

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORT (PIR) FY 2021

**GEF - IDB
PIR # 2**

IMPORTANT: The reporting period is GEF Fiscal Year (July 1st, 2020, to June 30th, 2021)

PROJECT GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Name:	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation through Low-Impact Ecotourism in SINAP II (ECOTUR-AP Second Phase)				
Project's GEF ID:	9889	Project's IDB ID:	PN-T1190	Overall Stage:	Disbursing (From eligibility until all the Operations are closed)
Country/ies:	Panama				
GEF Focal Area:	Biodiversity				
Executing Agency:	MINISTERIO DE AMBIENTE				
Project Finance:	Total disbursements of GEF Grant resources as of end of June 30th, 2021 (cumulative)				US\$150,000.00
Project Dates:	Date of First Disbursement				10/9/2019
	Agency Approval Date				11/17/2017
	Effectiveness (Start) Date				10/10/2018
	Original Last Disbursement Expiration Date ¹ (OED)				10/10/2020
	Current CED				10/10/2021
	Estimated Operational Close Date ² (EOC)				1/8/2022
	Actual Date of EOC, if applicable				
Project Evaluation:	Mid-term Date (Expected)				N/A
	Terminal evaluation Date (Expected)				12/10/2021

¹ For the GEF, this is equivalent to the project's "Expected Completion Date".

² For the GEF, this is equivalent to the project's "Expected Financial Closure Date".

DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE RATING (DO) & ASSESSMENT

Make an overall assessment and provide a rating³ of “likelihood of achieving project objective” during the period (2020-2021). Describe any significant environmental or other changes attributable to project implementation.

Project Objective: The general objective of this project is to contribute to improving the conservation and management effectiveness of Panama's protected areas through the promotion of low-impact ecotourism.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT (DO)

RATING

Very weak performance evidenced by the very few outputs obtained only a few months before the last disbursement contractual date (and no other outputs expected to be obtained on the short term). Therefore, the rating for fiscal year 2020-2021 is Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

HU

PROJECT STATUS UPDATE

On September 19, 2020, through communication No. MEF-2020-40093, the Bank received a formal request from the Ministry of Economy and Finance, for a 12-month extension of the last disbursement date, to be able to carry out the priority activities of the Technical Cooperation.

Weekly follow-ups meetings were held, to monitor the progress of the project and assess the executing unit. However, in April 2021, a review of the delivery timeline for the remaining products was conducted and it was concluded that these could not be delivered before the last disbursement date as agreed.

Because of the incapacity of the executing unit to execute the project and per IDB's Policies, it is not possible to grant a second extension of the last disbursement date. As a result, the project will be closed at the current date (October 10, 2021) and without use of the remaining resources.

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS RATING (IP) & ASSESSMENT

Insert here an assessment and provide ratings⁴ of overall Implementation Progress, including information on progress, challenges, and outcomes on project implementation activities from July 1st, 2020, until June 30th, 2021. **As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

OVERALL ASSESSMENT (IP)

RATING

This fiscal year the implementation progress was rated as Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). The lack of progress observed since the approval of the operation, and essentially due to poor Public Administration efficiency and "force majeure" situations, continues. The operation has shown very limited physical and financial progress during fiscal year 2020-2021.

HU

³ See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

⁴ See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

RISK RATING & ASSESSMENT

Make any adjustments necessary to the assessment ratings⁵ of overall Project Risk⁶ that you provided in the last PIR (2019-2020). Please include details and remedial measures for High and Substantial Risks, specifying who will be responsible for these measures.

OVERALL ASSESSMENT (RISK)	RATING
<p>Most of the execution difficulties are due to internal problems within the Executing Agency or adverse decisions/weak performance from other public Agencies (Ministry of Economy and Finance, General Controller). Therefore, the rating for fiscal year 2020-2021 is Highly Risk (H).</p>	<p>H</p>

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Please add information on any progress, challenges, and outcomes with regards to stakeholder engagement, based on the project's activities during its implementation through the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year. **As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

To develop the project's biosecurity plans, the executing agency implemented several participatory workshops in the territories of intervention, which included local experts to collect the community's opinions and local knowledge.

GENDER

Please add information on any progress, challenges, and outcomes with regards to any and all gender-responsive measures that were undertaken in the project's activities during the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year. Also: Were indicators on gender equality and women's empowerment incorporated in the project's results framework? (Yes/No). If applicable, include the indicator with its baseline, target, and current value (2020-2021).

This project's result matrix did not incorporate any disaggregated indicators on gender equality.

KNOWLEDGE

Please add information on knowledge activities and products developed in relation to the project (with GEF or non-GEF resources), with special emphasis on activities carried out during the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year. **As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

There are no knowledge products associated.

⁵ See Annex 1: Definition of Ratings.

⁶ These should include risks identified at CEO Endorsement AND any new risks identified during implementation.

PROJECT MODIFICATIONS

Please report any significant modifications made to the project design since July 1st, 2020. (The basis for comparison is the Project Results Framework Matrix included in the original Request for CEO Endorsement Document.) This should be based on the Project Results Framework Matrix included in the original Request for CEO Endorsement Document.

CATEGORY	YES/NO	APPROVED BY	DESCRIPTION OF CHANGE AND EXPLANATION
Objective	No		
Outcome	No		
Output/Activities	No		
Other	No		

EXTENSIONS OR OTHER MODIFICATIONS

Has the project been granted any extension or other modification covered by the OA-420 from July 1st, 2020, until June 30th, 2021? If yes, please explain below. **As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

No. On September 19, 2020, the Bank received a formal request from the Ministry of Economy and Finance, for a 12-month extension of the last disbursement date, to be able to carry out the priority activities. Weekly follow-ups meetings were held, to monitor the progress of the project and assess the executing unit. However, in April 2021, a review of the delivery timeline for the remaining products was conducted and it was concluded that these could not be delivered before the last disbursement date as agreed. Because of the incapacity of the executing unit to execute the project and per Bank's Policies, **it is not possible to grant a second extension of the last disbursement date**. As a result, the project will be closed at the current date (October 10, 2021) and without use of the remaining resources.

LESSONS LEARNED / BEST PRACTICES

If the project generated any lessons learned or best practices during the 2020-2021 GEF Fiscal Year, please provide a short description. **As applicable, please include information on issues and solutions related to COVID-19.**

No Data Available

ANNEX 1. DEFINITION OF RATINGS

Development Objective Ratings

1. **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Project is expected to achieve or exceed **all** its major global environmental objectives, and yield substantial global environmental benefits, without major shortcomings. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
2. **Satisfactory (S):** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major global environmental objectives, and yield satisfactory global environmental benefits, with only minor shortcomings.
3. **Marginally Satisfactory (MS):** Project is expected to achieve **most** of its major relevant objectives but with either significant shortcomings or modest overall relevance. Project is expected not to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives or yield some of the expected global environment benefits.
4. **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):** Project is expected to achieve **some** of its major global environmental objectives with major shortcomings or is expected to achieve only **some** of its major global environmental objectives.
5. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Project is expected **not** to achieve **most** of its major global environment objectives or to yield any satisfactory global environmental benefits.
6. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** The project has failed to achieve, and is not expected to achieve, **any** of its major global environment objectives with no worthwhile benefits.

Implementation Progress Ratings

1. **Highly Satisfactory (HS):** Implementation of **all** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised implementation plan for the project. The project can be presented as “good practice”.
2. **Satisfactory (S):** Implementation of **most** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan except for only a few that are subject to remedial action.
3. **Marginally Satisfactory (MS):** Implementation of **some** components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with **some** components requiring remedial action.
4. **Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU):** Implementation of **some** components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan with **most** components requiring remedial action.
5. **Unsatisfactory (U):** Implementation of **most** components is not in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.
6. **Highly Unsatisfactory (HU):** Implementation of **none** of the components is in substantial compliance with the original/formally revised plan.

Risk ratings

Risk ratings will assess the overall risk of factors internal or external to the project which may affect implementation or prospects for achieving project objectives. Risks of projects should be rated on the following scale:

1. **High Risk (H):** There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks.
2. **Substantial Risk (S):** There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold and/or the project may face substantial risks.
3. **Modest Risk (M):** There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.
4. **Low Risk (L):** There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.