism in Protected Areas (COTURAP); (c) tool for the evaluation of tourist potential in protected areas; (d) guide for the development of public use plans in SIGAP; (e) guide for development of business plans in SIGAP; (f) practical guide for establishing visitor entry fees in protected areas, including a commitment from CONAP to develop an online version; (g) analysis of legal instruments that regulate the development of ecotourism in protected areas; h) harmonization strategy of legal instruments that regulate the development of ecotourism in protected areas; i) proposal for modifications in current legal regulations that regulate tourism in protected areas.</p>	HS
	6 Number of protected areas implementing public use plans	– Two (2)	– Nine (9)	<p>Achieved 100%. This indicator was adjusted by recommendation of the MTR because the PMU was unable to identify the 4 protected areas indicated in the baseline that were implementing public use plans. The 7 pilot areas were considered as implementing their plans, although two of the plans were not officially approved at the time of evaluation (RMP Mirador Rey Tepepul and RMP Todos Santos Cuchumatán). All 7 PA are also implementing their business plans.</p>	HS
	7 Number of protected areas with Unified Visitor Registry (UVR) in project pilot landscapes	– Two (2)	– Five (5)	<p>Achieved 100%. Five of the seven pilot areas implemented the URV (RMP Quetzalí (Astillero I and II), San Pedro Sacatepéquez; RMP Sibinal; RMP Astillero Municipal de San Marcos; RMP Todos Santos Cuchumatán; and PBZ Volcán Chicabal). The difficulty of implementation at RMP Mirador Rey Tepepul is the lack of a reception booth; and at PNR Corazón del Bosque the groups arriving are large, so a more expedient process is needed to make it viable.</p>	HS
	8 Number of agreements between the private sector and SIGAP authorities for tourism operations within protected areas in the Western Highlands	– One (1): RMP Canjulá Tocapote, Los Maijones (Sibinal)	– Eight (8)	<p>Achieved 128,5%. At the moment of evaluation, 9 new agreements had been signed. The agreement considered as baseline was not renewed. There are six new agreements with the National Birdwatching Association and three with tour operators in Quetzaltenango and the capital for tours to Volcán Chicabal. Not all 7 PA were benefitted by agreements so far because of different tourist potential, some being more interesting locally than nationally or internationally.</p>	HS

<p>Result 2: Improved institutional framework for tourism management in protected areas, including a pilot program for implementation of ecotourism in the Western Highlands of Guatemala.</p>	<p>9 Change in indicators in the GEF - UNDP institutional capacity scorecard (100 protected area managers [CONAP, INGUAT, co-managers, municipalities, tour operators and local community organizations] trained in tourist attention and evaluation, monitoring and mitigation of impacts from ecotourism)</p>	<p>A. Participation: (a) Municipalities 76.67; (b) Associations 77.78; (c) Regional institutions 53.33; (d) Institutions in capital city 55.56</p> <p>B. Generate, access and use information and knowledge: (a) Municipalities 51.67; (b) Associations 58.33; (c) Regional institutions 31.67; (d) Institutions in capital city 33.33</p> <p>C. Development of strategies, policies and regulations: (a) Municipalities 40; (b) Associations 66.67; (c) Regional institutions 35.56; (d) Institutions in capital city 44.44</p> <p>D. Management and implementation: (a) Municipalities 33.33; (b) Associations 41.67; (c) Regional institutions 30.00; (d) Institutions in capital city 66.67</p> <p>E. Monitoring and evaluation: (a) Municipalities 16.67; (b) Associations 41.67; (c) Regional institutions 0; (d) Institutions in capital city 0.</p>	<p>A. Participation: (a) Municipalities 82.67; (b) Associations 83.78; (c) Regional institutions 59.33; (d) Institutions in capital city 61.56</p> <p>B. Generate, access and use information and knowledge: (a) Municipalities 57.67; (b) Associations 64.33; (c) Regional institutions 37.67; (d) Institutions in capital city 39.33</p> <p>C. Development of strategies, policies and regulations: (a) Municipalities 46; (b) Associations 72.67; (c) Regional institutions 41.56; (d) Institutions in capital city 50.44</p> <p>D. Management and implementation: (a) Municipalities 39.33; (b) Associations 47.67; (c) Regional institutions 36.00; (d) Institutions in capital city 72.67</p> <p>E. Monitoring and evaluation: (a) Municipalities 22.67; (b) Associations 47.67; (c) Regional institutions 6.00; (d) Institutions in capital city 6.00.</p>	<p>Not achieved - 80%. Only 4 out of 20 indicators were not achieved, although improvements and progress are noticeable in most of the municipalities involved in the project. Errors were found in the baseline and goal values for Development of strategies, policies and regulations for the Institutions in the capital city during the preparation of <i>Tracking Tools</i> for the MTR. These were adjusted, but the goal of improving 6 points in this indicator remained the same.</p> <p>A. Participation: (a) Municipalities 73.33 – did not achieve the goal for lack of involvement of Todos Santos Cuchumatán, where the administration in place since 2015 has not collaborated effectively with the project. (b) Associations 83.33 – did not achieve the goal for only 0.45 points. This is mostly due to the value of each criteria that defines progress; as there are few criteria, the next level would reach the maximum score, but that requires the involvement of local stakeholders and was not part of the plan; (c) Regional institutions 66.00 – surpassed by 6.67 points; (d) Institutions in capital city 66.67 – surpassed by 5.11 points.</p> <p>B. Generate, access and use information and knowledge: (a) Municipalities 63.33 – surpassed by 5.66 points; (b) Associations 70.83 – surpasses by 6.5 points; (c) Regional institutions 50.00 – surpassed by 12.33 points; (d) Institutions in capital city 66.67 – surpassed by 27.34 points.</p> <p>C. Development of strategies, policies and regulations: (a) Municipalities 62.22 – surpassed by 16.22 points; (b) Associations 66.67 – goal not achieved by 6 points because the associations lack capacity to revise their internal strategies and policies, depending upon external support; (c) Regional institutions 42.22 – surpassed by 0.66 points; (d) Institutions in capital city 56.66 – surpassed by 6.12 points.</p> <p>D. Management and implementation: (a) Municipalities 50.00 – surpassed by 10.67 points; (b) Associations 50.00 – surpassed by 2.33 points; (c) Regional institutions 43.33 – surpassed by 7.33 points; (d) Institutions in capital city 66.67 – not achieved by 6 points due to the uncertainty of funding and lack of personnel in Central CONAP which in turn prevents the activities in the annual work plan to be fulfilled.</p> <p>E. Monitoring and evaluation: (a) Municipalities 46.67 – surpassed by 24 points; (b) Associations 50.00 – surpassed by 2.33 points; (c) Regional institutions 10.00 – surpassed by 4 points; (d) Institutions in capital city 33.33 – surpassed by 27.33 points.</p> <p>An assessment of these results shows that there is more capacity for abstract tasks such as participation, planning and development of strategies than for implementation, monitoring and evaluation, which need to be improved.</p> <p>A Capacity Building Manual for Managers and Technical Staff and a Guide for Facilitators in topics related to tourism and protected areas were developed as support tools for capacity building workshops. These materials will be available from CONAP and project partner websites.</p>	<p>S</p>
---	--	---	---	--	-----------------

	<p>10 Number of protected areas in the Western Highlands established and registered in SIGAP</p>	<p>– Forty-one (41)</p>	<p>– Forty-three (43)</p>	<p>Achieved 100%. This indicator was corrected: the baseline was adjusted from 39 to 41, and the goal, from 41 to 43 – the goal of increasing 2 points remained the same. The register of new protected areas was achieved due to direct action from the project. The register of Mirador Rey Tepepul RMP, in Santiago Atitlán, was pending since 1993 and is therefore noted as a major accomplishment. It grants protection to 3,509.91 ha in the Western Highlands (the area was already considered in SIGAP because it is part of the RUMCLA – Multiple Use Reserve of the Lake Atitlán Basin). The PNR Ecological Park Corazón del Bosque adds another 8.94 ha. Other 19 new areas in the Western Highlands were registered in SIGAP during project implementation.</p>	<p>HS</p>
	<p>11 Number of protected areas in the Western Highlands with evaluation, monitoring and mitigation of impacts from tourism in ecologically sensitive areas</p>	<p>– Zero (0)</p>	<p>– Seven (7)</p>	<p>Achieved 100%. Biological monitoring protocols were adjusted for the 7 pilot protected areas and are being implemented. The biological monitoring protocols had to be simplified from the original design to be compatible with implementation by park rangers. Monitoring activities are executed eight months in the year. Monitoring impacts of ecotourism is a complementary activity that supports the maintenance of trails and infrastructure, trash collection, etc.</p>	<p>HS</p>
	<p>12 Change in revenues generated annually in 22 protected areas by tourist visitation</p>	<p>– \$1,393,123</p>	<p>– \$1,811,060 (30% increase)</p>	<p>Not achieved - 71.5%. The 30% increase in revenues from tourism was not achieved during the time of project implementation; an increase of 21.44% was achieved. This indicator was difficult to achieve because the project only had influence on 7 of the 22 protected areas. For this reason, the indicator is not considered realistic in conception and the project was not long enough to be able to fulfill this goal. Although the goal was not achieved, this increase is significant because there has not been enough time for the policies and regulations developed and approved through the project to be fully implemented, especially regarding shared management and reinstatement of revenues from visitor entry fees. These possibilities are new in the 7 pilot areas and more time is needed for consistent results. The business plans are ready, but not fully implemented, the agreements with tour operators are recent, as well as the increase in capacity for improving tourist attention services. The Impulsa Program had a call for proposals open at the time of the Terminal Evaluation and is guaranteed until 2019. Considering the new opportunities originated by the project, the goal for the increase of revenues from tourism will probably be surpassed in the coming years.</p>	<p>S</p>
	<p>13 Number of protected areas in the Western Highlands with a functional system of visitor entry fees and tourist services</p>	<p>– Two (2): Permanent Ban Zone Volcano and Lake Chicabal and RMP Concepción Chiquirichapa</p>	<p>– Eight (8): baseline + 6 pilot areas.</p>	<p>Achieved 200%. Six out of seven pilot protected areas have implemented visitor entry fees as well as other 6 protected areas in the region, with a total of 14 protected areas in the region when including the two defined as baseline. This implies relevant changes for protected areas because (a) regulations that reinstate revenues from visitor entry fees to protected areas were approved; (b) local populations initially resist the idea of paying entry fees, as people are used to free access; (c) an important effort was made in seeking political support, as many authorities find the idea of entry fees disagreeable for fear of losing support in elections.</p>	<p>HS</p>

	<p>14 Change in the financial gap to cover basic management costs and SIGAP investments as a result of increased revenues in protected areas from visitor entry fees and provision of tourist services</p>	<p>– \$ 1,209,132.79</p>	<p>– \$1,054,762.87 (15% reduction in financial gap)</p>	<p>Achieved 124.5%. This indicator was revised by recommendation of the MTR because it initially referred to the entire SIGAP and it was not feasible to expect the project to impact 15% of the financial gap at the national level by working with only seven protected areas in the Western Highlands. The indicator was therefore adjusted to the region. The goal was achieved, and the financial gap was reduced by 18.67%.</p>	HS
	<p>15 Change in management effectiveness of the selected protected areas in pilot landscapes through METT</p>	<p>– RMP Todos Santos Cuchumatán: 58 – RMP Astillero Municipal 1 and 2 de San Pedro Sacatepéquez (RMP Quetzalí): 27 – RMP Astillero Municipal de San Marcos: 54 – RMP Canjulá, Tocapote, Los Maijones: 32 – PNR Parque Ecológico Corazón del Bosque: 55 – RMP Rey Tepepul: 48 – PBZ Volcán Chicabal: 38</p>	<p>– PRM Todos Santos Cuchumatán: 58 (goal 77 points) – RMP Astillero Municipal 1 and 2 de San Pedro Sacatepéquez (RMP Quetzalí): 59 (goal 47 points) – RMP Astillero Municipal de San Marcos: 75 (goal 74 points) – RMP Canjulá, Tocapote, Los Maijones: 63 (goal 52 points) – PNR Parque Ecológico Corazón del Bosque: 75 (goal 75 points) – RMP Rey Tepepul: 64 (goal 68 points) – PBZ Volcán Chicabal: 60 (goal 58 points)</p>	<p>Not achieved - 71.4% - 5 of 7 protected areas Five of the seven pilot protected areas increased the score for management effectiveness. Management and public use plans RMP Mirador Rey Tepepul are ready and await formal approval by the Municipal Council, from where it will be submitted to CONAP at the regional and national levels. This process could not be initiated before the official registry of the Park in SIGAP. The plans were expected to be approved before project termination; had this happened, the score would have increased and the overall goal would have been achieved. But the plans are completed and no further difficulties should arise in the process of approval after the project is terminated. No effective progress was made in Todos Santos Cuchumatán for political reasons. The municipality had reached 78 points by 2015, before the last change in municipal government, but the new administration discontinued the activities and the points in the METT scorecard were reduced to the level of initial evaluation. The communities managing the RMP have not established a favorable relationship with the municipal authorities, which do not manifest much interest in park management because they do not perceive direct benefits to the municipality. The difficulty in granting approval to the public use plan is unfortunate, as the influx of tourists goes through the city and creates potential opportunities for revenue from services, especially as the city has interesting tourism potential for cultural reasons. Despite this situation, the municipality hired a person for the development of tourism activities, but no effort had been made at the time of the Terminal Evaluation to integrate neither the communities who in practice manage the RMP, nor local tourist guides.</p>	S
<p>Products Result 1:</p> <p>1.1. Update of Co-administration Policy and management instruments. 1.2. Update of Tourist Activities in Protected Areas Policy, which regulates interinstitutional cooperation, planning, investment and management. 1.3. CONAP regulations for the reinstatement of revenues from visitor entry fees and concessions in protected areas. 1.4. Environmental standards and certification system for the development of ecotourism regulate private sector investment in protected areas and enable biodiversity conservation.</p>					
<p>Products Result 2:</p> <p>2.1. Capacity building program increases technical capacity of protected area managers (CONAP, INGUAT, co-managers, municipalities, tour operator and local community organizations) for (a) implementation of environmental and social safeguards for ecotourism; b) visitor attention; y c) evaluation, monitoring and mitigation of ecotourism impacts (acceptable limits of change in ecologically sensitive areas in pilot areas). 2.2. Thirty (30) CONAP officials trained on visitor attention and monitoring impacts of ecotourism. 2.3. Monitoring strategy developed to assess acceptable limits of change in ecologically sensitive areas in pilot areas. 2.4. Management plans for protected areas include ecotourism as part of financial strategies. 2.5. Business plans defined for protected areas in pilot landscapes promote the development of new tourist destinations in areas with few visitors, but with ecotourism potential. 2.6. Pilot experience in applying an visitor entry fee system and concessions that include reinstating, assigning and levelling fees.</p>					

3.3.2 Relevance *

RELEVANT⁴

The project objective is coherent with **GEF-6 Strategic Objective 1 for Biodiversity**, which aims to improve the sustainability of protected area systems: “Improved efficacy in the management of new and existing protected areas; protected area systems ensure increase in revenues and diversification of income sources to cover all expenses necessary for management objectives.”

The project contributes to the **United Nations Sustainable Development Goals** in terms of protection, restoration and promotion of the sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainable management of forests and reduction of land degradation, and habitat and biodiversity loss. It also contributes to Goal 7 of the **United Nations Millenium Development Goals**, to ensure environmental sustainability.

The project is **perfectly suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies: the CONAP National Policy on Tourist Activities in Protected Areas** and Regulations (2000 and 2003), **SIGAP Environmental Management Framework** (2003), **INGUAT National Ecotourism Policy** (2003), **Guatemala National Policy for the Development of Sustainable Tourism** (2004-2014 and 2012-2022), the **Guatemalan Government Agendas for Change** (2012-2016) and **Competitiveness** (2012-2021). The project is also **aligned with the Guatemala Management Plan for Sustainable Tourism 2015-2025**.

The **Guatemala Government included tourism in one of the five axes of presidential priorities** of the General Government Policy 2016-2020 (“support to micro, small and medium-size enterprises, **tourism**, housing, and dignified and decent work”). The opportunities of financial improvement and legal certainty due to the reinstatement of revenues from visitor entry fees from ecotourism to protected areas, as well as new shared management opportunities, increase potential investment in the conservation of protected areas, species and ecosystems, contributing to the conservation of biological diversity of global importance, to the increase of resilience to climate change and the maintenance of ecosystem services.

3.3.3 Effectiveness and efficiency *

SATISFACTORY⁵

Effectiveness

Effectiveness is defined as the extent to which an objective was achieved or the how likely it is to be achieved.

Structural changes and unforeseen situations normally occur during project implementation, requiring adaptive management measures. In the case of this project, some turmoil took place upon the transition of government in 2015, after which there were reductions in CONAP personnel and

⁴ According to the Guide for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP supported projects financed by GEF, the project must be rated as Relevant or Not relevant.

⁵ According to the Guide for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP supported projects financed by GEF, Effectiveness and efficiency must be qualified according to a set of six ratings: Highly satisfactory, Satisfactory, Moderately satisfactory, Moderately unsatisfactory, Unsatisfactory and Highly unsatisfactory.

budget allocations. Political changes in the municipalities linked to the project equally required new efforts to reestablish cooperation, which did not always reach the former level of support.

At the beginning of implementation, the PMU realized that two of the goals were not feasible: developing economic incentives and an environmental certification system within CONAP. The alternative was to establish cooperation with INGUAT, which had appropriate conditions to implement equivalent solutions.

At the beginning of the project some of the collaboration and co-financing commitments were lost due to the time between project design and start up. This led to changes along implementation in the most relevant partners and stakeholders.

Adjustments were required for six of the indicators in the logical framework, some for lack of reference to baseline calculations, others due to the initial design or to updates in SIGAP data. Baselines were recalculated and indicators adjusted to enable comparisons along project implementation, which required funds for consultancies and working hours that had not been planned.

The availability of specialized consultants with expertise in tourism was found to be limited. Some of the contracts had to be cancelled and redrawn with new consultants, extending the time needed to generate the desired products.

Despite the several issues to which the PMU had to adapt and create solutions, all results were achieved and all products generated, including other documents that were not planned during project design. The only indicator that was not achieved refers to 30% increase in revenues from 22 protected areas in the Western Highlands. This indicator was not realistic because the project only had influence on 7 of the 22 protected areas. Other indicators were only partially achieved because the scores in the Institutional Capacity Scorecard (4/20) and Management Effectiveness did not improve as much as expected (see analysis of logical framework).

The general objective was also effectively achieved for creating new financing opportunities for SIGAP while respecting environmental conservation criteria. Despite unforeseen situations and political turmoil, project **effectiveness was highly satisfactory in terms of achieving the expected results.**

Result 1 was achieved and surpassed, as in addition to updating existing policies, developing and approving new policies and regulations, manuals and guides were produced as support tools for implementation. This consolidates a legal and technical base for the development of ecotourism in the country and creates new work and socioeconomic development opportunities, at the same time establishing a financial mechanism for the conservation and maintenance of protected areas.

Result 2 was equally achieved, with the inclusion of ecotourism in the CONAP program of work in harmony with national development policies and plans. Institutional capacities, especially at the municipal level, can surely be improved in the future, as well as management effectiveness, either through new projects or simply by the application of the legal base and the management tools developed as part of Result 1 of this project.

Efficiency

Efficiency is defined as the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible. For reasons already explained, as the need to recalculate baseline values for indicators in

the logical framework, replacement of consultants, financial execution in year one (70% of the AOP), and the difficulty in following up with co-financing institutions, efficiency is considered **satisfactory**.

No other difficulties in financial execution were observed: the tracking tools were well used and adjusted when necessary in the logical framework; accounting systems were approved by external audits, which only registered two minor issues that were immediately corrected; progress reports were punctually produced and management responses to the MTR were registered and implemented. The EA **demonstrated good adaptive management capacity** especially for problems in project design and political turmoil, as unrealistic goals for the structure of CONAP had been planned. These were achieved through interinstitutional cooperation.

It is relevant to register that financial execution was carried out by the UNDP, which ensured that all expenses were verified and adequately made according to planning.

Result 1 can be considered more efficient than Result 2, as it was less dependent upon external cooperation, and because nine extra products were generated which offer relevant support for the development of ecotourism in Guatemala. Result 2 was dependent on cooperation with municipalities and associations and was more affected by frailties in project design.

3.3.4 Country ownership

The project is **well integrated with the CONAP National Policy on Tourist Activities in Protected Areas** and regulations (2000 and 2003), which was updated as part of the project goals. Other relevant policies to which the project is related are SIGAP Environmental Management Framework (2003), INGUAT National Ecotourism Policy (2003), Guatemala National Policy for the Development of Sustainable Tourism (2004-2014 and 2012-2022), the Guatemalan Government Agendas for Change (2012-2016) and Competitiveness (2012-2021). The project is also aligned with the Guatemala Management Plan for Sustainable Tourism 2015-2025.

The **Guatemala Government included tourism in one of the five axes of presidential priorities** of the General Government Policy 2016-2020 (“support to micro, small and medium-size enterprises, **tourism**, housing, and dignified and decent work”). The project contributes to four objectives of priorities in the same policy, in components (a) financial sustainability (Biodiversity Conservation Strategies), (b) development of ecotourism and increase in local participation for shared benefits of ecotourism in protected areas (Management of Goods and Services), (c) development of capacity for the modernization of the State and application of management instruments for the conservation of biodiversity (Institutional Modernization Strategy), and (d) social participation in the application of management instruments for the public use of protected areas (Social Participation Strategy). This policy is integrated with priorities established in the National Development Plan K’atun 2032, which also includes tourism as a mechanism of economic development.

The **GEF Focal Point**, Vice-Minister of Natural Resources and Climate Change, acknowledged the importance of this project, the strategic relevance of tourism for Guatemala and the potential contribution of ecotourism to the sustainability of protected areas and as an additional income generation opportunity for communities and populations in their surroundings.

The **Guatemala National Policy for Sustainable Development of Tourism 2012-2020** designated INGUAT the task of developing a certification program for tourist service providers considering quality, sustainability and safety. The existence of this policy favored the project and is reflected in

the increasing role of INGUAT as project partner and assurance of continuity for some of the programs initiated through the project. The post of community tourist guide was created due to significant community interest, together with training provided by INGUAT. The INGUAT Q-Green Certification Program was expanded to incorporate the certification of protected areas and the Impulsa Program was developed to promote and support tourism services in the country. The Ministry of Economy and the Tourism Chamber plan to grant Impulsa winners with a membership for access to other capacity building opportunities and benefits. INGUAT has decided to register the Impulsa Program as a trademark. The fact that 2017 is the International Year of Sustainable Tourism for Development also favored the project for the involvement of INGUAT, which is working on the certification of the Yaxhá Nakum Naranjo National Park, managed by the Ministry of Culture and Sports, as the first protected area with environmental certification (Q-Green) in the country.

Many of the persons interviewed for this terminal evaluation considered that the most important result of this project is to have **institutionalized a program of work for the development of ecotourism** as a financial mechanism for the conservation of protected areas within SIGAP. **At the municipal level**, interviews with authorities revealed a clear understanding of the relevance and opportunities that tourism offers as a source of regional economic development. Evidence is the search for funds and partners to improve infrastructure in protected areas and support management, including volunteering school students, scouts and communities for environmental education and reforestation activities.

Within CONAP, among authorities and technical staff, ecotourism is perceived as an important financial mechanism that can help balance institutional shortcomings in the conservation of protected areas. For several people, **this project has broken an institutional paradigm**, as protected areas were often seen as suitable exclusively for conservation purposes. **Ecotourism is now seen as compatible due to the introduction of monitoring protocols for impacts of tourism and biological monitoring**, as these tools help set limits for visitation. The potential of increase of work and benefits for nearby communities is acknowledged. Another benefit is that project implementation has strengthened the image of CONAP, facilitating cooperation for the protection of natural areas and the development of sustainable tourism. Positive project results as well as a conceptual base provided through capacity building have certainly contributed to project ownership by people at all levels of participation.

Having strongly invested in policies, regulations and other documents developed with CONAP staff to improve the existing legal framework, the project leaves a **solid legal base for the development of tourism with a vision of sustainability that includes monitoring impacts on biological diversity**, a key element to assure the conservation of the natural heritage. Government representatives at the municipal, regional (CONAP) and national levels were involved in the process of approval of legal and other documents. These legal documents function as guidance for protected area management and are innovative for creating new shared management opportunities and eliminating former limitations.

3.3.5 Mainstreaming

The project **contributes to the programmatic area of Inclusive and Sustainable Development of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2015-2019** for investing in “policies and investments that promote and are responsible for the protection, use and conservation of natural resources, especially in the areas of biodiversity, climate change, water management and energy.”

The project is aligned with the **UNDP Country Program for Guatemala 2015-2019** for the component on inclusive and sustainable development, which includes strengthening alliances between government institutions, including the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources and CONAP. This is continued from the **UNDP Country Program for Guatemala (2010-2014)**, which includes the objective of **income generation opportunities** from ecotourism and provision of tourist services, contributing to the environment and sustainable development component. This component includes support to strengthen local and national institutions, to the civil society for improved inter-sectorial and decentralized environmental management and to the development of ecologically sustainable production projects that benefit rural populations. Although no specific mention is made in this document about tourism as a goal of the program, some project activities have corroborated the interest of the general public and the private sector in developing ecotourism as a source of income. The project therefore **contributes to the components of poverty alleviation, environmental conservation and sustainable development**. The Sibinal – Canjulá RMP, for example, had revenues of Q 26,000 in 2016, with the same amount having been gained by August 2017 due to the review of visitor entry fees, structural improvements and promotion of the park to increase visitation. At the PBZ Volcán Chicabal visitor entry fees were increased after the assessment of operational costs provided by the project, increasing the level of income. ASAECO therefore managed to distribute profits for the first time in 2016 to the 19 associated families who had always only done voluntary work since the area was purchased in 1999. The management plan developed through the project was used to organize visitation, establishing rules to prevent tourists from making noise during the night and ensuring the lake is kept free of litter. The NPR Corazón del Bosque also reviewed visitor entry fees. The managing committee acknowledged the importance of the protected area plans provided and the biological and impact monitoring efforts, especially because they formerly worked without planning. They also acknowledged that, with support from the project, more efficient communication was established with the CONAP Regional Office, which provides them with better support for management in the future.

The approval of management regulations for visitation activities, which reinstates revenues from visitor entry fees to protected areas managed by CONAP is of national relevance, as they improve maintenance possibilities and investments in tourist services to increase visitation and revenues. The approval of **SIGAP regulations for co-administration and shared management** is also relevant for allowing specific services to be provided by others, facilitating cooperation with associations and communities, and creating new income opportunities.

Despite political instability and loss of CONAP personnel, the project has proven that **ecotourism initiatives and services promote economic development**. For example, 646 new businesses were legalized and/or established between 2013 and 2017 by indirect influence of the project or not. One of the Impulsa Program beneficiaries reported that, being the only tour operator in his area, tourism now benefits the local population because tourist arrivals have led to the opening of new businesses. Another beneficiary reports a 15-20% increase of revenues to his business after he was selected by the Impulsa Program. These are positive indicators for the promotion of ecotourism in other areas of the country, creating opportunities of income generation for local populations and for protected areas while improving visitor infrastructure in cooperation with the private sector, indirectly improving the feasibility of the conservation of protected areas.

Climate change mitigation was not part of the GEF program when the project was designed. The increase in protected areas in SIGAP, biological and visitor impact monitoring, as well as capacity building for protected area management focused on sustainable tourism indirectly contribute to increase resilience and mitigate effects of climate change, but no specific activities were planned or executed for this purpose.

Project design did not incorporate criteria of **gender equality** as currently required by the GEF, as these were not required at the time (GEF 3-4). An analysis of capacity building workshops carried out through the project reveal strong gender inequality for cultural reasons. Even if the PMU had tried to have equal numbers of men and women in the workshops, this would hardly be achieved. Park rangers are nearly all men, so very few women were available to participate. Six of the seven protected area managers linked to the project are men, with an exception to Quetzalí RMP (former Astillero I and II San Pedro Sacatepéquez), where the manager is a woman with a degree in Agronomical Engineering; the mayors and municipal council members are men. The participation of women in project activities in the pilot sites was noted in traditionally female roles. A few positions within CONAP are occupied by women, but not the higher ones; the three regional directors in the Western Highlands are men. Although the PMU made efforts to improve gender equality from the year 2016, the percentage of female participation in workshops promoted by the project reached 20.8%. A higher percentage of female participation is registered in workshops directed to technical staff than to other positions such as park rangers, directors and protected area managers.

Examples of female participation were registered in activities such as provision of food in festivities promoted in protected areas, such as the Prayer for Rain at PBZ Volcán Chicabal; an athletic race promoted at Quetzalí RMP (former Astillero I and II in San Pedro Sacatepéquez); and management of the restaurant at PNR Corazón del Bosque.

A **Gender Equality Strategy for CONAP** is in development since 2015. The Council requested a number of changes upon review of the document, but the person in charge was dismissed when the government changed. A new person was hired in 2017 to oversee gender issues in CONAP, so at the time of the Terminal Evaluation the document “CONAP Gender Equality Strategy with Cultural Considerations 2017-2022” was being prepared for presentation to the Council. The document is organized according to four strategies: (a) mainstreaming gender issues with cultural considerations into the CONAP institution; (b) promote the principles of equality and equity with cultural considerations in planning, policies, strategies, plans, programs and projects implemented by CONAP; (c) improving the knowledge of technical and administrative staff in topics of human rights and women rights, with cultural considerations; (d) promotion and dissemination of management practices in public services focused on gender equality and cultural considerations. These are important references for future projects and to help change public perception of masculine and female roles in the country.

3.3.6 Sustainability *

MODERATELY LIKELY ⁶

Project sustainability was considered **moderately likely** especially due to political and socio-economic instability, insufficient budget and personnel in Central CONAP, Regional Offices and

⁶ According to the Guide for Terminal Evaluations of UNDP supported projects financed by GEF, Sustainability must be qualified according to a set of four ratings: Likely, Moderately likely, Moderately unlikely or Unlikely.

municipalities and associations that manage the pilot protected areas. The lack of technical capacity in the country to take responsibility for the development of ecotourism with environmental sustainability criteria is another weakness that was experienced during project implementation.

Financial sustainability

Likely

Several measures are in place to ensure the continuity of activities initiated during project implementation:

- a) consolidation of legal framework for the development of ecotourism in protected areas, with tourism embedded in national policies as a priority for development;
- b) approval of Management Regulations for Visitation Activities within SIGAP, which reinstates revenues from visitor entry fees to protected areas;
- c) approval of the Co-Administration and Shared Management Policy, creating new work and income generation opportunities from tourist services;
- d) visitor entry fees in protected areas are institutionalized based on operational needs and projected income. Although Mirador Rey Tepepul RMP has not yet established visitation fees for lack of infrastructure, conditions are being improved for short-term implementation;
- e) ownership of the Impulsa Program by INGUAT, with a continuity commitment of three years since 2017, as well as of the Certification of Protected Areas with criteria of environmental sustainability (Q-Green Label);
- f) development of business plans and public use plans for the seven pilot protected areas, which serve as models for the entire SIGAP;
- g) institutional capacities strengthened at the national, regional and municipal levels for the development of ecotourism, changing the perception project participants about the potential of ecotourism as a financial mechanism for protected areas, municipalities and communities.

Socioeconomic sustainability

Moderately likely

At the moment of the terminal evaluation, ownership of project products and benefits is strong within the main organizations involved. The risk lies in political instability that can lead to ample changes in personnel with exception to a few positions within CONAP that have been granted stability. This situation creates the risk of loss of institutional memory, technical capacity and tools produced by the project. After the last elections in 2015 and losses of CONAP personnel, the PMU strategically invested more efforts in consolidating external collaboration to achieve project goals. These alliances favor the continuity of project activities and the register of project memory by allocating capacity and knowledge beyond institutions that are more politically unstable.

Communities and associations involved in the project and CONAP personnel at the regional level and municipalities acknowledge the benefits of the project in terms of capacity building, especially for improving tourist attention services (ex. PNR Corazón del Bosque) and management plans (ex. PBZ Volcán Chicabal). Participants also acknowledge the value of management and public use plans, as many realize that their former work was done at random and that they did not have plans with legal value to support implementation. Benefits go beyond associations managing protected areas

because other people from nearby areas had opportunities to provide services to visitors, especially on special occasions. The public in general demonstrated interest in the development of tourism especially once sacred areas were protected to ensure respect for cultural traditions, and that income opportunities were created. This became evident in the pilot areas, as even local visitors accepted to pay entry fees so that more investments could be made and more visitor services were developed.

Notwithstanding political instability, participation of the private sector, of NGOs, local associations and universities in capacity building workshops promoted by the project help safeguard capacities, products and the memory of what was achieved, at least in the Western Highlands. In Todos Santos Cuchumatán, for example, tourism commissions retain the president of the former administration in the role of secretary for the new administration to ensure the continuity of the work without losing previous references.

The consolidation of cooperation agreements between CONAP and INGUAT in December, 2016, for the continuity of the Impulsa Program, and in September, 2017, for the development of the Q-Green Certification Label, just before project termination, is an important pillar to ensure the sustainability of programs at least until a national political change interferes. Although this change is possible, the lessons learned from cooperation and the value it has been given by CONAP and INGUAT personnel might suffice to further promote continuity throughout new governments, especially because tourism is embedded in national policies as an engine for economic and social development strongly linked to the Guatemalan natural heritage.

Sustainability of institutional framework and governance

Likely

Policies and regulations have been updated as well as the institutional framework to promote ecotourism in protected areas. The Co-Administration and Shared Management Policy and the Management Regulations for Visitation Activities within SIGAP are especially relevant. These legal documents are aligned with national plans and policies, with tourism as a priority for development. The most relevant national references are the General Government Policy 2016-2020, the INGUAT National Ecotourism Policy (2003), the Guatemala National Policy for the Development of Sustainable Tourism (2004-2014 and 2012-2022) and the Guatemala Management Plan for Sustainable Tourism 2015-2025. The sustainability of legal documents updated or created by the project is ensured by their official approval and by the inclusion of ecotourism as a financial mechanism for the conservation of protected areas.

The sustainability ensured in changes in the CONAP institutional framework is more at risk due to insufficient funds or personnel for proper implementation, as 85-90% of the current CONAP budget is used for institutional maintenance. There is uncertainty in the reinstatement of revenues from visitor entry fees to protected areas managed by municipalities, as the funds are deposited in a common municipal fund and most often used for other purposes, as the regulations approved only refer to areas managed directly by CONAP. Instability in personnel in regional CONAP offices and municipalities could hinder the continuity of biological monitoring. The agreements established with NGOs and educational institutions are relevant especially because they are not affected by political changes. The internal limitations of CONAP are more related to financial issues than to the legal or institutional framework, which have been consolidated by the project.

The risk to the institutional framework and governance is low because the legal framework is now adequate and includes criteria of environmental sustainability. The likelihood of sustainability increased with capacity building, which benefitted not only the Western Highlands but the entire SIGAP, as staff from all 10 Regional CONAP Offices, communities, stakeholders, NGOs and universities participated in workshops. The Universidad del Valle requested copies of the “Best Practices Manuals for Protected Areas”, upon their publication in September, 2017, for use as teaching materials in a master degree course on sustainable tourism. INGUAT became the most relevant stakeholder for embracing business concepts linked to the conservation of protected areas and ensuring the continuity of project programs based on legal documents, manuals and guides that benefit SIGAP.

Environmental sustainability

Likely

The main environmental risks to sustainability are associated to climate change, such as extreme events, as well as the misuse of natural resources that causes degradation. Conversion of forests to other uses and illegal wood extraction are the most common problems. Although the project did not work directly on these threats to protected areas, a decline in illegal wood extraction has been observed in the protected areas where the areas formerly served this purpose for the population (San Pedro and San Marcos, but also in Sibinal). The increased level of protection at the Mirador Rey Tepepul RMP also contributes to environmental sustainability and may lead to a gradual decrease in agricultural cultivation, especially as organized visitation increases and visitor entry fees are implemented.

The measures introduced by the project to increase the level of protection in some areas and implement monitoring to detect significant changes in biological diversity are relevant for SIGAP because they include environmental criteria that can be used to limit tourist activities and visitation in ecologically sensitive areas based on changes of behavior or presence of indicator species. The sustainability of the monitoring system is ensured by its inclusion in management plans of the seven pilot protected areas and by the enthusiasm and commitment with which park rangers and CONAP staff are implementing it.

The main limitation for sustainability expressed during the interviews for the Terminal Evaluation referred to lack of personnel in CONAP Regional Offices to continue biological monitoring and especially for the replication of project activities to other protected areas in SIGAP. Although the lack of technical personnel in Regional Offices is a budgetary issue, it is also a political issue with consequences for environmental sustainability. So, even though people at the directive and technical levels have taken ownership of the project concepts and goals, they feel limited in their capacity to expand to other areas.

3.3.7 Catalytic role

Ratings for the catalytic role depend on the level of replication achieved and is evaluated according to the following criteria: (a) scaling up - approaches developed through the project are taken up on a regional / national scale, becoming widely accepted, and perhaps legally required; (b) replication - activities, demonstrations, and/or techniques are repeated within or outside the project, nationally or internationally; (c) demonstration - steps have been taken to catalyze the public good, for instance through the development of demonstration sites, successful information dissemination and training; and (d) production of public good - the lowest level of catalytic result, including for instance development of new technologies and approaches or no significant actions were taken to

build on this achievement, so the catalytic effect is left to 'market forces'.

The project is mostly at the **replication level**, as policies and regulations are approved to support the development of ecotourism in Guatemala. These legal documents ensure the replication of benefits applied to the seven pilot protected areas to other areas within SIGAP and can be used as models for similar legislation in other countries where ecotourism is a development priority.

Because the main outputs of the project are policies and legal regulations, they will be necessarily replicated throughout SIGAP, and can be used as models by other countries. In a longer timeframe, these results may be scaling up. The five policies and regulations updated or developed introduce new alternatives for the management of protected areas and the increase and reinstatement of revenues from tourism. In this specific case, **the rating should be "scaling up"**, as these measures are being implemented in the pilot protected areas.

The guides for the development of plans and the tools to estimate tourism potential and define visitor entry fees based on operational costs are considered of **high replication potential for offering resources not formerly available**. The same applies to the capacity building manual for managers and technical staff and the respective guide for facilitators in topics of tourism.

Nine additional documents to support the management of ecotourism not initially planned were produced. These include an update of the COTURAP regulations, guides for the development of public use plans and business plans. A formal agreement was signed with CONAP for the development of an online version of the tool for estimation of visitor entry fees based on operational costs of protected areas and payment capacity of visitors. Once this tool is online, protected area managers in any region in Guatemala, as well as in other countries, can use the system to organize their costs and adjust visitor entry fees, at the same time gaining a solid view of what is needed to achieve self-sustainability. Although not enough time has passed for this tool to be used by other protected areas, institutions, projects or countries, the seven pilot protected areas are using it and developing public use and business plans, reaching the **demonstration** ranking.

The **biological monitoring** protocols are available for replication throughout SIGAP, with seven consolidated examples in the pilot areas. The protocols are currently being replicated to other protected areas in the Huehuetenango Department with funds from the "*Lifeweb*" project financed by the German Bank KfW. This project aims to consolidate SIGAP in the department by investing in improvements for 38,000 hectares of protected areas. As more time goes by, the results from **biological monitoring will generate important data sets for the Western Highlands**, based on which it will be possible to assess positive and negative aspects of the ecological condition of ecosystems and provide information to guide environmental management. In this case, the **repetition** ranking was achieved.

Apart from the expected outputs, including staff from the 10 CONAP Regional Offices to learn concepts and principles of ecotourism development and project implementation in capacity building workshops was a strategic decision. Some personnel within CONAP stated that the project broke an institutional paradigm by changing their perception on tourism as beneficial for environmental conservation. This mentality change is beneficial for gradually mainstreaming tourism management as a financial mechanism for the maintenance of protected areas. This initiative is attributed a **demonstration** ranking.

Professionals in charge of promoting tourism were hired by three of the municipalities benefitted by the project, another indicator of **replication**. A significant number of **new businesses** in tourism was opened or legalized during project implementation in the Western Highlands. Even if not by direct influence of the project, this demonstrates a favorable perception of the general public for the development of tourism which, in turn, will be supported by the legal framework updated by the project.

The **private sector** was offered opportunities for developing businesses in tourism with the Impulsa Program, created by the project in collaboration with INGUAT to benefit twenty winners per year in 2017. The certification of natural areas defined as Q-Green Label, also under the responsibility of INGUAT, promotes the adoption of regulations, manuals and guides developed by the project by those willing to improve the quality of tourism services in protected areas. This leads to more interest in visitation, increasing revenues and positively affecting the development of ecotourism in Guatemala.

Nine new **agreements with tour operators** were signed with pilot protected areas. Tour operators interviewed during the Terminal Evaluation see these agreements as leverage in their services because they can assure their clients that the visits will work out as planned, as they are officially authorized. Before the agreements, each visit had to be arranged separately, which consumed more time and created insecurity. The Go 2 Guate tour operator, for example, is going to increase the number of annual tours to Volcán Chicabal. These initiatives qualify as **scaling up** especially because they are in development **regardless of the existence of the project**.

The achievement potential of project results will be increased if they are disseminated through the **UNDP and GEF networks**, as well as if they are used in university courses in the area of tourism and made available from websites of universities, NGOs and other institutions that work on tourism in Guatemala.

3.3.8 Impact

Impact was rated as minimal due to the nature of this project, which did not include direct actions for ecosystem improvement. Due to the lack of direct intervention on ecological status during project implementation it was not possible to devise improvements at the time of the Terminal Evaluation. The results of the project cannot be directly linked to the ecological status of ecosystems in the pilot areas in the short term. A solid basis for the development of ecotourism and a financing mechanism for the conservation of protected areas was established by strengthening the political and institutional frameworks, building capacity and providing support to 7 pilot protected areas by designing planning instruments. **Direct impacts on the ecological status of ecosystems will be observed in the mid-long term**, as policies and regulations are widely applied and revenues are invested in the conservation and management of the protected areas where they were generated.

The total protected area in SIGAP increased due to the registry of two of the pilot protected areas (3,518.85ha). This prevents public land from being donated to private owners through political misconduct. The development and implementation of management plans, public use plans and business plans establish more favorable conditions for the conservation of species and ecosystem services and create pressure for action and support by the municipalities in charge of their management. Besides, the plans serve as models for other protected areas. All changes underway, from the implementation of visitor entry fees to the prohibition of practices formerly allowed, such

as wood harvesting, contribute to conservation, but it will be a while before communities understand and accept the new rules and stop illegally extracting natural resources from these areas. The increase in the investment on services and recreation options should be instrumental to expedite acceptance of rules, disseminate conservation objectives and environmental education initiatives. **After a longer period of biological monitoring it will be easier to draw conclusions about the ecological condition of these areas, define and mitigate threats to the conservation of species and ecosystem services.** A few years of biological monitoring will provide data for the definition of ecological baselines in the Western Highlands, where this type of information is not yet available, according to CONAP technical staff.

The management effectiveness tracking tools (METT) demonstrate **increased management capacity for all pilot protected areas**, although two of the seven municipalities did not achieve the expected scores. An analysis of the scorecards clearly shows more capacity in participation and planning than in implementation and monitoring. Although the expected scores were mostly achieved, there is certainly room for future improvement in management capacity.

The results listed below indirectly impact the conservation of the ecological status of protected areas in SIGAP and, particularly, of the seven pilot protected areas in the project.

The legal framework was adjusted to facilitate the development of ecotourism in protected areas, especially the Management Regulations for Visitation Activities within SIGAP and the Co-administration and Shared Management Policy and supporting Regulations. The impact of the first is on ensuring a source of income for protected areas from the reinstatement of revenues from visitor entry fees, which is in itself an incentive for the improvement of conditions and tourist services to increase visitation. The impact of the policy is in creating new opportunities for service providers, consequently for income generation, through shared management, which did not formerly exist, and for the administration of other areas of relevance for the conservation of biodiversity that are not protected areas. These legal regulations are complementary and create a favorable environment for the development of ecotourism which, in turn, creates better conditions for investments in the conservation of protected areas and the biodiversity they were established to protect.

Interviewees stated changes of vision on the part of protected area managers and institutions involved in management in terms of their perception of ecotourism as a financial mechanism for the maintenance of protected areas and biodiversity conservation.

Mirador Rey Tepepul RMP was registered in SIGAP. As this was pending since 1993, it is considered by most of the interviewees aware of the situation as a triumph at the national level. The 3,509 hectares are especially important because one of the last known populations of spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*) along the Pacific Coast of Guatemala lives there. Although this park does not represent an increase in the number of hectares in protected areas in SIGAP because it was already considered for being part of the Multiple Use Reserve of the Atitlan Lake Basin, the registry represents a change in the level of protection which is relevant to ensure the conservation of the area. The registry of the **PNR Ecological Reserve Corazón del Bosque** (8.94 ha) in SIGAP is relevant for representing a model of management by an association of farmers who has long understood the importance of conserving natural areas, especially for its value in water production and species conservation.

The number of protected areas implementing visitor entry fees increased. This result became clear as studies were developed by the project to estimate their operational costs. This is a **direct impact on the increase of revenues for the conservation of protected areas** which have adopted or will adopt this model. The seven pilot protected areas benefitted by the project also started implementing business plans.

Biological monitoring and monitoring for impacts of ecotourism became part of the SIGAP institutional framework. Monitoring routines are implemented in the seven pilot protected areas and serve as models for other areas.

Practical actions have been registered from the implementation of planning documents (management plans, public use and business plans). The pilot protected areas implemented or reviewed visitor entry fees; promoted events in protected areas to increase visitation; searched for partners and signed agreements with tour operators to increase revenues and build infrastructure; and improved trails for visitation and birdwatching. These are positive circumstances that put the ecotourism market in motion based on sustainability criteria to avoid negative impacts.

Investment and revenue generation opportunities were created based on sustainable ecotourism through the Impulsa Program and the certification for services and protected areas (Q-Green Label).

At the municipal level, changes due to project activities are demonstrated by investments in San Pedro Sacatepéquez to create a technical position for the management of the Quetzalí RMP (former Astillero I and II); in Todos Santos Cuchumatán the municipality hired a person to develop tourism activities in protected areas; the Santiago Atitlán municipality hired a manager for Mirador Rey Tepepul RMP and a coordinator for the development of tourism; and in Sibinal a person is hired on occasion to promote tourism events. Considering the limitations of staff and funding, these investments confirm political involvement and a broader view of tourism as a source of social and economic development.

Illegal wood extraction declined in the pilot protected areas. This is especially relevant in Quetzalí (former Astillero I and II San Pedro Sacatepéquez) and San Marcos RMP, which were long used for the purpose of wood extraction by nearby communities. The administration of these areas as protected areas based on management plans is gradually decreasing impacts due to external influence and increasing their potential for self-sustainability and conservation for future generations.

4 CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS

4.1 GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The **general objective of the project was achieved** because the financial sustainability of SIGAP was effectively strengthened by the establishment of new financial mechanisms and ways of promoting ecotourism in Guatemala in alignment with the conservation of biodiversity of global importance.

Result 1 was fully achieved and left an array of policies, regulations and additional products (manuals, guides, regulations, a proposal for harmonizing other legal documents) that consolidate an important base for the development of tourism in Guatemala.

Although **Result 2** only partially achieved some of the indicator goals in the logical framework, as the goals were dependent upon external cooperation, the accomplishment and products generated are considered excellent. Among the products are 21 plans for the seven pilot protected areas which are being implemented and serve as reference for the entire SIGAP.

4.2 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE DESIGN, IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

Conclusions on project design

The lack of written memory and register of decisions made in the design phase of the project required adaptations and corrections during implementation, but did not jeopardize the achievement of results.

Recommendations on project design

- (1) **Compile a registry of references used in project design and compare activities with existing projects to avoid duplication of efforts.** Especially register the data used to define the baseline of indicators and other information that supports project goals. Lack of reference data on the baseline calculations for several indicators in this project required them to be redefined at the expense of extra funds and time.
- (2) **Identify priorities of stakeholders and beneficiaries during project design and include funds in the project budget to support feasible activities.** Even if modest investments are made, supporting the development of activities of special interest increases cooperation with project activities and goals. This is especially relevant in environmental projects involving municipalities where conservation is often not seen as a priority. Authorities often prioritize actions that generate outcomes that are visible, politically interesting and focused on economic growth. Including activities with these characteristics can be an interesting strategy in project design. In addition to specific environmental conservation needs of partners and beneficiaries, identifying priorities of other stakeholders and including funds to support compatible activities can secure their interest and increase the viability of activities that are key for the achievement of project goals. Some of the interviewees suggested that projects should have regional focal points for pilot areas to ensure local commitment to the project. In the case of this project, it would have been important to provide equipment to CONAP regional offices and municipalities, such as waterproof clothing for biological monitoring, as well as support the construction of very basic infrastructure in pilot protected areas and take pilot area managers to visit other protected areas that are advanced in tourism management. Identifying synergies that are priorities for the project and

stakeholders increases potential achievement and the sustainability of activities initiated during project implementation. This issue was brought up repeatedly during interviews during the terminal evaluation. Many people involved in protected area management maintained the impression that, once the project provided management, public use and business plans, it would have been essential to include some funding at least for basic infrastructure. Small investments would have helped to consolidate and apply guidelines, as well as justified the implementation of visitor entry fees. Complementarily, had such funds been included in the project budget, it would have been easier to negotiate agreements and increase collaboration especially at the municipal level, as well as to start implementation of management and public use plans, including the application of visitor entry fees and approved policies and regulations in the pilot areas, yielding more substantial results in the field.

Conclusions on project implementation

Project implementation was considered Highly Satisfactory (HS), especially considering the need for adaptive management in recalculating indicator baselines, reduction of CONAP personnel due to budgetary losses and political instability. The coordination between CONAP and the UNDP on operational issues was considered Highly Satisfactory (HS). No major issues that would have required an intervention from the UNDP at higher levels occurred during project implementation.

Recommendations on project implementation

(3) Projects must invest efforts and resources in establishing institutional cooperation in order to share benefits as well as responsibilities for the sustainability of activities. The goals of this project were achieved mainly through cooperation agreements with relevant partners, which compensated for political instability and institutional difficulties.

Conclusions on monitoring and evaluation

Project monitoring and evaluation used all tools available except for co-financing activities and values, which ended with an incomplete follow-up.

Monitoring and evaluation were considered Satisfactory (S). The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan was satisfactorily designed. Although a specific M&E plan was not developed beyond what is described in the PRODOC, several mechanisms were in place. Apart from the Coordinator's routine responsibilities, quarterly meetings with the UNDP and one annual meeting of the tripartite commission were held. GEF monitoring instruments were thoroughly used: AOP, QPR, PIR, annual reports, reports on steering committee and co-financing partner meetings, as well as the Tracking Tools for Institutional Capacity, Financial Sustainability and Management Effectiveness (METT).

The lack of written memory and register of decisions made in the design phase of the project required adaptations and corrections during implementation, but did not jeopardize the achievement of results. Follow up of cofinancing activities was not satisfactory mainly due to a specific context of the project. Due to the time elapsed between project design in 2010 and start in 2013, part of the plans for the joint implementation of activities were lost, as organizations implemented their projects before the project started. This was compensated by instating other partner organizations. Although the activities of co-financing partners contribute to the general project objective and were implemented in the same region, most of these were not directly linked to specific project objectives.

Recommendations on monitoring and evaluation

- (4) **Ensure follow up of partner co-financing commitments.** In the case of this project, co-financing commitments were partially lost due to the delay between project design and start. Activities developed by partner organizations in the Western Highlands in synergy with project objectives were still considered as co-financing, but as they were not directly linked to the project, follow up was not prioritized. The amount of expenses made by Counterpart International on behalf of the project during the PPG, in 2012, was lost for lack of registry and therefore not included in the co-financing contributions.

4.3 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO FOLLOW-UP OR REINFORCE INITIAL BENEFITS FROM THE PROJECT

Conclusions

The replication potential of the main project activities is ensured by the vast reference documentation developed and available. The project is mostly at the **replication level**, as policies and regulations are approved to support the development of ecotourism in Guatemala. These legal documents ensure the replication of benefits applied to the seven pilot protected areas to other areas within SIGAP and can be used as models for similar legislation in other countries where ecotourism is a development priority.

The sustainability of the most relevant project activities and products is sufficiently ensured to promote the development of ecotourism in Guatemala. Formal agreements that ensure the continuity of project results and, in many cases, assure financial sustainability were signed: Impulsa Program (CONAP, INGUAT), Q-Green Certification Program (CONAP, INGUAT, Ministry of Culture and Sports), and Monitoring Program (CONAP, municipalities and community associations managing pilot protected areas).

Recommendations

- (5) **CONAP and INGUAT must ensure continuity of the development of ecotourism with sustainability criteria in Guatemala** and apply the products generated by this project throughout SIGAP, expanding biological monitoring and the monitoring of impacts from tourist visitation. CONAP must develop an online tool for the calculation of visitor entry fees based on operational costs of protected areas so it is widely available to SIGAP and beyond Guatemala.
- (6) CONAP technical staff must **follow up and support the implementation of management plans, public use and business plans in the pilot protected areas benefitted by the project, including biological monitoring and monitoring of impacts from tourist visitation.** The support from CONAP is highly valued in protected areas and is especially important in case political changes in the municipalities result in the dismissal of persons currently in charge of management. **Data generated through biological monitoring must be adequately processed** and preferably made available online for the benefit of all who work in biodiversity conservation.
- (7) **CONAP must define a continued capacity building strategy** with support from people who were capacitated as facilitators through this project to ensure the maintenance and increase of technical capacity at the regional level. This is especially relevant as political changes incur in losses of personnel benefitted by capacity building workshops delivered by the project. For the same reason and to increase the chance of perpetuation and wider use, practical manuals and

guides generated by the project should be made available from websites beyond CONAP, such as in universities providing courses linked to tourism and environmental management, partner NGOs, INGUAT and other organizations working on ecotourism.

4.4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE DIRECTIONS UNDERLINING MAIN OBJECTIVES

Conclusions

The project consolidated the legal and institutional frameworks for the development of ecotourism in Guatemala. More concrete results will be visible as policies, regulations and models of public use and business plans are extended to other protected areas within SIGAP.

The lack of professional experts in sustainable tourism is a relevant limitation in Guatemala.

The loss of technical staff by institutions due to political changes negatively affects the continuity of activities initiated through projects and contributes to the loss of capacity improved through project workshops.

Recommendations

(8) **CONAP should reconsider the complexity of approval of legal and technical documents** such as management plans and public use plans, which have to be submitted to repeated analysis at different institutional levels that take long and cause delays in the implementation of projects. The approval of plans for the protected areas managed by municipalities first requires written mention in the minutes of a Municipal Council meeting. The plans then have to be protocolled at the CONAP Regional Office, where they are technically and legally reviewed. From the Regional Office, they are sent to Central CONAP, where they are again technically and legally reviewed. If approval is granted at all levels, the plans are sent to the Executive Secretary for ratification. If at any instance the documents are not approved they are returned to the municipality for improvement without further assistance provided by CONAP to ensure approval. Considering the reduced technical staff in CONAP and the number of protected areas lacking management plans, time would be best employed in supporting the development of more plans than reviewing them more than once. Optimizing these procedures would be beneficial to CONAP technical staff in terms of their work load and, if they are instead able to support the development of plans, by the time plans are ready there should be no obstacle for approval and less need of revision. It is important to optimize these processes so that different documents can be approved either by the Regional or Central Office, with criteria defined for each case. In the case of this project, expedited approval would have meant more time for implementation of management and public use plans with support from the project.

(9) **INGUAT should consider offering second time participants in the Impulsa Program private tutoring instead of generic capacity building.** Beneficiaries are interested in having support to develop specific issues in their businesses. Some of the topics offered in capacity building workshops in the Impulsa Program seemed fairly basic to beneficiaries who had long term experience in tourism business. A more flexible program would help them develop new business perspectives and vision as well as seek complementary expertise more relevant to their individual enterprises.

- (10) **CONAP and INGUAT must design and disseminate more tourist destinations that include protected areas** to promote visitation and support the development of ecotourism. The Association in charge of the PBZ Volcán Chicabal perceives the need for promoting the area as its main weakness and greatly welcomes any form of support. Personnel at the Mirador Rey Tepepul RMP presume that the park was only included in a tourist destination because it was part of this project, which corroborates the relevance of external support to promote visitation to protected areas that are not widely known.
- (11) **An effort to regulate access of tour operators to protected areas through CONAP is important** to avoid unregistered services without adequate safety conditions and qualified guides for tourists, as well as to prevent disloyal competition with tour operators who are formally registered and follow legal obligations, such as those contemplated by the Impulsa Program.
- (12) **As possible, CONAP should hire tourism experts for the Regional Offices** to promote the development of tourism activities with sustainability criteria and social participation. These experts would ideally provide support to municipalities and community groups in promoting the protected areas they are in charge of. An analysis of existing protected areas and their tourism potential should help prioritize regions where experts would have more potential for development.
- (13) Considering the instability of public positions in Guatemala, the main threat to the memory and sustainability of project benefits, future projects must **secure strong involvement of NGOs and research / education institutions** for ownership of project knowledge and products. This will increase the potential of sustainability given that these institutions are not susceptible to political changes.

4.5 BEST AND WORST PRACTICES IN ADDRESSING ISSUES RELATING TO RELEVANCE, PERFORMANCE AND SUCCESS

Best practices

Consolidating ecotourism in the agenda of CONAP, associations and municipalities as a financial mechanism for the maintenance of protected areas and the and conservation of biological diversity. This is evinced by funds allotted for tourism by protected area managers. The municipalities of San Pedro Sacatepéquez, San Marcos, Todos Santos Cuchumatán, Sibinal and Santiago Atitlán, the Association of Ecological Farmers in Quetzaltenango (Volcán Chicabal) and La Guadalupeana Agricultural and Artisanal Development Association in Sololá (Corazón del Bosque) improved their knowledge and vision of the potential of tourism at the same time the perspectives of biodiversity conservation improve due to monitoring biological indicators and impacts from tourism. Pilot protected area managers attribute more value to ecotourism and are more aware of the potential self-sustainability and generation of revenues for municipalities and local populations.

Promoting tourism with sustainability criteria including monitoring of biological indicators and impacts from visitation as essential components to prevent the degradation of natural conditions and generate data that should be used to define visitation limits, especially in ecologically sensitive areas that host endemic or threatened species. This is corroborated by the inclusion of principles of sustainability, benefit sharing and egalitarian participation in the Policy on Visitation Activities in Protected Areas”.

Involving the private sector in the development of ecotourism and maintenance of protected areas is key for this type of project. The private sector increases the chances of sustainability of project actions and products by applying them in practice and not being affected by political changes.

Participation of personnel from the 10 CONAP Regional Offices in capacity building workshops, which extends benefits of the project to the entire country, complementing the scope of policies and regulations, increasing replication potential and continuity of project actions. The national biological diversity information system (in development) and the review of the CONAP internal manual of procedures with the inclusion of guides and manuals developed by the project will complementarily ensure the technical references are not lost due to political changes.

The commitment by Central CONAP to develop an online tool for calculating visitor entry fees in protected areas. This will facilitate the use of the tool throughout the country (SIGAP) and beyond, helping protected area managers to review fees based on operational costs. To increase stability, this tool should also be made available from other websites such as INGUAT, the Tourism Chamber and other institutions.

Capacity building and involvement of park rangers and regional technical staff in biological monitoring. In addition to acknowledging the value of local capacity and knowledge, a high level of satisfaction was observed during the Terminal Evaluation on the part of park rangers because they learned to perceive elements of nature they did not notice before. Some park rangers were taking photographs and making videos to share their monitoring experiences, which demonstrates an increase in their appreciation of nature and the protected areas where they work. This enthusiasm is important as it is passed on to community members, creating replication effects and more interest in conservation.

Not treating the project as though it were an institution, always acknowledging activities and products to the executing agency and stakeholders. Had reference been made of the project as a player in implementation, especially in formal documents that will continue in use, the PMU avoided the risk of creating the impression that these documents would no longer have value once the project ended. The same refers to not having developed a specific webpage for the project, which helped to add relevance and visibility to the CONAP website. Having integrated project activities as part of the CONAP agenda gave these actions an institutional placement and helped the stakeholders, and even the executing agency, to see them as actions that must be sustained.

Worst practices

The lack of memory of data used in project design, which prevented the PMU from understanding and being able to use some of the logical framework indicators. Some of the baseline values that referred to financial amounts and protected areas had to be recalculated to enable comparison with progress made in implementation.

4.6 LESSONS LEARNED

Institutional coordination is essential for best results in the development of tourism with environmental sustainability criteria in protected areas. This was expressed by representatives of INGUAT and CONAP who understood and saw the advantages of cooperation to both institutions due to the implementation of activities of mutual interest facilitated by the project.

It is very important to adjust projects to the institutional capacity of the executing agency. Large projects generate many new activities and an extra work load to employees, who are often insufficient in number. Simultaneous projects are also common. These conditions create risks for the projects in terms of achieving expected results.

Activities that may strengthen environmental institutions should be considered for inclusion in projects. Especially large projects should support specific activities focused on strengthening institutional budgetary requirements. To develop specific studies on conservation issues considered national priorities for presentation to the National Congress, such as natural disasters due to climate change or the maintenance of ecosystem services essential for production, may help authorities better perceive the value of institutions in charge of environmental issues.

An assessment of stakeholder priorities is key to facilitate project ownership and achievement of goals. This applies more specifically to municipalities, but also to protected areas not directly managed by CONAP. Such an analysis would identify activities and needs that could have been included in the project to favor the establishment of agreements and better cooperation to achieve expected results. Although such an assessment was carried out in the design phase, changes in personnel and in the external context of the project often complicate practical application.

It is important to involve CONAP directors and technical staff of CONAP Regional Offices since the design phase of projects so they can contribute to concepts and provide notions of regional reality. This promotes project ownership as implementation progresses, as well as sustainability once the project is terminated. Technical staff with regional experience should also be involved in capacity building workshops so they can later function as facilitators. Staff in CONAP Regional Offices expressed some regret for not having been involved in the **selection of consultants**. This is more than anything due to the fact that some of the consultancy reports that were not considered satisfactory required revision and corrections by CONAP staff. Although quality issues in consultancy reports will most likely not be solved if technical staff participate in selection processes, participation would increase collaboration and engagement in improving unsatisfactory products.

Involvement of the private sector increases the sustainability of project activities and programs for applying, in practice, what was designed and approved in documents and products, while reducing the impact of political changes.

The implementation of monitoring of biological indicators and impacts of visitation in protected areas must be adjusted to local capacity. Simple protocols are more easily adopted and implemented, while complementary data can be requested in the long term after park rangers and others in charge have gained more experience.

It is important that the increase in capacity to perform **evaluations of impact caused by tourist visitation**, objective of several capacity building workshops organized by the project, is followed by increased knowledge in possible mitigation alternatives so that protected area managers are able to take immediate corrective action once problems are detected.

Managers of the pilot protected areas represented by **municipalities and associations** evaluated using the UNDP Institutional Capacity Scorecard clearly demonstrate **better ability to participate in processes and projects and, in second place, to generate, access and use information and knowledge to develop strategies, policies and legislation**, while **capacity for management and implementation of activities and for monitoring and evaluation are significantly lower**. These three

groups of criteria are clearly separated in the scorecard, which might be related to the span of political administration in municipalities: four years grants enough time for participation in processes, use of information and planning strategies, but not enough time for implementation. This substantiates the relevance of conserving technical staff for practical application of development plans. It is important for future projects to consider existing capacity so investments are made to improve the weakest points. In a similar way, application of the institutional capacity scorecard at the beginning of projects can identify frailties of project partners and stakeholders that should be addressed by project actions.

Capacity building workshops should include open hours to allow participants to exchange information and experience, identify common agendas and opportunities for collaboration between regions and/or institutions.

Local capacity building workshops are more effective for addressing particular needs of a region or protected area, which contributes to solving practical problems and increases the level of interest. In addition, travel and lodging costs which often prevent people from participating are spared.

It is very important to avoid disseminating a perception of tourism as the great economic solution for the surroundings of protected areas and to work within the reality that it can create additional income opportunities for some people, communities and the private sector as well as for the maintenance of protected areas. Although practically all goals designed in the project were achieved and that ecotourism gained importance in the perception of the general public and institutions involved for creating income alternatives for communities, families and people living around protected areas, this process is still in its initial phase. For example, in the PBZ Volcán Chicabal, although revenues were distributed for the first time among 19 families in 2016, they were not significant in terms of provision of income.

5 ANNEXES

5.1 EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and: respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/ or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

<p>Evaluation consultant agreement form⁷ Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System Name of consultant: SÍLVIA RENATE ZILLER Name of consultancy organization (where relevant): UNDP GUATEMALA I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.</p> <p>Signed in Florianópolis - SC, Brazil, 02 August, 2017.</p> <p>Firma: </p>

⁷ www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct

5.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA MATRIX FROM TOR (SPANISH)

Criterios de evaluación	Preguntas	Indicadores	Fuentes	Metodología
Relevancia: ¿Cómo se relaciona el proyecto con los objetivos principales del área de interés del FMAM y con las prioridades ambientales y de desarrollo a nivel local, regional y nacional?				
¿Es relevante el proyecto para los objetivos del área focal de biodiversidad y para las prioridades estratégicas del FMAM?	¿Cómo respalda el proyecto al área de interés sobre biodiversidad del FMAM y las prioridades estratégicas?	Existencia de una clara relación entre los objetivos del proyecto y el área focal de biodiversidad del FMAM.	Documentos del proyecto. Estrategias y documentos del área focal biodiversidad del FMAM.	Análisis de documentos. Sitio Web del FMAM Entrevistas con personal del PNUD y del proyecto.
¿Es relevante el proyecto para el ambiente y los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible de Guatemala? ¿El proyecto ha tomado en consideración las realidades (culturales, socio-económicas etc.) de la zona de intervención tanto en su diseño como implementación?	¿Cómo el proyecto apoya las prioridades ambientales y de desarrollo a nivel nacional? ¿Cuál ha sido el nivel de participación de los interesados en el diseño del proyecto? ¿El proyecto toma en consideración las realidades nacionales (marco de políticas e institucional) tanto en su diseño como en su implementación? ¿Cuál ha sido el nivel de participación de los interesados en la implementación del proyecto?	Existencia de una clara relación entre los objetivos del proyecto y el objetivo de manejo sostenible del medio ambiente de la Política y Estrategia Nacional de Desarrollo. Apreciación de interesados clave con respecto al nivel de adecuación del diseño e implementación del proyecto a las realidades nacionales y capacidades existentes. Coherencia entre las necesidades expresadas por los interesados nacionales y el criterio PNUD-GEF. Nivel de involucramiento de funcionarios gubernamentales y otros socios en el proceso de diseño del proyecto.	Política Nacional de Desarrollo (SEGEPLAN, K'atun 2023) Política Nacional para el Desarrollo Turístico Sostenible de Guatemala 2012-2022. Documentos del proyecto. Socios e interesados clave del proyecto.	Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas con personal del PNUD y del proyecto. Entrevistas con interesados clave.
¿El proyecto es internamente coherente en su diseño?	¿Existen vínculos lógicos entre resultados esperados del proyecto y el diseño del proyecto (en términos componentes del proyecto, elección de socios, estructura, mecanismos de implementación, alcance, presupuesto, uso de recursos, etc.)? ¿Es la duración del proyecto suficiente para alcanzar los resultados propuestos? ¿Las áreas de intervención del proyecto presentan las características necesarias para alcanzar los resultados propuestos?	Nivel de coherencia entre los resultados esperados y el diseño de la lógica interna del proyecto. Nivel de coherencia entre el diseño del proyecto y su enfoque de implementación. Nivel de coherencia entre las áreas de intervención y los resultados esperados.	Documentos del proyecto. Socios e interesados clave del proyecto.	Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas con personal del PNUD y del proyecto. Entrevistas con interesados clave.
¿El Proyecto proporciona lecciones y experiencias relevantes para otros proyectos similares en el futuro?	¿La experiencia del proyecto ha brindado la posibilidad de obtener lecciones relevantes para otros proyectos futuros destinados a objetivos similares?		Datos recolectados en toda la evaluación	Análisis de datos

Efectividad: ¿En qué medida se han logrado los resultados y objetivos previstos del proyecto?				
¿Ha sido el proyecto efectivo en alcanzar los resultados esperados?	¿Se alcanzaron los resultados previstos?	Indicadores en el marco de resultados estratégicos/marco lógico del proyecto.	Documentos del proyecto. Reportes de avance trimestral y anual.	Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas con interesados clave. Entrevistas con el equipo del proyecto.
¿Cómo se manejaron los riesgos y supuestos del proyecto?	¿En qué medida se gestionaron adecuadamente los riesgos? ¿Cuál ha sido la calidad de las estrategias de mitigación desarrolladas? ¿Existen estrategias claras para la mitigación del riesgo relacionadas con la sostenibilidad a largo plazo del proyecto?	Integridad de la identificación de riesgos y supuestos durante la planeación y el diseño del proyecto. Calidad de los sistemas de información establecidos para identificar riesgos emergentes y otras cuestiones. Calidad de las estrategias de mitigación del riesgo que se desarrollaron	Documentos del proyecto. Reportes de avance trimestral y anual. Equipo del proyecto, PNUD e interesados clave.	Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas.
Eficiencia: ¿El proyecto se implementó de manera eficiente en conformidad con las normas y los estándares internacionales y nacionales?				
¿El proyecto estuvo respaldado de manera suficiente?	¿Se utilizó o necesitó el manejo adaptativo para asegurar un uso eficiente de los recursos? ¿Han sido utilizados como herramientas de gestión durante la implementación del proyecto el marco lógico, los planes de trabajo o cualquier cambio realizado a estos? ¿Han sido los sistemas financieros y contables adecuados para la gestión del proyecto y para producir información financiera precisa y a tiempo? ¿Han sido los reportes de progresos adecuados? ¿Responden a los requerimientos de reporte? ¿Ha sido la ejecución del proyecto tan efectiva como fue propuesta originalmente (planeado vs. real)? ¿El cofinanciamiento ha sido según lo planeado? ¿Los recursos financieros han sido usados eficientemente? ¿Cómo ha sido usado el enfoque de gestión basada en resultados durante la implementación del proyecto?	Disponibilidad y calidad de los reportes financieros y de progreso. Puntualidad y adecuación de los reportes entregados. Cofinanciamiento planeado vs real. Cuán adecuadas han sido las opciones seleccionadas por el proyecto en función del contexto, la infraestructura y el costo. Costo asociado al mecanismo de delivery y estructura de gestión, en comparación con otras alternativas.	Documentos del proyecto. Equipo del proyecto. PNUD.	Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas claves.

Sostenibilidad: ¿En qué medida hay riesgos financieros, institucionales, socioeconómicos o ambientales para sostener los resultados del proyecto a largo plazo?				
¿Las cuestiones de sostenibilidad se encuentran adecuadamente integradas en el diseño del proyecto?	¿Han sido integradas estrategias de sostenibilidad en el diseño del proyecto?	Evidencia/ calidad de la estrategia de sostenibilidad.	Documentos del proyecto.	Análisis de documentos.
¿Han sido integradas estrategias de sostenibilidad en la implementación del proyecto?		Evidencia/ calidad de las acciones llevadas a cabo para asegurar la sostenibilidad. Evidencia de compromiso de socios internacionales, gobiernos y otros interesados para apoyar financieramente sectores/actividades relevantes luego de la finalización del proyecto.	Equipo del proyecto, PNUD e interesados clave.	Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas.
Sostenibilidad financiera	¿Han sido integradas estrategias de sostenibilidad financiera? ¿Son sostenibles los costos recurrentes luego de la finalización del proyecto?	Nivel y fuente de respaldo financiero futuro que debe proporcionarse a actividades y sectores relevantes luego de la finalización del proyecto. Compromisos de socios internacionales, gobierno u otros interesados en respaldar financieramente.	Documentos de respaldo de acuerdos. Socios e interesados clave del proyecto.	Entrevistas
Sostenibilidad institucional y gubernamental	¿Existe evidencia de que los socios y beneficiarios del proyecto darán continuidad a las actividades más allá de la finalización del proyecto? ¿Cuál es el grado de compromiso político para continuar trabajando sobre los resultados del proyecto? ¿Es adecuada la capacidad existente a nivel nacional y local para garantizar la sostenibilidad de los resultados alcanzados?	Grado en que las actividades del proyecto y los resultados han sido asumidos por las contrapartes y beneficiarios.	Equipo del proyecto, PNUD e interesados clave.	Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas
Sostenibilidad ambiental	¿Existen riesgos para los beneficios ambientales que fueron ocasionados que se espera que ocurran? ¿Existen amenazas ambientales que el proyecto no haya abordado?	Pruebas de las posibles amenazas. Evaluación de las amenazas	Documentos y evaluaciones del proyecto Evaluaciones de amenazas Equipo del proyecto, PNUD e interesados clave.	Análisis de documentos Entrevistas
Desafíos a la sostenibilidad del proyecto	¿Cuáles son los principales desafíos que pueden dificultar la sostenibilidad de los esfuerzos? ¿Se han abordado durante la gestión del proyecto? ¿Qué potenciales medidas podrían contribuir a la sostenibilidad de los esfuerzos logrados por el proyecto?	Cambios que podrían significar desafíos al proyecto.	Equipo del proyecto, PNUD e interesados clave.	Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas.

Impacto: ¿Hay indicios de que el proyecto haya contribuido a reducir la tensión ambiental o a mejorar el estado ecológico, o que haya permitido avanzar hacia esos resultados?

<p>¿Se prevé que el proyecto alcance su objetivo de conservar la biodiversidad de importancia global en Sistema Guatemalteco de Áreas Protegidas?</p>		<p>Cambio en la sostenibilidad financiera del Sistema Guatemalteco de Áreas Protegidas Evidencia de implementación de Planes Maestro y Planes de Gestión y Manejo de Visitantes Cambio en las capacidades técnicas del personal de CONAP y socios administradores</p>	<p>Equipo del proyecto, PNUD e interesados clave. Tracking Tools</p>	<p>Análisis de documentos. Entrevistas.</p>
---	--	---	---	---

5.3 TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE (SPANISH)

Contrato para un Contratista Individual

INTRODUCCIÓN

De acuerdo con las políticas y los procedimientos de Seguimiento y Evaluación (SyE) del PNUD y del FMAM, todos los proyectos de tamaño mediano y regular respaldados por el PNUD y financiados por el FMAM deben someterse a una evaluación final. Estos términos de referencia (TdR) establecen las expectativas de la Evaluación Final (EF) del proyecto Promoviendo el Ecoturismo para Fortalecer la Sostenibilidad Financiera del Sistema Guatemalteco de Áreas Protegidas –SIGAP- (PIMS: 3374), ejecutado por el Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas (CONAP) e implementado por el Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo -PNUD- con dotación financiera del Fondo para el Medio Ambiente Mundial (FMAM).

CUADRO SINÓPTICO DEL PROYECTO

Título de Proyecto:	Promoviendo el Ecoturismo para Fortalecer la Sostenibilidad Financiera del Sistema Guatemalteco de Áreas Protegidas			
Identificación del proyecto del FMAM:	3374		<i>al momento de aprobación (millones de USD)</i>	<i>al momento de finalización (millones de USD)</i>
Identificación del proyecto del PNUD:	81367	Financiación del FMAM:	1,295,455	“Pendiente de determinar al cierre de proyecto”
País:	Guatemala	IA ⁸ y EA ⁹ poseen:	CONAP: 1,050,000	“Pendiente de determinar al cierre de proyecto”
Región:	Centroamérica	Gobierno:	-	“Pendiente de determinar al cierre de proyecto”
Área de interés:	Biodiversidad	Otro:	TNC: 45,000 Asociación Vivamos Mejor: 104,151.79 Helvetas Guatemala: 240,000 FCG: 338,000 USAID: 144,700 Rainforest Alliance: 100,000	“Pendiente de determinar al cierre de proyecto”
Programa operativo:	GEF - 3	Cofinanciación total:	2,021,851.79	“Pendiente de determinar al cierre de proyecto”
Organismo de Ejecución:	Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas	Gasto total del proyecto:	3,317,306.79	
Otros socios involucrados:	INGUAT MICUDE MINECO Municipalidades ONGs	Firma del documento del proyecto (fecha de comienzo del proyecto):		22/01/2013
		Fecha de cierre (Operativo):	Propuesta: 31/01/2017	Real: Pendiente de Cierre. Fecha prevista: 31/10/2017

OBJETIVO Y ALCANCE

El Sistema Guatemalteco de Áreas Protegidas –SIGAP-, integrado por más de 330 áreas, ocupa alrededor del 30% del territorio del país. En la región del Altiplano Occidental de Guatemala, las áreas protegidas ocupan aproximadamente 2,490km², aproximadamente el 2% del territorio nacional. Esta región alberga gran variedad de especies endémicas gracias a su variación altitudinal y diversidad de microclimas. El SIGAP es clave para la conservación de la biodiversidad en Guatemala, la cual es considerada de importancia global. Sin embargo, en la actualidad el SIGAP cuenta con una importante brecha financiera que limita su capacidad de administrar tan importante patrimonio.

⁸ Agencia Implementadora

⁹ Organismo Nacional de Ejecución

Por otro lado, el turismo es una industria de creciente importancia, tanto a nivel mundial como nacional. La Organización Mundial del Turismo, organismo de las Naciones Unidas encargado de la promoción de un turismo responsable, sostenible y accesible para todos, en su informe “Panorama OMT del turismo internacional. Edición 2016” estimó que el turismo supone el 10% del Producto Interior Bruto Mundial, y que 1 de cada 11 empleos están relacionados con la industria turística. A su vez, predice un crecimiento continuado del turismo, y proyecta que en el 2030 se alcancen los 1,800 millones de llegadas de turistas internacionales a nivel mundial.

Guatemala cuenta con un alto potencial turístico, y muy especialmente sus áreas protegidas, sirviendo de ejemplo que tres de los cuatro principales destinos turísticos del país son en la actualidad áreas protegidas. En este contexto, el turismo supone una oportunidad para generar ingresos que puedan ser destinados a la reducción de la brecha financiera del SIGAP y en definitiva a la conservación de la biodiversidad.

El proyecto “Promoviendo el Ecoturismo para Fortalecer la Sostenibilidad Financiera del Sistema Guatemalteco de Áreas Protegidas”, comenzó su implementación en el año 2013 con la meta de contribuir a la conservación de la biodiversidad de importancia global existente en Guatemala a través de fortalecer la sostenibilidad financiera del Sistema Guatemalteco de Áreas Protegidas –SIGAP– mediante el desarrollo de nuevos mecanismos financieros en el sector del ecoturismo.

Para lograr su meta, el proyecto contempla los siguientes resultados y productos:

Resultado 1: Marco legal y político fortalecido para la implementación del ecoturismo como parte de una estrategia para promover la sostenibilidad financiera del SIGAP

Producto 1.1: Reforma de la Política de Co-administración de APs y sus instrumentos de gestión actualizada

Producto 1.2: Política sobre la Actividad Turística en Áreas Protegidas que rige la cooperación interinstitucional, la planificación, la inversión y el manejo actualizada

Producto 1.3: Normativo del CONAP para la recolección y reinversión de las tarifas de entrada y concesiones en APs diseñado.

Producto 1.4: Estándares ambientales y sistema de certificación para el desarrollo del ecoturismo regulan las inversiones del sector privado en las APs y posibilitan la conservación de la biodiversidad.

Resultado 2: Un marco institucional mejorado para el manejo del ecoturismo en las áreas protegidas incluye un programa piloto de implementación de ecoturismo en Altiplano Occidental de Guatemala

Producto 2.1: Programa de entrenamiento incrementa la capacidad técnica de los administradores de APs.

Producto 2.2: Treinta (30) oficiales del CONAP entrenados en la atención de visitantes y en el monitoreo de los impactos del ecoturismo

Producto 2.3: Estrategia de monitoreo desarrollada para evaluar los límites aceptables de cambio en áreas ecológicamente sensibles en los paisajes piloto

Producto 2.4: Planes Maestros para APs incluyen el ecoturismo como parte de sus estrategias financieras.

Producto 2.5: Planes de negocio definidos para APs en los paisajes piloto promueven el desarrollo de nuevas rutas turísticas en áreas con pocos visitantes pero con potencial ecoturístico.

Producto 2.6: Experiencia piloto para la aplicación de un sistema de tarifas de entrada.

La EF se realizará según las pautas, normas y procedimientos establecidos por el PNUD y el FMAM, según se establece en la Guía de Evaluación del PNUD para Proyectos Financiados por el FMAM.

Los objetivos de la evaluación son analizar el logro de los resultados del proyecto e identificar lecciones aprendidas que contribuyan a la sostenibilidad de los beneficios del proyecto y que contribuyan a mejorar la programación del PNUD.

ENFOQUE Y MÉTODO DE EVALUACIÓN

Se ha desarrollado con el tiempo un enfoque y un método general¹⁰ para realizar evaluaciones finales de proyectos respaldados por el PNUD y financiados por el FMAM. Se espera que el evaluador enmarque el trabajo de evaluación utilizando los criterios de **relevancia, efectividad, eficiencia, sostenibilidad e impacto**, según se define y explica en la [Guía para realizar evaluaciones finales de los proyectos respaldados por el PNUD y financiados por el FMAM](#). Se redactó una serie de preguntas que cubren cada uno de los criterios incluidos en estos TdR (Anexo C). Se espera que

¹⁰ Para obtener más información sobre los métodos de evaluación, consulte [el Manual de planificación, seguimiento y evaluación de los resultados de desarrollo](#), Capítulo 7, pág. 163

el evaluador modifique, complete y presente esta matriz como parte de un informe inicial de la evaluación, y la incluya como anexo en el informe final.

La evaluación debe proporcionar información basada en evidencia que sea creíble, confiable y útil. Se espera que el evaluador siga un enfoque participativo y consultivo que asegure participación estrecha con homólogos de gobierno, en particular el Centro de Coordinación de las Operaciones del FMAM, la Oficina en el País del PNUD, el equipo del proyecto, el Asesor Técnico Regional del FMAM/PNUD e interesados clave. Se espera que el evaluador realice una misión de campo en Guatemala, incluidos los siguientes sitios del proyecto:

- Municipio de Sibinal, San Marcos
- Municipio de San Pedro Sacatepéquez, San Marcos
- Municipio de San Marcos, San Marcos
- Municipio de Todos Santos Cuchumatán, Huehuetenango
- Municipio de Santiago Atitlán, Sololá
- Municipio de Santa Lucía Utatlán, Sololá
- Municipio de San Martín Sacatepéquez, Quetzaltenango

Las entrevistas se llevarán a cabo con las siguientes organizaciones e individuos como mínimo:

- Director del Proyecto
- Oficial de Programa de Ambiente y Energía del PNUD
- Coordinador de Proyecto
- Asesor Técnico Regional del PNUD/FMAM
- Funcionarios de CONAP a nivel central y regional
- Socios clave del Proyecto:
 - a. Representantes del Instituto Guatemalteco de Turismo -INGUAT-
 - b. Representantes de gobiernos locales: Municipalidades de Sibinal, Todos Santos Cuchumatán, San Marcos, San Pedro Sacatepéquez y Santiago Atitlán.
 - c. Representantes de áreas protegidas administradas por asociaciones comunitarias: Asociación de Agricultores Ecológicos de la Laguna Chicabal –ASAECO- y Asociación Agropecuaria y Artesanal para el Desarrollo la Guadalupeana.
 - d. Socios Co-financistas

El evaluador revisará todas las fuentes de información relevantes, tales como el documento del proyecto, los informes del proyecto, incluidos el PIR¹¹ anual y otros informes, revisiones de presupuesto del proyecto, examen de mitad de período, informes de progreso, herramientas de seguimiento del área de interés del FMAM, archivos del proyecto, documentos nacionales estratégicos y legales, y cualquier otro material que el evaluador considere útil para esta evaluación con base empírica. En el Anexo B de los "TdR" de estos Términos de Referencia se incluye una lista de documentos que el equipo del proyecto proporcionará al evaluador para el examen.

Se espera que el/la contratista elabore y presente en su oferta técnica, una metodología detallada sobre como conducirá la evaluación. Esta propuesta metodológica debe incluir los instrumentos de evaluación a ser utilizados.

CRITERIOS Y CALIFICACIONES DE LA EVALUACIÓN

Se llevará a cabo una evaluación del rendimiento del proyecto, en comparación con las expectativas que se establecen en el Marco lógico del proyecto y el Marco de resultados (Anexo A), que proporciona indicadores de rendimiento e impacto para la ejecución del proyecto, junto con los medios de verificación correspondientes. La evaluación cubrirá los criterios de: **relevancia, efectividad, eficiencia, sostenibilidad e impacto**. Las calificaciones deben proporcionarse de acuerdo con los siguientes criterios de rendimiento. Se debe incluir la tabla completa en el resumen ejecutivo de evaluación. Las escalas de calificación obligatorias se incluyen en el Anexo D de los TdR.

Calificación de la evaluación:

1. Seguimiento y Evaluación	calificación	Comentarios
Diseño del Seguimiento y Evaluación al inicio del proyecto		
Ejecución del plan de Seguimiento y Evaluación		
Calidad general de Seguimiento y Evaluación		
2. Ejecución de los IA y EA:	calificación	Comentarios
Calidad de la implementación del PNUD		
Calidad de ejecución: organismo de ejecución		
Calidad general de aplicación y ejecución		
3. Evaluación de los resultados	calificación	Comentarios

¹¹ Project Implementation Review

Relevancia		
Efectividad		
Eficiencia		
Calificación general de los resultados del proyecto		
4. Sostenibilidad	calificación	Comentarios
Recursos financieros:		
Socio-políticos:		
Marco institucional y gobernanza:		
Ambiental:		
Probabilidad general de sostenibilidad:		
5. Impacto: Considerable (C), Mínimo (M), Insignificante (I)		
Mejora del estado ambiental		
Reducción de la tensión ambiental		
Progreso hacia el cambio de la tensión y el estado		
Resultados generales del proyecto		

FINANCIACIÓN/COFINANCIACIÓN DEL PROYECTO

La evaluación valorará los aspectos financieros clave del proyecto, incluido el alcance de cofinanciación planificada y realizada. Se requerirán los datos de los costos y la financiación del proyecto, incluidos los gastos anuales. Se deberán evaluar y explicar las diferencias entre los gastos planificados y reales. Deben considerarse los resultados de las auditorías financieras recientes, si están disponibles. El/la contratista recibirán asistencia de la Oficina en el País (OP) y del Equipo del Proyecto para obtener datos financieros a fin de completar la siguiente tabla de cofinanciación, que se incluirá en el informe final de evaluación.

Cofinanciación (tipo/fuente)	Financiación propia de CONAP (USD)		Organismo asociado 1 (USD)		Organismo asociado 2 (USD)		Total (USD)		
	Propuesto	Real	Propuesto	Real	Propuesto	Real	Propuesto	Real	% ejecutado
Subvenciones									
Préstamos/concesiones									
Ayuda en especie									
Otro tipo									
Totales									

INTEGRACIÓN

Los proyectos respaldados por el PNUD y financiados por el FMAM son componentes clave en la programación nacional del PNUD, así como también en los programas regionales y mundiales. La evaluación valorará el grado en que el proyecto se integró con otras prioridades del PNUD, entre ellos la reducción de la pobreza, mejor gobernanza, la prevención y recuperación de desastres naturales y el género.

IMPACTO

El/la contratista valorarán el grado en que el proyecto está logrando impactos o está progresando hacia el logro de impactos. Los resultados clave a los que se debería llegar en las evaluaciones incluyen si el proyecto demostró: a) mejoras verificables en el estado ecológico, b) reducciones verificables en la tensión de los sistemas ecológicos, y/o c) un progreso demostrado hacia el logro de estos impactos.¹²

CONCLUSIONES, RECOMENDACIONES Y LECCIONES

El informe de evaluación debe incluir un capítulo que proporcione un conjunto de **conclusiones, recomendaciones y lecciones**.

ARREGLOS DE IMPLEMENTACION

La responsabilidad principal para gestionar esta evaluación radica en la OP del PNUD en Guatemala. La OP del PNUD contratará al evaluador(a) y apoyara en los arreglos de viaje dentro del país (solicitud de reuniones y confirmación). El Equipo del Proyecto será responsable de mantenerse en contacto con el/la contratista para establecer entrevistas con los interesados, organizar visitas de campo, coordinar con el Gobierno, etc.

¹² Una medida útil para medir el impacto del avance realizado es el método del Manual para la Revisión de Efectos Directos a Impactos (RoTI, por sus siglas en inglés) elaborado por la Oficina de Evaluación del FMAM: [ROTI Handbook 2009](#)

PLAZO DE LA EVALUACIÓN

La duración total de la evaluación será de 90 días de trabajo, en un tiempo de 5 meses, de acuerdo con el siguiente plan:

Actividad	Días de trabajo efectivo
Preparación	10 días
Reuniones con equipo de proyecto, personal de la OP de PNUD y asesor técnico regional	5 días
Misión de evaluación (visitas de campo)	20 días
Reuniones con personas clave	7 días
Presentación de resultados iniciales ¹³	1 día
Borrador del informe final	15 días
Revisión y comentarios de la OP de PNUD	5 días
Revisión por Centro de Operaciones del GEF y otros interesados	5 días
Informe final	7 días
Informe final en inglés	15 días

PRODUCTOS DE LA EVALUACIÓN

Productos esperados:

No	Resultado final	Contenido	Período	Responsabilidades
1	Informe inicial	El evaluador proporciona aclaraciones sobre los períodos y métodos	15 días de la firma del contrato y previo a la misión al terreno	El/la contratista lo envía a la OP del PNUD
2	Borrador del informe final	Informe completo, (por plantilla anexo F) con anexos	21 días de haber finalizado la misión al terreno	A ser revisado por OP (Oficial de Programa y Oficial de Monitoreo), Asesor Técnico Regional
3	Informe final*	Informe revisado	10 días tras haber recibido los comentarios del PNUD sobre el borrador	A ser revisado por OP (Oficial de Programa y Oficial de Monitoreo), Asesor Técnico Regional
	Informe final en inglés	Informe traducido a idioma inglés	14 días tras haber recibido aprobación del informe final por parte de PNUD	A ser revisado por OP (Oficial de Programa y Oficial de Monitoreo), Asesor Técnico Regional

*Cuando se presente el informe final de evaluación, también se requiere que el evaluador proporcione un 'itinerario de la auditoría', donde se detalle cómo se han abordado (o no) todos los comentarios recibidos en el informe final de evaluación.

PERFIL DEL CONTRATISTA

El/la contratista deberá tener experiencia previa en evaluación de proyectos similares. Es una ventaja contar con experiencia en proyectos financiados por el FMAM. El/la contratista seleccionado no deben haber participado en la preparación o ejecución del proyecto ni deben tener ningún conflicto de intereses con las actividades relacionadas al proyecto. Disponibilidad para viajar a zonas rurales.

El/la contratista debe reunir las siguientes calificaciones:

a) Formación académica

- ✓ Título universitario en ciencias ambientales, ingeniería en ciencias ambientales o una disciplina relacionada.
- ✓ Estudios de maestría en gestión de proyecto, evaluación, o carrera a fin.

b) Experiencia General:

- 5 años de experiencia en evaluando proyectos
- 5 años de experiencia en dirigir sesiones de capacitación, incluyendo capacidades para facilitar talleres, reuniones y capacitaciones
- 5 años de experiencia en gestión de proyectos

c) Experiencia específica:

- Dos experiencias comprobadas sobre manejo práctico y teórico de los enfoques de sostenibilidad ambiental y turismo en áreas protegidas.

¹³ Al finalizar la misión en terreno el/la contratista presentara los resultados de la misión que incluyen valoraciones iniciales.

- Dos experiencias comprobadas sobre el abordaje y conceptos de la gestión basada en resultados y gestión de conocimientos.
- Competente en ambos idiomas, español e inglés.
- Completamente competente en la aplicaciones del siguiente software: Word, Excel, Power point.

d) Competencias y valores corporativos

- Cualidades de liderazgo y trabajo en equipo
- Conocimiento de planificación estratégica
- Conocimiento y habilidad en el manejo de programas de cómputo
- Excelente comunicación y habilidad para redactar documentos e informes
- Habilidad de análisis, redacción y comunicación.
- Habilidad para redactar publicaciones, reportes y presentaciones.
- Habilidad para manejar y trabajar con equipos multidisciplinarios y multiculturales.
- Fuerte motivación y habilidad para trabajar bajo presión y con límites de tiempos.
- Experiencia en dirigir sesiones de capacitación, incluyendo capacidades para facilitar talleres, reuniones, etc.
- Capacidad de trabajar de manera independiente o con poca supervisión.
- Familiarización con el contexto gubernamental (deseable).
- Excelentes habilidades en el área financiera y de manejo de presupuestos.
- Integridad y ética
- Respeto por la diversidad
- Excelentes relaciones humanas
- Actitud de servicio
- Efectividad operacional

ÉTICA DEL EVALUADOR

Los consultores de la evaluación asumirán los más altos niveles éticos y deberán firmar un Código de conducta (Anexo E) al aceptar la asignación. Las evaluaciones del PNUD se realizan de conformidad con los principios que se describen en las '[Directrices éticas para evaluaciones](#)' del Grupo de Evaluación de las Naciones Unidas (UNEG).

MODALIDADES Y ESPECIFICACIONES DE PAGO

%	Hito
10%	Tras la aprobación del Informe Inicial
40%	Después de la presentación y aprobación del primer borrador del informe final de evaluación.
50%	Después de la presentación y aprobación (OP del PNUD y ATR del PNUD) del informe final definitivo de evaluación en español y en inglés.

La factura se emitirá a nombre de Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo, NIT 312583-1, en Quetzales [cuando aplique, al tipo de cambio de las Naciones Unidas a la fecha de facturación]. El PNUD no es agente retenedor de impuestos, por lo que el Proveedor deberá proceder conforme la legislación tributaria que le aplique.

La descripción de la factura deberá incluir lo siguiente: "Pago correspondiente al producto No. xx de xx, según contrato xxx".

"Los pagos a contratistas nacionales se harán efectivos en Quetzales, y cuando aplique, se emitirá exención de IVA". Los pagos a contratistas ubicados en un país distinto al del Comprador, se efectuarán en Dólares de los Estados Unidos de América y se realizará por medio de transferencia bancaria, presentando la factura correspondiente. El costo de la transferencia será deducido del pago ya que es responsabilidad del contratista cubrirlo.

DOCUMENTACIÓN REQUERIDA PARA LA PRESENTACIÓN DE LA OFERTA

Los Contratistas Individuales interesados, deben presentar su propuesta en **digital (física es opcional, en sobre cerrado)**, foliada, con índice del contenido en el orden solicitado, y debe incluir los siguientes documentos para demostrar sus calificaciones:

1. Carta del Oferente dirigida a PNUD confirmando interés y disponibilidad (formato adjunto).
Anexos:

- 1.1. Curriculum Vitae o Formulario P11 firmado, que incluya fechas de inicio y fin, experiencias en actividades similares, detalle de las tareas y un mínimo de tres (3) referencias profesionales fácilmente localizables.
 - 1.2. Propuesta Financiera que indique el precio fijo total de la oferta –todo incluido–, expresado en Quetzales o Dólares de los Estados Unidos de América (para extranjeros no domiciliados en Guatemala) y sustentado con un desglose de los costos según formato adjunto, el cual puede ser modificado según los rubros que el Contratista considere pertinente.
 - 1.3. Términos de Referencia firmados.
2. Propuesta Técnica:
- 2.1. Carta explicando por qué se considera como el candidato más idóneo para desarrollar los servicios.
 - 2.2. Documento que describa sustantivamente la Metodología por medio de la cual enfocará y conducirá las actividades para cumplir con los servicios de Consultoría.
 - 2.3. Plan de trabajo que incluya cronograma detallado de las actividades mínimas especificadas en estos TdR y otras que el Contratista en base a su experiencia considere convenientes; fechas en base a duración de los servicios estipulada para la consultoría, considerando entrega y revisión de productos.
3. Documentos adicionales:
- 3.1 Fotocopia de Documento Personal de Identidad (DPI) o equivalente
 - 3.3 Fotocopia(s) de credenciales académicas: Constancia(s) de Títulos Universitario(s) y/o Diplomas por cursos de especialización y cursos universitarios aprobados.
 - 3.5 Fotocopia de por lo menos tres (3) cartas de referencias laborales/contratos/finiquitos por actividades similares a las requeridas en estos términos de referencia.

CRITERIOS PARA LA SELECCIÓN DE LA MEJOR OFERTA

La evaluación de las ofertas se hará por medio del método de puntuación combinada, en donde la evaluación curricular y la propuesta técnica se ponderarán con un máximo de 70%, combinándose con la oferta financiera, que se ponderará con un máximo de 30%.

Criterios		Puntuación	
		Niveles	Máxima
Formación académica	Título universitario en ciencias ambientales, ingeniería en ciencias ambientales o una disciplina relacionada.	10	15
	Estudios de maestría en gestión de proyecto, evaluación, o carrera a fin	5	
Experiencia General	5 años de experiencia en evaluando proyectos	10	40
	5 años de experiencia en dirigir sesiones de capacitación, incluyendo capacidades para facilitar talleres, reuniones y capacitaciones	10	
	5 años de experiencia en gestión de proyectos	10	
	Dos experiencias comprobadas sobre manejo práctico y teórico de los enfoques de sostenibilidad ambiental y turismo en áreas protegidas.	5	
	Dos experiencias comprobadas sobre el abordaje y conceptos de la gestión basada en resultados y gestión de conocimientos.	5	
Propuesta Técnica Metodológica	Plenamente armónica con Términos de Referencia y con sólido nivel técnico. Presenta propuesta metodológica que demuestra sólido conocimiento y correcta aplicación de la técnica en el alcance de resultados.	35	35
	Armónica con los Términos de Referencia y técnicamente aceptable. Presenta propuesta metodológica que demuestra conocimiento y aplicación de la técnica de manera aceptable para el alcance de resultados.	30	
	Armónica con los Términos de Referencia, pero técnicamente débil. Débil propuesta metodológica que demuestra débil aplicación de la técnica en el alcance de resultados.	20	
	No armónica con los Términos de Referencia. Propuesta metodológica y aplicación de la técnica débil y fuera de contexto en cuanto a los TdR.	0	

Plan de trabajo y Cronograma	Incluye cronograma y plan de trabajo descriptivo ajustado a la realidad del proyecto, considerando las actividades a realizar de manera integrada y coherente.	10	10
	Incluye cronograma y plan de trabajo con descripción débil de las actividades, no presenta las actividades de forma integrada y coherente.	7	
	Solo incluye cronograma	1	
Sub – Total	Sub – Total por Evaluación Curricular y Propuesta Técnica	100	70%
Propuesta Financiera	(Propuesta más baja/Propuesta Evaluada) * 30%	30%	
TOTAL PUNTUACION DE OFERTA		100%	

FIRMA DEL CONTRATISTA INDIVIDUAL

La evaluación de las ofertas se hará por medio del método de puntuación combinada, en donde

Declaro de conformidad que todos los términos de referencia sostenidos han sido comprendidos perfectamente, que serán sostenidos y cumplidos ante el Contratante, en caso de ser adjudicado/da.

Nombre de Oferente: _____

Firma: _____ Fecha: _____

5.4 QUESTIONNAIRE USED AND SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Stakeholders	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
	Relevance			
UNDP, CONAP, INGUAT, Protected Area managers	How can the project or continued actions change the reality in the region of intervention? Generating work opportunities in tourism in protected areas for local people.	Evidence of changes of perception and project activities in development	Interviews; PIRs; METT	Closed interviews and revision of project documents
	Effectiveness			
UNDP, PMU, NGOs	Does the project involve stakeholders by information exchange and feedback, and was their participation promoted in the design, implementation and M & E? Yes, although stakeholders changed along implementation for operational issues and important opportunities to consolidate alliances and cooperation.	Stakeholders declare to participate in project design and take roles in implementation	PRODOC compared with PIRs and project reports; interviews	Closed interviews and revision of project documents
UNDP, PMU, NGOs	Did the project consult with and make use of abilities, experience and knowledge from competent governmental institutions, NGOs, community groups, private sector enterprises, local governments and academic institutions in the design, implementation and evaluation of project activities in order to generate effective environmental and social impacts? Yes, especially from CONAP for the experience in managing protected areas, also from INGUAT, NGOs, community associations and municipalities.	Information during project design	PRODOC, UNDP Country Program, GEF Strategies and Objectives	Revision of project documents
UNDP, PMU, INGUAT, NGOs	Did stakeholders take ownership of the project? Yes, a high level of ownership was verified, including commitments for the continuity of actions started through the project.	Stakeholders know the project well, participate in implementation and have a vision of project sustainability	Interviews; list of stakeholders from PRODOC and PIRs	Closed interviews and revision of project documents
	Efficiency			
UNDP, CONAP, INGUAT, regional authorities and protected area managers, NGOs	How effective was project coordination? It was excellent and demonstrated relevant ability in establishing cooperation at all levels. None of the people interviewed expressed anything but positive remarks about the Coordinator.	Examples of coordination and integration with stakeholders	Interviews with stakeholders; PIRs; QPRs	Comparison of progress in products in logical framework; review of scorecards and analyses

Coordinator, CONAP, INGUAT, Ministry of Environment and NR	How do you see the UNDP as Implementing Agency? Excellent, for the structure in Guatemala and experience.	Evidence of conflict and problem solving during project implementation	Interviews with stakeholders	Collection of evidence in interviews and PIRs
UNDP, INGUAT, regional authorities and protected area managers, NGOs	Did the executing agency adequately respond to significant implementation problems (in your case)? Yes, but there were no problems that required intervention at higher levels.	Evidence of conflict and problem solving during project implementation	Interviews with stakeholders	Collection of evidence in interviews and documents: PIR, coordinator reports, QPRs
UNDP, INGUAT, NGOs	Was the executing agency adequately chosen to implement the project, based on project design? Yes, despite current personnel and budgetary limitations.	Evidence of conflict and problem solving during project implementation	Documents: PRODOC, PIR, QPR, other reports	Collection of evidence in revised documents
UNDP, CONAP	Please tell me what you think of the quality and difficulties of risk management. Risks were well assessed at the beginning and coherently followed up during project implementation.	Comparison between initial risk assessment and situations during project implementation	Interviews	
	Sustainability			
UNDP, CONAP, INGUAT, PMU, NGOs	Are there social or political risks that threaten the sustainability of project results? Yes, especially political instability.	Evidence of political or financial instability	Interviews, project documents, PIR, QPR, MTR	Closed interviews and revision of project documents
UNDP, CONAP, INGUAT, PMU, NGOs	Is there enough awareness and ownership by stakeholders? Yes, including expressions of change of vision regarding tourism as a financial mechanism and at the local level people expressed satisfaction with capacity building programs and in implementing monitoring protocols.	Evidence of ownership and changes of attitude or initiative in pilot protected areas	Interviews, project documents, PIR, QPR, MTR	Closed interviews, revision of project documents, visit to protected areas and reports on changes by regional authorities and PA managers
UNDP, CONAP, INGUAT, PMU	Are there financial aspects that may threaten the sustainability of project results? Are there mechanisms in place to ensure financial and economic sustainability once GEF funding ceases? Several mechanisms are in place to ensure continuity, especially the inclusion of tourism in national policies and plans.	Evidence of political or financial instability or insufficient project ownership by government	Interviews, project documents, PIR, QPR, MTR	Closed interviews, revision of project documents, visit to protected areas and reports on changes by regional authorities and PA managers
UNDP, CONAP, INGUAT, PMU	Are there risks from the legal and institutional frameworks that threaten the sustainability of benefits from the project? Sustainability is best ensured in legal documents due to the update and development of policies and regulations that facilitate the development of ecotourism in Guatemala.	Evidence of political or financial instability or insufficient project ownership by government	Interviews, project documents, PIR, QPR, MTR	Closed interviews, revision of project documents, visit to protected areas and reports on changes by regional authorities and PA managers

UNDP, CONAP, protected area managers, regional authorities, NGOs	How will actions started during the project be continued? What risks are there? Why? The activities initiated will be continued due to formal commitments and to their relevance, although the risk of change of personnel and loss of people who were capacitated exists at every election. Lack of funds is another realistic risk.	Evidence of incorporation of concepts and actions in pilot protected areas an in SIGAP	Interviews, project documents, PIR, project outputs	Closed interviews, revision of project documents, visit to protected areas and reports on changes by regional authorities and PA managers
	Results and impacts			
ALL	What are the main outcomes of the project? Achievement of the general objective of establishing ecotourism as a financial mechanism for the conservation of protected areas; approval of policies and regulations; increased technical and institutional capacity; development of plans for pilot protected areas; reduction of SIGAP financial gap in the Western Highlands; the Impulsa Program and process of certification of natural areas; the alliance with INGUAT; the involvement of the private sector.	Evidence of positive changes of vision, attitude, and logical framework results	Interviews, logical framework	Comparison of indications from interviews and expected project results, and lessons learned
ALL	What are the main limitations of the project? Not having funds to support the construction of basic infrastructure in pilot protected areas; lack of follow-up of co-financing commitments; logical framework indicators with problems; policies and regulations are limited to protected areas under direct management by CONAP; difficulty to grant small concessions.	Difficulties found and how they affect the results and the sustainability of the project	Interviews, logical framework	Comparison of indications from interviews and expected project results, and lessons learned
	Monitoring & Evaluation			
UNDP, PMU, CONAP	The M&E plan was adequately budgeted and financed during project implementation? Yes, the funds were well planned and well applied.	Evidence that the M&E plan was well observed and had adequate responses	Interviews; scope of co-financing; adaptive management	Evaluation of answers and changes to findings in MTR
UNDP, PMU, CONAP	Were management response or adaptive management actions carried out by recommendation of project reports (PIRs) and the MTR? Yes, recommendations were implemented.	Indications of need for adaptation	Interviews; management responses and changes recommended by MTR	Evaluation of documents that register changes (PIR, management response to MTR)
UNDP, PMU, CONAP	Was the level of evaluation in the PIRs consistent with the findings in the MTR? If not, why? Yes, the PIR reflect reality and the reports are transparent.	Coherence of evaluations	PIR, MTR	Comparison of PIRs with MTR findings

UNDP, PMU, CONAP	How effective was the Steering Committee in following project advances and supporting the project? The SC supported implementation and approved all extraordinary changes requested by the PMU, such as adjustments in logical framework indicators.	Evidence of participation and action by the Steering Committee	Interviews; project documents	Collection of evidence of action by Steering Committee
	Country ownership			
UNDP, PMU, CONAP, INGUAT, NGOs	Did the government publish laws or develop policies and regulations aligned with project objectives? Yes, these were the main goals of the project and all policies, regulations and technical documents were approved.	List of laws, policies and regulations created or updated	Project outputs; logical framework	Comparison of objectives and expected results with products and their application, verified in pilot protected areas and in interviews
UNDP, PMU, CONAP, INGUAT, NGOs	What changes did the project produce in the country legal structure that can ensure that ecotourism will be more developed in new areas in the future? The more relevant changes are the reinstatement of revenues from visitor entry fees, the possibilities of shared management and the inclusion of areas of relevance for biodiversity that are not protected areas for management by third parties.	List of laws, policies and regulations created or updated; capacity building	Project outputs; logical framework	Comparison of objectives and expected results with products and their application, verified in pilot protected areas and in interviews
	Project finance			
UNDP, PMU, CONAP, NGOs and other co-financists	Were there significant differences between expected co-financing and the amount contributed and, if so, why? Co-financing contributions more than doubled the expected amount especially due to the alliance established with INGUAT and investments in the Impulsa Program made by the Ministry of Economy.	Expected and actual co-financing data	Project co-financing table; interviews to verify discrepancies	Comparison between expected and obtained; co-financing table at end of project
UNDP, PMU, CONAP	Were project components externally financed adequately integrated with components financed by GEF? Not really, mainly due to the delay between project design and start up, which made co-financing organizations use up the funds committed before implementation began. Further contributions were considered, but were not directly related to project activities, although contributing to the higher goal of biodiversity conservation. This situation was compensated along project implementation by the alliance with INGUAT.	External financing is convergent with project outputs	Interviews; QPR, PIR	Evaluation of financial sources that led to products and results

UNDP, PMU, CONAP	Were there other financial contributions obtained during project implementation (FONACON, NGOs, others)? Yes, especially by INGUAT and the Ministry of Economy as seed capital for the Impulsa Program.	Additional co-financing obtained during project implementation	Project co-financing table; details of additional funds	Co-financing documentation beyond amount planned or expected
	Mainstreaming			
UNDP, PMU, CONAP INGUAT, regional authorities and protected area managers, NGOs	Did the project produce positive or negative impacts on local populations and their livelihoods to date? Yes, but these are not yet significant improvements because the legal changes are recent and there has not been enough time for implementation of new income generating opportunities such as visitor entry fees, shared management and more investment from the private sector.	Evidence of changes in vision, ecotourism concepts and effective changes in pilot protected areas	Interviews, visit to pilot protected areas	Documentation of changes
UNDP, PMU, CONAP	Were gender equality issues taken into account during project design and implementation? If so, how and to what extent? No, because these issues were not part of the GEF 3-4 directives when the project was designed.	Percentage of men and women involved and benefitted by the project	Participant lists in workshops, in charge of project tasks and involved in project activities	Verification of percentages in reports on workshops or activities; visit to pilot protected areas
UNDP, PMU, CONAP NGOs	Is there evidence of that project results contributed to increase the resilience of natural areas to natural disasters in the region of intervention? Only indirectly for the registry of two protected areas in SIGAP. No specific activities for this purpose were included in the design of the project.	Evidence of implementation of biological monitoring, increased protection and connectivity of natural fragments and knowledge of intervention sites	Interviews, visit to pilot protected areas, PA connectivity maps, monitoring documents	Records of improved connectivity and protection of natural remnants, monitoring implemented, people with knowledge
	Lessons learned and recommendations			
UNDP, PMU, CONAP INGUAT, regional authorities and protected area managers, NGOs	What are the lessons learned as a result of this project? Better understand the needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries to include funds that can support them and increase integration and ownership. Institutional coordination is key for success. It is important to involve regional stakeholders from the design phase. Involvement of the private sector increases the chance of sustainability of actions initiated through the project. Monitoring protocols must be adjusted to local capacity.	Interviewees know the project well enough to suggest relevant issues	Interviews; reports on lessons learned, MTR	Collection of lessons learned with more relevance to those most often repeated

<p>UNDP, PMU, CONAP INGUAT, regional authorities and protected area managers, NGOs</p>	<p>What are the best practices? Consolidation of ecotourism in the agenda of CONAP, associations and municipalities. Promotion of ecotourism with criteria of environmental sustainability. Involving the private sector in the development of ecotourism and the conservation of protected areas. Participation of personnel from 10 CONAP Regional Offices in capacity building workshops. The commitment of CONAP to develop an online tool for calculating visitor entry fees based on operational costs. Involvement of park rangers and regional technical staff in biological monitoring. Not treating the project as though it were an institution.</p>	<p>Interviewees know the project well enough to suggest relevant issues</p>	<p>Interviews; reports on lessons learned, MTR</p>	<p>Collection of lessons learned with more relevance to those most often repeated</p>
<p>UNDP, PMU, CONAP INGUAT, regional authorities and protected area managers, NGOs</p>	<p>What should be different in future projects? Ensure that in addition to planning theoretical activities funds are budgeted for practical implementation to consolidate results. Leave a registry of documents and data used in project design and the definition of indicators and other references.</p>	<p>Interviewees know the project well enough to suggest relevant issues</p>	<p>Interviews</p>	<p>Record of opinions indicating future needs or requirements as well as limitations of the project</p>

5.5 LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Document	General contents
UNDAF Guatemala	Guatemala: United Nations Development Assistance Framework
GEF Priority strategies	Program document with eligibility criteria for GEF 4-5-6 Biodiversity Focal Area
UNDP Program Document for Guatemala	UNDP Action program for Guatemala 2010-2014 y 2015-2019 and Country Program Action Plans 2010-2014 and 2015-2019
Initiation plan	Project start-up plan
Project Identification Form (PIF)	Project summary
Project Document (PRODOC)	PRODOC signed by the UNDP and the Guatemala Government
Logical Framework	Objectives, expected results, indicators and progress
Project Implementation Reports (PIR)	Annual report: 2014 – 2017
Annual Operational Plan (AOP)	Annual workplans: 2013 – 2017
Quarterly Progress Reports (QPR)	Reports 2013 - 2017
Auditing reports	Financial audits 2014-2016
Mid-Term Review Report	Report
Management responses	Management responses to MTR Request for modifying indicators responding to the MTR Justification for project extension (MTR recommendation)
UNDP Risk analysis	Project progress report and project risks 2013-2017
Budget revisions	Approved by the Government and UNDP
Co-financing records	Co-financing results obtained for project implementation
GEF Tracking tools	Evaluation of progress in institutional capacity, management effectiveness and financial capacity of the SIGAP
National policies	Política Nacional para el Desarrollo Turístico Sostenible de Guatemala 2012-2022; Plan Maestro de Turismo Sostenible de Guatemala 2015-2025; Política General de Gobierno de Guatemala 2016-2020; Plan Nacional de Desarrollo K'atun – nuestra Guatemala 2032 (SEGEPLAN); Estrategia de Equidad de Género con pertinencia cultural del Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas 2017-2022
Coordinator reports	Annual records of project implementation
Media	Several materials: inception workshop, capacity building seminars and workshops, course for designing tourism projects, biological monitoring, visits to pilot areas, Sello Q Verde Certification System, Impulsa Program, exchange of experiences between protected area managers, delivery of management, public use and business plans to the seven pilot protected areas, presentation of reviewed policies, celebration of the international day for biological diversity, launch of the RMP Quetzalí (former Astillero I and II) and the PNR Corazón del Bosque, project folders

Documents and products resulting from the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy on visitation activities in protected areas 2015-2025 • Policy on joint administration and shared management in protected areas and supporting Regulations • Management regulations for visitation activities within SIGAP • Regulations on the concession of visitor services within SIGAP • COTURAP Regulations • Official registry documents of the PA MRP Mirador Rey Tepepul and PNR Parque Ecológico Corazón del Bosque in SIGAP • New tourist destinations (6), including CONAP and INGUAT websites • Environmental standards of the Certification Program • Study on visitor entry fees for protected areas and new businesses (since 2013) and tourist services that promote tourism in the Western Highlands conducted for the Terminal Evaluation • Biological monitoring agreements and protocols • Logical framework and <i>tracking tools</i> for institutional capacity, management effectiveness and financial sustainability of SIGAP, including the financial sustainability scorecard for SIGAP that considered 19 protected areas for indicator 12 of the logical framework • Report and agreement CONAP – INGUAT for the Impulsa Program • Manual for the management and investment of visitor entry fees on tourist visitation in protected areas managed by CONAP • Tool for the evaluation of tourist potential in protected areas • Tool for the evaluation, prevention and monitoring of impacts in protected areas • Guide for the development of public use plans within SIGAP • Practical guide for the establishment of visitor entry fees in protected areas • Guide for the development of business plans for protected areas • Management plans of the 7 pilot protected areas • Public use plans of the 7 pilot protected areas • Business plans of the 7 pilot protected areas • Diagnostic of legal instruments that regulate the development of ecotourism in protected areas • Harmonization strategy for legal instruments that regulate the development of ecotourism in protected areas • Proposal for changes to the legal instruments that regulate the development of ecotourism in protected areas • Capacity building manual on tourism in protected areas for managers and technical staff • Guide for facilitators on capacity building on tourism and protected areas • Fluxogram of the process of revision of project products • Report on the design and implementation of a monitoring system for impacts on biological diversity from tourist visitation • Consultancy report on the UVR – Unified Visitor Registry • Report with summary table on institutional capacity • Reports on capacity building workshops (several) • Report on biological diversity, sustainable tourism and threats to conservation in the Western Highlands of Guatemala • Agreements signed between PA managers and tour operators • CONAP park ranger manual • Best practices manuals in protected areas: Management of Sustainable Tourism, Lodging, Food services, Tourism Operators and Guides, and Transportation • Call for proposals for the design of an online system / web application for the calculation of visitor entry fees in protected areas (2017) • Summary of lessons learned (Powerpoint presentation by the Coordinator) • Map of project intervention sites • Letters of co-financing commitments by FUNDAECO and FCG • Co-financing tables 2013-2015 and 2016-2017
---	---

5.6 TRAVEL ITINERARY

From 21 August to 09 September, 2017

21/08	22/08	23/08	24/08	25/08
8:30h UNDP Initial meeting – Guatemala City	8:00-12:00h Office work	8:00h Travel to pilot protected areas	10:00h RMP Quetzalí (Astillero I and II), San Pedro Sacatepéquez	8:00h RMP Canjulá, Sibinal
11:30-17:00h Meeting with project Coordinator	14:00h Interview with UNDP staff	14:00h CONAP Oficinas regionales	15:00h Authorities San Pedro Sacatepéquez	16:00h Authorities Sibinal municipality
26/08	27/08	28/08	29/08	30/08
10:00h RMP Laguna Chicabal, ASAECO Association	9:00h NPR Corazón del Bosque 11h Management Committee	6:00h PRM Todos Santos Cuchumatán 11h Authorities and technical staff Todos Santos C.	6:00h RMP Mirador Rey Tepepul 11:30h Authorities Santiago Atitlán	8:00-12:00h Office work – Guatemala City
Travel	Travel	Travel	Viaje – Return to Guatemala City	14:00h Ex CONAP staff, Guatemala City 16:00h Tour operator Go2Guate
31/08	01/09	02/09	03/09	04/09
Office work	10:30h GEF Focal Point – Vice- Minister MERN	Office work	Office work	10:00-13:15h CONAP Central
Office work – meeting with Coordinador for clarifications	Office work	Office work	Office work	Office work
05/09	06/09	07/09	08/09	09/09
9:00h Clarifications with Coordinator 10-12h INGUAT	8:00h Beneficiaries of Impulsa Program	Office work	08:30h UNDP Presentation initial findings	10:00h Arrival at Florianopolis, Brazil
16:00-17:00h UNDP Flor de María Bolaños y Nely Herrera	Office work	Office work	14:00h Airport 16:00h Departure from Guatemala	---

5.7 LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Names	Organization	Position
CONAP Regional Offices, Western Highlands 23.08.2017		
Cristina Vásquez	CONAP - Altiplano Occidental Office	SIGAP Technical Staff
Samuel Estacuy	CONAP - Altiplano Occidental Office	Director
Enrique Mérida	CONAP - Altiplano Nor-Occidental Office	Director
Eliezer Peralta	CONAP - Altiplano Central Office	Director a.i.
Glendy Cuztal Chavajay	CONAP - Altiplano Central Office	SIGAP Technical Staff
Astillero I y II San Pedro Sacatepéquez Regional Municipal Park 24.08.2017		
Karina Poxtor Gonón	San Pedro Municipality	Coordinadora de Áreas Protegidas
Consejo Municipal San Pedro Sacatepéquez - 24.08.2017		
Mynor Emilio Navarro	San Pedro Municipality	Council Member III
Aroldo Orozco	San Pedro Municipality	Council Member I - Environment
Carlos Bautista	San Pedro Municipality	Mayor
Sibinal – Canjulá Regional Municipal Park 25.08.2017		
Elfido Pérez	Sibinal Municipality	Coordinator for Protected Areas, Environment and Tourism
Ildeberto Roblero	Sibinal Municipality	Council Member III
Sibinal Municipal Council 25.08.2017		
Silvestre Pérez Ortiz	Sibinal Municipality	Council Member for the Environment
Amilcar Roblero	Sibinal Municipality	Mayor
Volcán Chicabal Permanent Ban Zone / ASAECO 26.08.2017		
Juan García García	ASAECO	Legal Representative
PNR Corazón del Bosque / la Guadalupe Association 27.08.2017		
Juan Alfonso García	La Guadalupe Association	Management Committee
Juan Omocht	La Guadalupe Association	Management Committee
Pantaleón Andrés De León	La Guadalupe Association	Management Committee
José Timiteos	La Guadalupe Association	Management Committee
Antonio Camilo Tai	La Guadalupe Association	Management Committee
Manuel Trinidad Ajú	La Guadalupe Association	Management Committee
Rafa Santos Saloj	La Guadalupe Association	Management Committee
Andrés Vasquez	La Guadalupe Association	Management Committee
Selvy Pérez	Ut'ze Association	
Todos Santos Cuchumatán Regional Municipal Park 28.08.2017		
Esteban Marías	CONAP	Park Ranger

Todos Santos Cuchumatán Municipal Council		
28.08.2017		
Oliver Hernández	Todos Santos Municipality	Municipal Advisor
Fortunato Mendoza	Todos Santos Municipality	Council Member
Juan Ortiz	Todos Santos Municipality	Environment Coordinator
Daniel Pablo Bautista	Todos Santos Municipality	Council Member
Hilario Nmarías Carrillo	Todos Santos Municipality	Council Member
Mirador Rey Tepepul Regional Municipal Park		
29.08.2017		
Diego Armando Pablo Mendoza	Santiago Atitlán Municipality	Protected Area Coordinator
Pedro Chiviliu	CONAP	Park Ranger
Daniel Reanda Esquivel	Santiago Atitlán Municipality	Environment and Natural Resources Office
José Arnaldo Ortíz	Santiago Atitlán Municipality	Park Ranger
Rolando Tol Gozález	Independent Birdwatching Guide	
Santiago Atitlán Municipal Council		
29.08.2017		
Lucía Acertia	Santiago Atitlán Municipality	
Diego Armando Pablo Mendoza	Santiago Atitlán Municipality	Protected Area Coordinator
Pedro Chiviliu	CONAP	Park Ranger
Diego Sosot Yatas	Santiago Atitlán Municipality	Council Member
Jonatan Say	Santiago Atitlán Municipality	Director Planning Office
Roberto Mendoza	Santiago Atitlán Municipality	Technical staff
Marvin Petzey	Santiago Atitlán Municipality	Council Member
Angélica Mendoza	Santiago Atitlán Municipality	Municipal Secretary
CONAP Central Office		
30.08.2017		
Minor García	CONAP	Executive Sub-Secretary
Andrea Fernández	CONAP	Director International Cooperation
Elder Figueroa	CONAP	Executive Secretary
Andrea Díaz	CONAP	Financial Director
CONAP ex technical staff and authorities		
30.08.2017		
Dafne Edith Domínguez		Ex Director of Development for SIGAP
Manuel Alberto Henry		Ex Project and Technical Director
Manuel Benedicto Lucas		Ex Executive Secretary
Tour operator		
30.08.2017		
Gustavo Morales	Go2Guate	Director

GEF Focal Point – Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources		
01.08.2017		
Carlos Fernando Coronado	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources	Vice-Minister of Natural Resources and Climate Change
Central CONAP Technical staff		
04.08.2017		
Lucila Pérez	CONAP	Sustainable Tourism Technical staff
Luis Quiyuch	CONAP	Cooperation with municipalities
Melisa Ojeda	CONAP	Biodiversity Technical staff
Fernando Castro	CONAP	Director SIGAP Development
Samy Palacios	CONAP	SIGAP Coordinator
Eulalia Camposeco	CONAP	Legal Department
Leonela Mauricio	CONAP	Legal Department
Ana Luisa de León	CONAP	Director Education for Sustainable Development
INGUAT		
05.08.2017		
Jorge Mario Samayoa	INGUAT	Director Natural Resources Section
Edith Anavisca	INGUAT	International Cooperation and Investment Promotion
Sandy Tello	INGUAT	Certification Labels
Impulsa Program beneficiaries		
06.08.2017		
Marvin Pop	Jardín las Conchas	Independent Entrepreneur
Oscar Campollo	ONCA	Independent Entrepreneur

5.8 SUMMARY OF FIELD VISITS

23 August, 2017

Ciudad de Guatemala - San Pedro Sacatepéquez

Meeting with the Directors of the three CONAP Regional Offices and their technical staff: Samuel Estacuy and Cristina Vásquez, Western Highlands region; Enrique Mérida, North-Western Highlands region; Eliezer Peralta and Glendy Chavajay, Central Highlands region.

This meeting was very important to provide the evaluator with an overview of the regions and the responsibilities and challenges of the CONAP Regional Offices, as well as to collect their impressions and experience in the project.

24 August, 2017

Quetzalí (former Astillero I and II) Regional Municipal Park, San Pedro Sacatepéquez

Morning: meeting with the Park Manager, Agronomical Engineer Karina Paxtor, and walk along the visitor trail. Illegal harvesting of trees was observed during the visit.

Afternoon: meeting with the Municipal Council in San Pedro Sacatepéquez, with the Mayor, the Secretary of Environment, and the President of the Council.

25 August, 2017

Sibinal Regional Municipal Park - Canjulá

Morning: walk along the visitor trail with the Coordinator of the Environment Department, Élfido Pérez, the 2nd Council Member Gerardo García Miguel and the park ranger Ildeberto Roblero.

Afternoon: meeting with the Mayor and Council Member for the Environment.

26 August 2017

Volcán Chicabal Permanent Ban Zone, San Martín Sacatepéquez

Meeting with the Legal Representative of ASAECO, Juan García García, visit to the visitor reception infrastructure and accommodations.

Walk to the volcano crater accompanied by the son of one of the associates, who is getting involved in the management of the area; review of infrastructure, trails and ritual areas. Much garbage is seen along trails despite efforts of awareness by the managers.

27 August, 2017

PNR Corazón del Bosque, Quetzaltenango

With the Management Committee of the La Guadalupeana Association we walked around the reserve, visiting the restaurant, the swimming pool under construction, the energy generation plant, the new nursery and the visitor trail with resting and ritual areas. During the walk the members shared their vision and experience of the project, and their views of nature conservation. Once the walk was finished we were joined by Selvyn Pérez Aju, the son of one of the associates, a representative of the younger generation who is getting involved in the management of the area.

28 August, 2017**Todos Santos Cuchumatán Regional Municipal Park, Todos Santos Cuchumatán**

The interview with the CONAP Park Ranger, Esteban Matías, was conducted in the Regional Park during a birdwatching exercise. This was meant to mix data collection with one of the practical applications developed under influence of the project.

Later in the day, a meeting was held with representatives of the Municipal Council in Todos Santos Cuchumatán. The Mayor, who is still to sign off on the park management and public use plans, did not attend the meeting.

29 August, 2017**Mirador Rey Tepepul Regional Municipal Park, Santiago Atitlán**

The visit started with a hike along the birdwatching trail with a certified birdwatching guide, the Park Manager, two park rangers and a Park Ranger of the CONAP Regional Office. Interviews were conducted along the way but especially on the wooden platform lookouts built along the way for visitors.

Later in the day, a meeting was held in town with the Director of Planning, the Park Manager, the 1st Council Member, who represented the Mayor, a Park Ranger of the CONAP Regional Office, a technical representative of the municipality and other three Council Members, as well as the Secretary who registered the meeting.

5.9 NEWSPAPER ARTICLE PUBLISHED DURING THE MISSION TO GUATEMALA

This newspaper article was found by chance on “Prensa Libre” during the mission to Guatemala without any influence of project managers.

It covers the planting of native trees in one of the seven pilot protected areas and opportunities offered by the Impulsa Program to private entrepreneurs in ecotourism. It was considered a positive indicator of project impacts for having been published without direct influence of the project, as the Coordinator was not aware of it before I showed it to him.

Date: September 1st, 2017.

Buscan mejorar hábitat del Quetzal

Estudiantes del Cusam **plantaron cien árboles de aguacatillo** en refugio del ave símbolo en San Marcos.

Por **Whitmer Barrera**
ciudades@prensalibre.com.gt

Estudiantes de Auditoría del Centro Universitario de San Marcos (Cusam) plantaron cien árboles de aguacatillo en el refugio El Quetzal, en San Rafael Pie de la Cuesta, en ese departamento.

La jornada de reforestación forma parte de la promoción de la cultura ambiental para preservar y conservar la reserva ecológica. Durante la actividad participaron 31 estudiantes, quienes plantaron los árboles, los que, según los técnicos agroforestales de la Municipalidad, sirven para producir los frutos con los que se alimenta el Quetzal.

El ave nacional tiene su hábitat natural en un bosque de ese municipio de la bocacosta de San Marcos,

por ello eligieron reforestar el área para mejorar el ecosistema del lugar. Se contó con el apoyo de las autoridades para elegir el lugar idóneo para plantar los árboles.

“Actividades de esta naturaleza contribuyen a despertar el interés de los estudiantes del Cusam para que participen en eventos que ayudan a mejorar el entorno natural” de San Marcos. En el caso de San Rafael Pie de la Cuesta tiene la dicha de contar con el refugio donde habita nuestra ave nacional”, expresó Patricia del Rosario Fuentes,

“Actividades de esta naturaleza contribuyen a despertar el interés de los estudiantes del Cusam para que participen en eventos que ayudan a mejorar el entorno natural”.

Rosario Fuentes, docente del Cusam

tes, docente de esa extensión de la Usac.

Los estudiantes del curso Problemas Socioeconómicos de Guatemala dijeron haberse sentido complacidos por ayudar a preservar la especie única en el país, ya que a través de este tipo de proyectos se protege un ecosistema sano e idóneo para el ave.

CONTRIBUCIÓN

El refugio El Quetzal consta de dos caballerías de bosque, donde varios grupos han llegado a plantar árboles de las especies tepemiste, canoj y aguaca-

tillo para contribuir a mejorar el entorno de las aves y otras especies que habitan en el lugar.

“Aquí han venido estudiantes desde primaria hasta universitarios, además de grupos organizados e instituciones como el Club de Leones y personas particulares que se sienten comprometidos con el cuidado del hábitat del ave símbolo”, expresó Josué Barrios, encargado de la oficina de programas sociales de la Municipalidad.

Las autoridades ediles instan a los grupos organizados, universidades e instituciones para que coordinen programas ambientales en favor del entorno del lugar, ya que es necesario unir esfuerzos para fortalecer el ambiente en ese lugar, declarado reserva natural por el Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas.



FOTO PRENSA LIBRE: WHITMER BARRERA

Una estudiante del Cusam planta un árbol de aguacatillo en un sector del refugio El Quetzal, en San Rafael Pie de la Cuesta, donde habita el ave nacional.



FOTO PRENSA LIBRE: ÁNGEL JULAJUJ

El programa Impulsa, del Conap, promueve la creación de proyectos ecoturísticos en Sololá.

SOLOLÁ

Conap fomenta turismo ecológico

Programa incentiva proyectos amigables con el ambiente.

Por Ángel Julajuj

ciudades@prensalibre.com.gt

El programa Impulsa del Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas (Conap) insta a empresarios y emprendedores de Sololá a fortalecer el turismo ecológico, a través de la cultura, artesanías y protección de parques ecológicos.

El Conap y el Instituto Guatemalteco de Turismo, con el apoyo del Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo, organizaron el tercer encuentro de Impulsa en ese departamento para instar a los asistentes a desarrollar proyectos turísticos enfocados en el cuidado del medioambiente.

Edith Anabisca, coordinadora del programa, dijo que este reúne a empresarios en fortalecimiento de áreas ecológicas y turísticas.

Agregó que en el encuentro participaron empresarios, artesanos, emprendedores y personas que pueden causar impacto positivo en áreas protegidas, que tengan ideas de negocios en fortalecimiento del turismo.

Impulsa certificará a 20 emprendedores que de-

sarrollen proyectos turísticos que promuevan el cuidado del medioambiente. Los participantes reciben asesoramiento en la construcción de modelo de negocio viable, contacto con potenciales socios comerciales e inversionistas y la posibilidad de acceder a capital semilla.

Impulsa tiene como objetivo elevar las capacidades de crecimiento de pequeñas y medianas empresas cuya operación estimule el turismo en áreas protegidas, así como impulsar dicha industria como herramienta de crecimiento económico.

Según Elieser Peralta, coordinador del Conap, en el país hay 334 áreas protegidas, y Sololá ocupa el cuarto lugar de las más visitadas, por lo que es necesario fortalecer el destino turístico a través de proyectos ecológicos.

20

emprendedores que desarrollen proyectos amigables con el ambiente serán certificados por el Conap.

al Maximo de Tu
phone nuevo

motorola



Moto C Plus

Llévatelo por

Q699



Pantalla



8MP/Flash/
Cámara
Frontal



Memoria
interna
16GB



+ 30 horas
de batería

4GLTE



Moto e⁴ plus

Llévatelo por

Q1399



Pantalla



13MP/Flash/
Cámara
Frontal



Memoria
interna
16GB



Hata 2 días
de batería
+ carga rápida

4GLTE

que pagas lo recibes en saldo

Incluye 3 GB+ f +

Música sin gastar tus megas

MAX

MAXIMIZAMOS TU VIDA

Aplican restricciones

5.10 SUMMARY TABLE OF MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS (METT) ANALYSIS

No.	Criterion	RMP Sibinal	Corazón del Bosque	RMP Rey Tepepul	RMP San Marcos	RMP San Pedro	RMP Todos Santos	PBZ Chicabal
1	Legal status	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
2	Regulations	2	2	2	3	2	2	2
3	Law enforcement	2	2	2	2	1	2	2
4	PA objectives	2	3	2	3	3	3	2
5	PA design	2	3	3	3	2	3	2
6	Boundary demarcation	2	3	2	2	2	2	2
7	Management plan	2	3	2	3	2	2	2
7a		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
7b		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
7c		1	1		1	1		
8	Regular workplan	2	1	2	2	2	1	1
9	Resource inventory	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
10	Protection	3	2	1	2	2	2	1
11	Research	1	2		2	1	1	1
12	Resource management	1	2	2	2	2	2	1
13	Staff numbers	1	2	2	2	2	1	2
14	Staff training	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
15	Current budget	1	2	2	1	2	1	1
16	Security of budget	1	2	2	2	2	1	2
17	Management of budget	1	2	2	2	2		2
18	Equipment	2	2	1	2	2	1	2
19	Maintenance of equipment	1	2	2	3	2	2	2
20	Education and awareness	2	1	1	2	1	1	
21	Planning for land and water use	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
21a		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
21b		1	1	1	1	1		1
21c		1	1	1	1	1		1
22	State and commercial neighbours	2	1	2	2	1	2	2
23	Participation of indigenous peoples		3	2	1	1	3	3
24	Local communities + management	1	2	3	2		2	2
24a		1	1	1	1		1	1
24b		1	1	1	1	1	1	
24c			1	1	1		1	1
25	Economic benefit to local comm.	2	1	2	2	1	2	2
26	Monitoring and evaluation	2	1		2	1	2	2
27	Visitor facilities	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
28	Commercial tour operators	1	2	2	1			2
29	Fees	2	3		2	1	1	2
30	Condition of values	2	3	2	2	2	1	2
30a		1	1	1	1	1		
30b		1	1		1	1		
30c		1	1	1	1		1	
	Total score	63	75	64	75	59	57	60