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Executive Summary

As part of the collaborative Osa and Golfito Initiative (INOGO), we carried out an analysis in 2012 of community leaders’ perceptions of existing resources and needs in the diverse communities in the Osa and Golfito region. Combining participant observation and standardized interviews with local leaders throughout the region, we easily identified key social resources of the region. Of particular importance to this biodiverse area is the finding that nature and natural resources are the #1 most frequently cited community strength in the region (mentioned as one of three primary strengths by 56.1% of those surveyed). The next most frequently cited strengths included community identity (45.6%), tourism (28.9%), employment (34.1%), and community organizations (19.3%).

Another key asset in the region is the amount of ongoing collective action and civic participation. Respondents to our surveys identified a total of 187 different organizations operating in their communities (averaging 31.2 distinct organizations per district in the study region). While these organizations tend to concern themselves with multiple community aspects simultaneously, our analysis indicates local development was most frequently cited thematic foci (16.0% of the organizations identified) and that membership in groups focusing on development was amongst the highest (averaging over 20 group members apiece). Groups focused on securing a potable water supply (11.2% of the organizations) were also consistently represented in the communities (our surveys also revealed favorable opinions of local water quality – see below – a testimonial to the efforts of these
organizations). Committees working in support of local schools were identified in nearly all communities (representing 9.6% of all organizations), as were church (10.2%) and athletic organizations (7.0%). Although fewer in number, local finance and micro-credit enterprises (5.9%) were cited by respondents as valuable assets for future sustainable development centered on human well-being in the region. There is particular need for microcredit enterprises in the region south of Golfito.

The region’s principle economic motor, the tourism industry, is viewed quite favorably by the majority of respondents, and was the industry most frequently cited as being highly environmentally sustainable (58.6% responded “high” or “very high”) as well as highly economically sustainable (39% responded “high” or “very high”). In addition, some development concerns that are common in other regions -- education and water quality -- were rated rather favorably in the study area. The quality of primary schools was rated as either “high” or “very high” by 49.9% of respondents and rated as “poor” or “very poor” only by 9.6%. Evaluations of secondary schools produced similar results, with 50.8% of those interviewed rating colegios as being “good” or “very good” with only 11.3% of respondents rating them as “poor” or “very poor”. Water quality was rated as “acceptable” or “very clean” by 67.6% of those surveyed and rated as “dirty” or “very dirty” by 9.7%.

While health care quality remains a concern, especially for more advanced care, access to health care for typical, everyday concerns was likewise perceived as good in most cases. With respect to the government’s approach to infrastructure-driven development in the region, 87% of residents exhibited awareness of the proposed international airport and 81% exhibit awareness of the proposed Diquís
Hydroelectric Project. While most of those surveyed were in favor of the airport (69.1%), support for Diquís was strongly divided (27.8% “good”/“very good”, 27.5% “bad”/“very bad”, and 30.5% had no opinion).

The most striking social challenge in the region is the absence of a regional inter-community identity within the Osa and Golfito region. People generally do not think of themselves as part of a larger geospatial community, like the “Osa Region” or the “Golfo Dulce Region.” Identities are much more local, often focused on townships and urban centers. Even inter-community activity is mostly restricted to neighboring communities or to larger population centers for health care, education and commerce. Information gathered during the surveys indicates very little interaction on a regional basis. We found, for example, that 137 of the 187 organizations identified (73.3%) have activity restricted primarily to the local community, and that only 22 organizations (11.8%) across the study area have contact with national or international actors. Ironically, despite high levels of collective action within communities, there is little integration of local development efforts with national and international policies and processes affecting the region.

During our interactions with organizations in the region with national and international ties, we also found that staff is often imported from other regions of Costa Rica, especially San Jose, or from abroad. This tendency reduces meaningful participation for local, rural residents in Osa and Golfito. Furthermore, much of the collective action occurring in study area communities is funded locally. The lack of regional, national, and international funding leaves many community needs out of
reach. This capacity to interact with key actors at the regional level and beyond is a component of social capital that is critical to human-centered development.

Unlike highly rated primary education in the region, secondary schools and universities are perceived as physically inaccessible. This results in poorly perceived high school graduation rates (50.8% say “very few” students or “none” graduate) and even lower perceived university attendance rates (74.1% “very few” or “none”). A related concern persists about drug and alcohol abuse among youth, who are seen as having few opportunities for meaningful professional preparation and are thus prone to listlessness and vice. A clear relationship is perceived between the condition of upper level education and the expressed safety and security concerns due to an increasingly delinquent youth population.

In terms of health and nutrition, local diets are inordinately high in basic grains especially rice, beans, and corn. Residents report consuming very little animal protein. Although access to basic health care is not expressed as a concern, the quality of the health care at existing facilities is a common concern. The existing clinics and EBAIS’s are almost universally described as understaffed and underfunded, as well as having sporadic hours of operation. Other INOGO documents (Gaffikin 2013, Menke and Carnoy 2013) explore the health and education dimensions of the region in greater detail.

In our analysis the existing livelihood options in the region (commerce, tourism, agriculture both with and without African oil palm, cattle ranching, fishing, mining, and forest products) were evaluated on perceived environmental and economic sustainability of each activity. Only tourism was considered both
economically and environmentally sustainable. Agriculture, fishing, commerce and mining were rated as very economically unsustainable by more than 30% of those interviewed. The expansion of African oil palm is reflected in the perception that it has “high” or “very high” economic sustainability as revealed by 50.7% of those surveyed; however, only 26.5% rate it as “high” or “very high” with respect to environmental sustainability. The data reveal that traditional activities are no longer seen as economically viable, while new activities such as African oil palm cultivation have suspect environmental credentials.

We conclude that successful programs and organizations exist in the Osa and Golfito region upon which further success can be built. Local micro-finance projects have helped foster entrepreneurial spirit as well as longer term financial planning. Entrepreneurship has been fostered by the creation of agricultural cooperatives and other programs that have led to locally-owned and operated enterprises with a history of contributing to locally identified development needs. Such entrepreneurial capacity building could be further enhanced by the development of one or more small business incubators, local and regional marketing hubs, and in the case of small agriculturalists, local farmer’s markets offering higher dividends for local produce.

To increase the development capacity of the tourism sector, further training and promotion of professionalism among local businesses and organizations is essential. While vocational training is needed in all sectors, ideally linked with small business incubators, the authors and other members of the INOGO team regard the potential for a regional tourism-training hotel, or “Escutel,” as especially attractive. Building on the successes of hospitality training institutions elsewhere, an Escutel
would evolve its own benchmarks for service quality and hospitality management with the unique environmental and social content of the Osa and Golfito region.

In an effort to develop a regional “brand,” we recommend building on the internationally recognized conservation and biodiversity reputation of the Osa Peninsula. Such branding can increase social capital through greater intra- and inter-regional communication. In identifying themselves as part of the greater socio-political landscape, Osa and Golfito residents will be better equipped to confront the primary development challenges facing their region in the next two to three decades.
The Osa and Golfito Initiative Overview

What is INOGO

The Osa and Golfito Initiative, “INOGO”, is an international collaborative effort to develop strategies for sustainable human development and environmental stewardship in the Osa and Golfito Cantons of Costa Rica. The effort’s core is a collaboration between people and institutions in the US and Costa Rica, facilitated by the Stanford Woods Institute for the Environment at Stanford University.

INOGO is designed to build on the many previous efforts in the region, working hand in hand with Costa Ricans in local communities, in the public and private sector, and with NGOs to create shared visions and long-term strategies for a sustainable future for Osa and Golfito. The project integrates the social, cultural, and economic dimensions of the region with both its marine and terrestrial ecosystems.

In addition to producing new studies and reports, the goal of this initiative is to generate a living process for sustainable development led by Costa Ricans, especially the people from Osa and Golfito. It also aims to provide information and products that will be useful to stakeholders in the region for their ongoing decision-making processes. We envision a two-phase trajectory for INOGO, Phase 1: Development of a Strategies for Action, and Phase 2: Socialization and Implementation.

Phase 1 of INOGO features four key components for the study region:

• Synthetic Analyses, written to pull together and interpret existing information, plus fill a few holes, and thus create a baseline for future work;
• Case Studies to address timely issues, where it was clear that local actors needed more information to advocate for community and environmental wellbeing;

• Interactive Co-development with stakeholders of scenarios depicting possible alternative futures, a process which in itself has value as it gives leaders the space to think about long-term goals alongside potential collaborators

• Design of strategic pathways towards sustainable development.

The full INOGO process is described in a document titled “The Osa and Golfito Initiative, INOGO: Building a shared dream”.

*Listening and consulting with stakeholders*

An important goal of the INOGO process is to maintain an inclusive, participatory process that engages actors at the local, regional, and national levels. Throughout the initiative, INOGO has been working to make sure that the local communities’ concerns, aspirations and needs are heard, in particular those relevant for a more positive future, where families have a chance to improve their quality of life in healthy social and natural surroundings.
Phase 1 Products
Osa and Golfito Initiative

**SYNTHETIC ANALYSES:**
- Health
- Education
- Economy
- Community Assets and Challenges
- Terrestrial Ecosystems
- Marine Ecosystems
- Organizations, Institutions and Financial Resources

**CASE STUDIES:**
- Proposed International Airport
- Impact of Diquis Dam on Terraba Sierpe Wetland
- Alternative Livelihoods within the Golfo Dulce Forest Reserve
- Socioeconomic Impact of Oil Palm Expansion
- Capacity of Oil Palm Plantation to Support Biodiversity

**ALTERNATIVE FUTURES SCENARIOS:**
- What do you want the region to look like in 2030?
- Business as Usual
- Rapid Growth
- Preferential Scenario (defined by regional leaders)

**STRATEGIES FOR ACTION:**
- Defining the future role of the Stanford Woods Institute in study region
- A discussion of key strategic actions identified by the INOGO efforts in areas such as education and alternative agriculture

**WEBSITE:**
- All products will be shared
- Online Library
- Interactive GIS Library
**The INOGO Study Region**

The study region of the Osa and Golfito Initiative was defined based on ecological boundaries, plus the Panamerican Highway. We initially considered a focus on the Osa Peninsula, but reflected that the Golfo Dulce logically needed to be included because of its importance to both human and natural processes. Once this was done, it became logical to include surrounding communities and as much of its watershed as we could.

![Map of Osa and Golfito Initiative](image)

**Boundaries of the territory covered by the Osa and Golfito Initiative, INOGO**

These ecologically-based boundaries include parts of the cantons of Osa and Golfito, and even include portions of some districts. While this provided a significant challenge in some data collection and analysis, we recognize that all boundaries have
their own challenges. Our map thus shows the initial boundaries of INOGO: as a living process it is anticipated that these boundaries may change over time.
Introduction

Long acclaimed for its rich biodiversity (see Dirzo et al 2013), Costa Rica has also been known for cycles of impoverishment, wealth disparity, and resource degradation derived from export-based economic policies (Edelman 1997; Vandermeer and Perfecto 2000; Hall et al. 2000; Horton 2007; Fletcher 2012). Nowhere in Costa Rica is more representative of these development woes than the region surrounding the Osa Peninsula, a region defined and governed by the cantonal jurisdictions of Osa and Golfito. Development in this region has historically been driven by a variety of extractive and agricultural industries – the heavy influence of United Fruit Company’s banana exports, a subsequent shift to gold mining, small-scale agriculture and cattle, then the growth of small scale ecotourism in the 1990s and 2000s, and the more recent expansion of African oil palm cultivation under the umbrella of a former United Fruit Company subsidiary, Palma Tica.

Despite vast investment, interventions focused on preserving the region’s biodiversity have generally ignored inequality in access to resources (Fletcher 2012) and been seen by locals as overly conservation-oriented and carried out “a espaldas de la comunidad [with its back to the communities]” (Nuñez et al, 2007, p.1). In largely neglecting human well-being, these interventions have been unable to overcome the region’s relative per capita poverty despite investments of many millions of dollars in recent decades (Courvisanos 2006; Nuñez et al, 2007; Appendix A). The government’s current approach to development in the region focuses on infrastructure -- including new roads, installation of electricity, the country’s third
international airport, and Central America’s largest hydro-electric dam (Umaña 2012). It remains unclear whether the ecological costs of this infrastructural development will be justified with respect to improved social and economic well-being for local residents of Osa and Golfito.

This document summarizes the results of a fieldwork-based diagnostic analysis of the social milieu of the Osa and Golfito region. It focuses on the existing institutions and resources, as well as the problems and challenges to the region’s long-term development. Our analysis began with an exhaustive review of existing public policy, agency and organizational documents, and published research. Additional primary data were gathered via 310 ethnographic interviews with regional community leaders conducted between January and May 2012. Methodology and the resulting data are discussed in more detail in subsequent sections of this paper. We first turn to a historical background of the region before continuing with a description of the origins of INOGO, and a review of pertinent literature that guided our analysis. Lastly, we present the implications of our findings and discuss them in the context of pertinent theory of development and its applications.

**Background on the Region**

Much like the rest of Costa Rica, the Osa and Golfito region – for simplicity, hereafter called the “INOGO region” – has been subjected to many different rural development campaigns; yet, the history of settlement and unique ecological conditions in the area have shaped a divergent history as described below.
a) Fruits, Forests, and Forced Relocations

The modern history of the INOGO region is characterized by the omnipotent influence of the United Fruit Company (UFC) and its subsidiary in the region (Gibson 1999). From 1938 onwards, the UFC was based in the town of Golfito, with operations in the cities we now know as Ciudad Cortés and Puerto Jiménez. They developed banana plantations around Palmar, and in Golfito they established the port and built the railroad. By 1955, nearly all of UFC’s banana production in Costa Rica was shipped from Golfito. The aura of prosperity attracted many migrants from other parts of the country, from Panama, and from Nicaragua, and Golfito grew. Yet in 1985, due to a combination of factors, including declining production and falling prices worldwide, the United Fruit Company abruptly pulled out of the region. As a result of the dominating presence of UFC in its history, scholars still contend that a culture of top-down, heavy-handed management persists in the region (Horton 2007; Fletcher 2012).

In another effort to accelerate development at the end of the 1950s, the government granted a concession of 47,000ha of the Osa Peninsula to a company called Osa Productos Forestales (OPF). The objective was to create “a tropical sustainable forestry industry centered on rotational harvests and waste-free processing of all the harvested wood into a variety of products for maximum economic returns” (Christen 1994: 74). Large tracts of land were purchased and leased for these tree plantations. Following in the footsteps of UFC, OPF constructed
roads, bridges, and other infrastructural works necessary to convert concession lands into functional farms and to further encourage agricultural development in the region. However, local populations still residing within the concession challenged the OPF on the takeover of their lands, sparking controversy and physical conflict. Eventually in 1978 the government’s Legislative Assembly approved the appropriation of the OPF lands, with much of the company’s former land being incorporated into the newly created Corcovado National Park and the Golfo Dulce Forest Reserve. Conflict persisted due to the lack of improvement in standard of living resulting from the creation of the protected areas, and in particular, the forced relocation of 300 residents (Cuello, Brandon and Margoluis, 1998).

After UFC and OPF pulled out of the region, vast numbers of unemployed laborers infiltrated the forests and national park on the Peninsula in order to pursue the next most viable livelihood option: gold mining. Although commercial gold mining along the Río Tigre existed as far back as 1937, it was the withdrawal of United Fruit that made illegal artisanal gold mining an attractive livelihood option for the thousands of newly unemployed workers (Naughton 1993). Eventually this subsistence-driven activity came into direct conflict with the management strategy of the new Corcovado National Park and, under heavy conservationist pressure, in the early 1980s the Costa Rican government authorized the relocation of an additional 800 gold mining families – some voluntary and some forced – from Corcovado to surrounding areas including lands inside the Golfo Dulce Forest Reserve (Cuello, Brandon and Margoluis, 1998). While their current impact on national parks and protected areas is not well documented, artisanal gold miners in the region continue
to leave behind garbage, contaminate the water, damage the vegetation, and put hunting pressure on wildlife.

**b) Beef, Beechwood and Tenuous Tenure**

Starting in 1980, the Institute for Land and Colonization (ITCO, subsequently IDA, the Agrarian Development Institute) established a livestock program in the region that supplied land for productive use. ITCO stipulated that those using the land had to pay for it over time, only securing tenure after working productively on the land for 15 years. Due to the poor suitability of tropical soils for agriculture, the success of this program relied on expensive fertilizer inputs. With little access to low interest credit in the area, farmers often could not buy the fertilizer necessary to support expected yields. Compounding the challenges to agricultural productivity were distance from markets, poor transportation, and lack of technical assistance.

By 1986 the National Production Council was dismantled, ending their role in the commercialization of rice. Subsequently medium and large producers essentially abandoned rice production (van den Hombergh 2004). Around the same time, due to international pressures and protectionist policies of the U.S., livestock production across the country also fell sharply -- so much so that by 1994 Costa Rica was forced to become a net importer of beef in order to satisfy internal demand (van den Holmbergh 2004; Edelman 1997). Many residents sold their land rather than work the poor quality soil (Horton 2009). Yet since many of the landholders never qualified
for an official title from IDA, many such land sales involved illegal transactions resulting in many new “owners” of land who still do not possess legal title.

Also in the late 1980s, as part of the government’s Comprehensive Rural Development Program, various municipalities, including Osa and Golfito, signed a contract with Ston Forestal, a Costa Rican subsidiary of Stone Container Corporation (a producer of paper and cardboard). Of the 24,000 hectares of *Gmelina arborea*, or beechwood planted in the region under these contracts, an estimated 600,000 tons of wood chips were slated to be produced and shipped from Punta Estrella, Golfo Dulce (van den Hombergh 2004). The Costa Rican government granted Ston Forestal the benefits of a Free Trade Zone as an incentive to attract them to this underdeveloped region. However, the renting of lands to Ston Forestal resulted in social and environmental conflicts following such actions such as draining wetlands, planting trees in the maritime zone, and planting trees on land with higher potential for agriculture. The Asociación Ecologista Costarricense (AECO, The Costa Rican Ecologist Association) began collecting reports of the environmental damage and mounted a national campaign that got the attention of international organizations including the Rainforest Action Network and Greenpeace.

Following the election of President Figueres in 1994, the Ston Forestal Company was denied permission to construct a marine port despite an approved environmental impact assessment. They were also denied permission to build Central America’s largest chipping facility. Thus in 1995 only 13,000ha of a planned 24,000ha of beechwood had been planted. Without the chipping facility there was little demand for the wood, and without an alternative way to earn money from the plantations,
residents of the Osa were left with land further degraded by Ston Forestal (van den Hombergh 2004). Following the unresolved deaths of two Costa Rican ecologists involved in the coalition challenging Ston Forestal’s presence in the region, the company ceased operations in the Osa region and was sold in 1999 (van den Hombergh 2004).

c) Local Impact of Increased Global Demand for African Oil Palm

Despite a history of crop failures and market vulnerability experienced with previous agricultural commodities in the region (cacao, banana, rice, cattle), African oil palm has emerged as the next in a line of agriculturally-driven economic activities in Osa and Golfito. Oil palm (*Elais guineensis* var.) is a major global commodity, and according to the *Cámara Nacional de Productores de Palma* (CANAPALMA), in Costa Rica’s Southern Pacific, Central Pacific, and Atlantic zones there were 60,000 hectares under cultivation in 2011. This is an increase of 17% since 2006 making palm oil is the 10th most important export for Costa Rica (CADEXO 2012). National trends in plantation expansion are mirrored in the cantons of Osa and Golfito where small holders and large landowners alike are reaping the benefits of predictable, year round harvests and equally consistent demand.

Oil palm expansion in the Osa and Golfito Region has occurred largely via contract agriculture established by Palma Tica, a member corporation of the agro-industrial conglomerate Grupo Numar, which introduced current forms of plantation management to growers nationwide. Unprecedented economic stability, coupled with
a lack of competitive alternatives within or outside of agriculture, makes oil palm
cultivation extremely attractive to growers (see analysis in Beggs and Moore 2013). It
is highly likely that agricultural land will continue to be taken out of food crops and
pasture to be replaced by palm plantations, a form of land use change with strong
economic incentives to growers and moderate gains to landless workers.

d) “A forest left standing is more valuable than one cut down”

Costa Rica was arguably the first country to develop ecotourism on a major
scale, avoiding many previous issues with tourism’s role in development (deKadt,
1977; Wheeller 1991), and allowing the industry to contribute directly to positive
economic (Chacón 1991), environmental (Budowski 1976), and social outcomes (Boo
1989; Ziffer 1989; Honey 1999). Tourism in the INOGO region began as early as the
1950s when foreign investors began purchasing coastal land in the region, but it was
not until the late 1980s and early 1990s that development of this sector boomed along
with the broader emergence of ecotourism in the country. Despite all the previous
livelihood options in the region (such as bananas, forestry, and gold), the dominant
economic motor in the region today remains small-scale nature-based tourism
(Horton, 2009; Fletcher 2012, Hunt et al 2013). In other parts of the country, there is
a new trend away from ecotourism. Indeed, since the installation of the country’s
second international airport in Liberia in 2000, it has been suggested that Costa Rica
is currently in jeopardy of “cracking the golden egg” (CREST 2013) from the ‘golden
goose’ of ecotourism, by moving away from small scale, sustainable ecotourism
toward large scale resort, second home, and residential tourism development along the Pacific Coast (Honey et al 2010; Van Noorloos 2011). Happily, this is not yet the case in Osa and Golfito.

However, there is also a debate about the ability of tourism to meet the region’s development needs. Analyses of tourism’s impact in this region indicate a positive relationship between ecotourism projects and rainforest conservation, even regeneration (Almeyda et al 2010; Fletcher 2012). They also indicate positive economic impacts in the form of household income and employment that exceed other livelihood options (Hunt et al 2013; Almeyda et al 2010). But looking at the broader social and economic impacts of tourism, one finds outcomes that are more mixed including reference to seasonal job instability and inflation of local land prices (Horton 2009). Another suggestion is that ecotourism is “just another form” of neoliberal conservation which does little to reduce, and may even enhance, inequalities of access to land and resources. Indeed, in just this spirit ecotourism in Osa has been blamed for contributing to the continued impoverishment and land degradation in the region (Fletcher 2012; see also Hunt et al 2013). Either way, in the INOGO region an estimated 20% of the population is involved directly in tourism, with an additional 60% involved indirectly via related services (Horton, 2009). Clearly development efforts must carefully consider the importance of tourism in the Osa and Golfito region.
e) Current Development Dilemmas

Of major relevance to all the aforementioned economic activities of Osa and Golfito are the major new infrastructure projects espoused by recent governments. The projects include (1) Costa Rica’s third international airport just outside of Sierpe-Palmar Norte (Araya Monge 2011); (2) Central American’s largest hydro-electric dam upstream from the Terraba-Sierpe wetlands along the Terraba River (Fornaguera 2012); (3) road improvements such as those to the Chacarita-Rincon highway, or those linking Sierpe to the Chacarita-Rincon highway, and (4) concurrent installation of electricity in historically remote communities along said roadways.

The public discourse around this development emphasizes improved quality of life of the region’s residents. A concern remains that, without additional policy intervention, the current approach to development will further consolidate the social and economic structures responsible for perpetuating the region’s underdevelopment (Fletcher 2012). Opposition to the airport and the hydroelectric project has already materialized. Much of the opposition revolves around the lack of regulatory policy for these projects related to key development goals such as health access, educational quality, and long-term income opportunities that do not jeopardize the region’s natural resources. A central objective of the INOGO is to achieve better human-centered development outcomes amidst such projects in this complex regional context.

We now turn to a description of activities related to the social component’s first product – the diagnostic analysis. We first compiled existing social assessments and inventories in the scholarly literature, NGO reports and agency publications.
These existing writings documented an overwhelming emphasis on conservation and natural resource oriented development strategies. Our review of 48 initiatives in which more than $21.1 million was invested in projects in the Osa (see Appendix A), found that only 17.4% of this funding went toward human socio-economic improvements whereas 82.6% of this funding was dedicated to conservation efforts. Also evident from our assessment of existing reports and studies is a research fatigue in over-studied gateway communities around Corcovado National Park. The earlier emphasis on conservation and our concern for research fatigue in certain communities guided our current approach. Thus our analysis here highlights the human dimensions of development and secondly, we purposely concentrated our efforts in under-studied communities within the Osa and Golfito region.

To carry out the fieldwork in the understudied areas a field team was assembled around a core of selected local residents, in-country experts, and Stanford anthropologists with experience studying social and environmental impacts of tourism on the Osa Peninsula. For a description of team’s field methods, please see Appendix B; here we move ahead to key findings.
Results: Capitals, Constraints, and Capabilities

a) Community Assets and Challenges

In order to evaluate capital and capabilities as perceived in the study region, a section of the survey assessed what respondents saw as strengths of their communities (see coding key in Appendix D). Data from participant observation, surveys in less-studied areas (sample of 310), and interviews with key local leaders throughout the region reveal a number of important assets and strengths (Table 1). Of particular importance to this biodiverse area is the finding that nature and natural resources are the #1 most frequently cited community strength in the region (mentioned as one of three primary strengths by 56.1% of those surveyed). In other words, community leaders throughout the region see the biodiversity of their homeland as one of its top local resources; this is not a population that needs to be persuaded of the virtues of biodiversity.

The next most frequently cited strengths were community identity (45.6%) and local employment (34.1%). At first glance, these findings seem at odds with the common perception that there is no regional identity in the INOGO study area and that employment opportunities are scarce in the region. Closer inspection reveals that respondents were referring to local community (village- or town-level) identity, not that for the region, and were expressing pride in the existence of jobs locally, even if there are shortages. Tourism, being one of the main sources of income and employment in the region, came in as the next main strength, cited by 28.9% of our
interviewees. People of the Osa and Golfito regions have learned to capitalize on the unique ecosystem in which they live through ecotourism. It is also important to note that community organizations, mentioned by 19.3% of the sample, are highly active in the region.

Turning to challenges, the most striking reported social challenge in the region is the absence of a regional Osa-Golfito inter-community identity (Table 2). Most inter-community activity is restricted to neighboring communities for recreational purposes or to larger population centers for key needs -- health care, education and commerce. Quantitative and qualitative information gathered during the surveys indicates very little interaction on a regional basis. When a subset of organizations for which we had corresponding information are characterized by the geographic extent of their activities, it was determined that 137 of 187 organizations identified (73.3%) have activity restricted primarily to the local community, and that only 22 organizations (11.8%) in the full study area have contact with national or international actors. Ironically, despite high levels of collective action within communities, there is little integration of local development efforts with national and international policies and processes affecting the region.
Table 1: Most commonly cited community strengths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>% mentioned theme as the primary strength</th>
<th>% mentioned as one of the three principle strengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature and natural resources</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Identity</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment/commerce</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community organization</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Most commonly cited community challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>% mentioned as primary challenge</th>
<th>% mentioned as one of the three principle challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of community identity</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs/alcoholism</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure of government</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, we noted that interviewees had a bit more difficulty identifying strengths and assets than they did challenges and constraints in their communities. Reflecting the development challenges faced by this region, 43.3% of those surveyed could not identify at least three strengths of their communities, and 10% were unable to identify even one. In comparison, less than a quarter of those sampled (24.7%) were unable to identify three challenges in their community.

**b) Characteristics of Collective Action**

A key asset in the region is the amount of ongoing collective action and civic participation. Extent of collective action was assessed in several ways. First, an exhaustive list of organizations operating in the communities surveyed was identified (Appendix D). Respondents to our surveys identified a total of 187 different organizations operating in their communities, averaging 26.7 distinct organizations per district in the study region. Secondly we assessed average membership of the organizations, which was determined to be 13.1 with a range of 3 to 160 members. This was equivalent to 0.60 organizations per respondent across the region, varying from 0.67 to 1.29 organizations per respondent within the districts (see Tables 3 & 4).

Next, we assessed average and total membership in organizations by focus of their activity (Figure 2). As these organizations tend to address multiple community concerns simultaneously, our analysis indicates that overlapping concern for human well-being and development were the most frequently cited thematic foci of the organizations identified, reported 26.2% and 16.0% of the time respectively. Groups
focusing on development also had a high average number of members, 21.8 members per group, second only to church organizations (an average membership of 22.7). Organizations focused on potable water supply (11.2% of the total) were also consistently represented in the communities (our surveys also revealed favorable opinions of local water quality – see below – a testimonial to the efforts of these organizations). Committees working in support of local schools are active in nearly all communities (9.6% of the organizations), as were church (10.2%) and athletic organizations (7.0%). Finally, though fewer in number, local finance and micro-credit enterprises (5.9%) were cited by respondents as valuable assets for future sustainable development emphasizing human well-being in the region.

**Table 3: Characteristics of organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Org. theme</th>
<th># of unique orgs</th>
<th># mentions</th>
<th>% unique orgs per theme</th>
<th>% mentioned</th>
<th>Average # members</th>
<th>Principle funding source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>The government/municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Local fundraising activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>Personal funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-specific</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>Donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>The government/municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Local fundraising activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>Local fundraising activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>Donations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>Member fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>Member fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>Local fundraising activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>187</strong></td>
<td><strong>855</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.1</strong></td>
<td>Local fundraising activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Average organizational membership by issue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Average number of participants in an organization of by theme in the region</th>
<th>Percentage of groups with each theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-specific</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well-being</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Issues addressed by organizations working in the community
We also explored collective action by assessing the capabilities of organizations, focusing on their sphere of activity. The field team identified each organization as operating primarily at one of four scale levels: local (n=185, 57.1%), regional (n=8, 2.5%), national (n=73, 22.5%), and international (n=4, 1.2%).

Additionally, organizations were categorized based on the source of their funding. It was found that 22.5% rely on state or national funding, whereas the most groups (57.1%) operate off locally generated revenues (Figure 3).

During our interactions with organizations in the region with national and international ties, we found that staff is often imported from other regions of Costa Rica, especially San José, or from abroad. This reduces meaningful participation for local, rural residents in Osa and Golfito in broader-scaled organizations. Furthermore, much of the collective action occurring in Osa and Golfito communities is funded locally; the lack of regional, national, and international funding leaves many community needs out of reach. The capacity to interact with key actors at the regional level and beyond is a component of social capital that has been identified (e.g. Bebbington, 1999) as critical to human-centered development in other regions of Latin America and elsewhere.
**Figure 3**: Sources of funding for organizations operating in the community (of the 324 identifications of funding sources by respondents)

![Source of Funding](image)

(c) Development and Livelihoods

For each of the main livelihood options in the region (commerce, tourism, agriculture both with and without African oil palm, cattle ranching, fishing, mining, and forest products) we asked respondents to describe its environmental and economic sustainability. Tourism, the region’s principle economic motor, was the only activity viewed favorably by the majority of respondents. It was the activity most frequently cited as being highly environmentally sustainable (58.6% responded “high” or “very high”) as well as highly economically sustainable (39% responded “high” or “very high”). The recent expansion of African oil palm in the region is reflected in the perception that it has “high” or “very high” economic sustainability to 50.7% of those
surveyed; however, only 26.5% rate it as “high” or “very high” with respect to environmental sustainability. We conclude that traditional activities in the region are no longer seen as competitive, while new activities such as African oil palm cultivation have suspect environmental credentials.

With respect to the government’s big infrastructure projects for the region, 87% of residents exhibited awareness of the proposed international airport and 81% exhibit awareness of the proposed Diquís hydroelectric project. While most of those surveyed were in favor of the airport (69.1%), support for Diquís was strongly divided (27.8% “good”/“very good”, 27.5% “bad”/“very bad”, and 30.5% had no opinion).

d) Perceptions of education and health in Osa and Golfito

Largely absent in the challenges identified by participants are education, health and water quality – precisely the areas to which development investments are typically directed in Latin America. Our respondents rated these topics rather favorably, reflecting their national and region priority as development goals. As of 2010, Costa Rica had made substantial progress on many of the health and education targets of the Millennium Development Goals (MGD7). Although published indicators for the region, as well as the data gathered in this effort, suggest key deficiencies in those realms, interviewees were consistently favorable in their perceptions of education, health and water quality throughout the region (Figures 4-10). Here we review survey results pertaining to education and health: for thorough analysis of these topics see Menke and Carnoy (2013) and Gaffikin (2013), respectively.
The quality of primary schools was rated as either “high” or “very high” by 49.9% of respondents and rated as “poor” or “very poor” only by 9.6%. Evaluations of secondary schools produced similar results, with 50.8% of those interviewed rating colegios as being “good” or “very good” with only 11.3% of respondents rating them as “poor” or “very poor”. Unlike highly rated primary education in the region, secondary schools and universities are perceived as physically inaccessible (Figures 4-5). There is a distinct drop off in the attendance rates as students move from primary to secondary school indicated by poorly perceived high school graduation rates (50.8% say “very few” students or “none” graduate from colegio) and even lower perceived university attendance rates (74.1% “very few” or “none”) (Figures 6-9).

A related concern persists about drug and alcohol abuse among youth, who are seen as having few local opportunities for meaningful professional preparation and are thus prone to listlessness and vice. Respondents articulated a clear relationship between the perceived inaccessibility of upper level education and safety and security concerns due to an increasingly delinquent youth population.

While health care quality remains a concern, especially for more advanced care, access to health care for typical, everyday concerns was likewise perceived as good in most cases. EBAIS (Equpos Básicos de Atención Integral de Salud, operating at various locations or “Sedes” in the study zone) are the most utilized health care resource, despite being described as “underfunded” or “understaffed” (complaints we commonly heard in Jimenez, Alto Laguna, Pavon, etc) with “questionable quality” and “irregular hours.” Water quality was rated as “acceptable” or “very clean” by 67.6% of those surveyed and rated as “dirty” or “very dirty” by 9.7% (Figure 10). In terms of
nutrition, local diets are inordinately high in basic grains especially rice, beans, and corn. Residents consume little animal protein or vegetables. Although access to basic health care is not expressed as a concern, the quality of the health care at existing facilities is a common concern.
Figures 4-5: Perceived quality of education of primary and secondary school

The perception of the quality of primary education, by district (n=302)

The perception of the quality of secondary school, by district (n=293)
Figures 6-7: Perceived attendance rates at primary and secondary schools

Perceived attendance rate of students in primary school, by district
(n=294)

Perceived attendance rate of students in secondary school, by district
(n=303)
Figures 8-9: Perceived high school graduation and university attendance rates

Perceived high school graduation rate, by district
(n=297)

Perceived university attendance rate, by district
(n=290)
Figure 10: Perceived water quality

(n=309)
Discussion & Conclusions: Pursuing development centered on human well-being

This document has summarized the key findings of the social and institutional analysis carried out in 2012 for the Osa and Golfito Initiative, INOGO. It is one report among several (http://inogo.stanford.edu/node/145?language=en) and case studies (http://inogo.stanford.edu/node/170?language=en).

The research described here indicates a high level of collective activity in the communities of Osa and Golfito of Costa Rica, yet the lack of effective social capital remains a key constraint to capabilities and livelihoods. The paradox stems from the fact that social capital is an emergent property. Unlike other capitals (e.g. natural, political, economic), social capital is not held by individuals, but rather it emerges through involvement and interaction with other actors. It requires that interaction in order to enhance quality of life and livelihood benefits for the group. Our results suggest that collective activity within communities is common yet regional activity incorporating organizations across communities is rare. There is also markedly less interaction with national or international actors amongst even the most active and widespread organizations working in these communities. As Bebbington, Sen, and others have argued, under such circumstances it is unlikely that further development-related investment in health, education or infrastructure will overcome persistent cycles of impoverishment and resource degradation as have characterized the Osa and Golfito region since the early 20th century. There is greater promise in investments
that increase rural residents’ capacity to retain or improve access to assets, especially the accumulation of the social capital necessary for improved access to regional, national, and international-level institutions and actors.

Fortunately successful programs and organizations exist in the Osa and Golfito region upon which further success can be built. Local micro-finance projects have helped foster entrepreneurial spirit as well as longer term financial planning. Examples include projects supported by FINCA and KIVA, as well as locally managed Empresas de Credito Comunal. Entrepreneurship has also been fostered by the creation of agricultural cooperatives and programs such as the Nature Conservancy funded Asociación de Emprendedores para el Desarrollo Responsable (ASEDER). These programs have led to locally owned and operated enterprises with a history of contributing to locally identified development needs. Such entrepreneurial capacity building could be further enhanced by the development of one or more small business incubators, local and regional marketing hubs, and in the case of small and medium-scaled agriculturalists, local farmer’s markets offering higher dividends for local produce.

As the region’s primary economic motor, the tourism sector is already important; carefully developing yet greater capacity in the sector is paramount. INOGO urges that further tourism development in the region not be permitted to deviate from the model of small-scale stayover ecotourism that has built the region's reputation and made it so attractive. But at the same time, further training opportunities and the promotion of professionalism among local tourism businesses and organizations is essential. AGITUR (Asociación de Guías Turísticos de Piedras
Blancas) is an example of a local organization dedicated to that objective. Ideally tourism-related vocational training would be linked with small business incubators throughout the region. We specifically note the potential for a regional tourism training hotel, or "Escutel" (for escuela-hotel). Building on the successes of open-for-business hospitality training institutions elsewhere, an Escutel in the INOGO region would help to generate and reinforce regional benchmarks for service quality and hospitality management with the unique environmental and social content of the Osa and Golfito region.

An effort by the national Consejo de Competitividad is underway to develop a regional “brand” for exports from the region. This branding effort could also leverage the internationally recognized conservation and biodiversity reputation of the Osa Peninsula. In that respect branding would foster increased social capital by promoting greater interaction between regional actors both among and within communities, and thus facilitate greater regional identity. In viewing themselves as part of the greater socio-political landscape, Osa and Golfito residents will be more capable of confronting the primary development challenges facing their region in the next two to three decades.

Finding ways to develop social capital will be critical to improved human well-being in this region since local residents are caught in a vortex of national and global processes they have little institutional or political capacity to address. These processes include but are not limited to the following: the attractiveness of the area to tourism development, including ecologically vulnerable wetland areas; an increasing presence of real estate interests catering to second-home and residential
tourism; signs of increasing interest by chain hotels, cruise ships, and other purveyors of mass tourism in and around the Osa Peninsula; and the actors and forces that have the most influence on these processes often being entirely exogenous to the region. Without sound development policy in place, the history and current socio-political context of Osa and Golfito suggest external actors are more likely to worsen the quality of life for local residents. It is important to better communicate the social and environmental vulnerabilities inherent to the “modernization” approach to development, as currently promoted by decision-makers behind “big project development” in the region. It is clear from the amount of collective activity devoted to development issues, as well as residents’ noted desire for additional development-related organizations, that these are the principle concerns of the region’s population.
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Osa Peninsula Project Report Summaries 1990-2009: An Analysis of Pre-INOGO Efforts

Claire Menke
REPORT SUMMARY

48 initiatives (detailed in Appendix One of this Report) have brought more than $21,105,160\textsuperscript{1} to the Osa Peninsula since 1990, with little tangible evidence to show for the time and money spent\textsuperscript{2}. Of the 48 projects included in this analysis, only 18 initiatives have completed reports that detail both project duration and amount of funding – only 3/8 of the projects have done sufficient, transparent evaluation so that other investors and organizations can learn from the regional development history. 17 projects refrained from including investment figures in the final report.

Investment efforts in the Osa have mostly been relatively small in scale. Only three programs have invested more than $300,000, and the grand majority of projects that reported their budget spent less than $60,000 in the Osa (Figure 1). 25 of the 42 projects indicated the project duration only lasted a maximum of 4 years (Figure 2). Unfortunately, level of funding is not strongly correlated with project duration ($r^2=0.02$ for all projects, $r^2=0.095$ for projects with duration <50 months) – money is not invested consistently or over a longer period of time. Lack of both money and time invested in these programs indicates limited potential for success and project sustainability.

*Note: Friends of the Osa and TUVA merged in 2006 to form Osa Conservation. Initiatives and projects in this report are identified as being managed or financed by whichever organization started the project.

---

\textsuperscript{1} All currency values are in US dollars.
\textsuperscript{2} Prior to 1992, donors contributed more than $11,465,644 to conserving and developing the Osa Peninsula (Cabarle et al. 1992).
Figure 1: Histograms of Project Funding. a) Includes all known investment values, b) Only includes investments below $100,000.

Little information has been published about the reports (detailed in Appendix One) since the initial evaluation was filed for each founding or managing organizations’ records. This suggests that, while promising at the outset, lack of continual funding has led many projects to a swift end. Projects require a constant, long-term source of funding in order to be successful over into the future.
While only 55% of projects primarily focused on conservation (n=27, Figure 3), 82.6% of the money invested in the region has gone towards these conservation initiatives – 99.1% of which was put toward terrestrial conservation. If the BOSCOSA Project, which was largely considered a failure due to poor management and distribution of funds, is discounted in these values, roughly 93.3% of known funding would go toward conservation. Of the known investments, $19,521,074 was donated with the primary purpose of supporting terrestrial conservation whereas only $168,000 was set aside for conserving marine life. Because of an emphasis on terrestrial conservation, nearly half of the projects were initiated in protected areas – ACOSA, Osa Biological Corridor, Corcovado National Park, Piedras Blancas National Park, or Térraba-Sierpe Wetlands. The majority of conservation-focused donations are intended to strengthen security infrastructure, purchase more land for conservation purposes, and defend the land that is already under legal protection. And, though these initiatives have successfully preserved land, a fraction of the investments in the region have attempted to alleviate the poverty of residents undermined by conservation efforts. Several projects also aimed to reduce infringement of park boundaries for extractive purposes without addressing the root cause of the symptomatic reaction to limited economic options.
While 45% of projects profess to primarily address the needs of local communities, only 17.4% of funding has been directed toward improving the socio-economic status of the residents that live on the Osa Peninsula ($4,151,850).

Of the projects meant to cure the economic woes of Osa residents, the majority focus on agricultural programs. While especially pertinent in the limited-use buffer zones of the ACOSA system protected areas, the projects do not seem to provide the necessary training that would help the initiatives be sustainable. Only 5 projects of the 49 detailed in this report have focused primarily on capacity building, 2 projects maintain this as a secondary focus (Figure 4).

---

3 If BOSCOSA is removed from these values, only $1,416,086 (6.7% of known funding) has been donated toward improving resident lifestyles since 1990.
This final theme, lack of community involvement and direction, is constant throughout the project evaluation reports. In several write-ups managers acknowledged that they should have taken community structure and opinions into account prior to starting the program. For example, in the “Protection and Control Plan for Corcovado and Piedras Blancas NPs and Adjacent Areas” project, the report recommended that future actors, “work with the communities, not for them,” insinuating that they had difficulty gaining the community’s approval for the project. The COVIRENAS program, which created natural resource vigilance groups, was slow to start because participants were not used to expressing opinions or raising their own concerns. Previous projects have been paternalistic and not embracing community stakeholders in the creation of projects.

Due to the combination of limited project lifespan, lack of consistent funding and little emphasis on building community capacity for development, few projects have survived in the Osa. If the Iniciativa Osa y Golfito wishes to improve upon past attempts at sustainable socio-economic development, it should focus on those three main failings. Building a sense of community from the outset by integrating local desires and actions into the Initiative’s Action Plan should increase community buy-in. Not only will this improve the image of future development programs (including the Iniciativa Osa y Golfito), but it may inspire the community to take ownership of the development process, reducing the need for future investment. INOGO should consider integrating community needs into the foundation of the Initiative and its future actions.
Appendix One: NGO Reports Included in this Analysis

Regional Initiatives

Mesoamerican Biological Corridor (MBC) Consolidation Project
Osa Biological Corridor
Conservation Trust for the Osa Peninsula, Costa Rica (“The Osa Campaign”)

Regional Initiative Sub-Components

Atta Biodiversity Information System
Biological Corridors and Protected Areas in the Osa Peninsula
Collection of Ecological Data and Maps of the Distribution of Ecosystems for Five Conservation Areas (ECOMAPS Project)
Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Production in the Osa Biological Corridor
Establishing the Biological Boundaries of Costa Rica’s Biological Corridor (Phase I)
Establishing the Biological Boundaries of Costa Rica’s Biological Corridor (Phase II)
Institutional Strengthening of the Osa Conservation Area
Proposed Methodology for Design and Validation of a Biological Corridor in Costa Rica’s Golfo Dulce Forest Reserve
Protection and Control Plan for Corcovado and Piedras Blancas National Parks and Adjacent Areas, Costa Rica
Study of Land Tenure and a Conservation Strategy for Private Lands in the Core Area of the Osa Biological Corridor

Other Initiatives

Archaeological Conservation in the Diquis Delta
Bamboo Collective (?)
BOSCOSA Project
Bottlenose and Spotted Dolphins as Indicators of Pesticides in Golfo Dulce, Costa Rica, and Their Value as Ecosystem Protectors
Building Regional Conservation Capacity
Campanario Biological Station
Canopy Research Facility
Cerro Osa Land Purchase: a conservation priority for the Osa Peninsula
Coastal Marine Management in the Osa Peninsula
Coastal Tourism Development in Costa Rica: Environmental, Social & Economic Impact
Community Agroforestry Program (CAP)
Community Sustainable Self-Development in the Buffer Zone of Piedras Blancas National Park and Golfito Wildlife Refuge, Costa Rica
Community-based coastal restoration and sanitation in the Golfo Dulce
Environmental Education for the Conservation of Flagship Species in the Osa Peninsula
Environmental Education Program Emphasizing Solid Waste Management and Disposal at Drake Bay, Costa Rica
Extractive Reserves for Fallen Wood (part of the regional initiative: Sustainable Timber Harvesting in the Osa Peninsula Forests)
Field-based Analysis of Biochar for Agricultural Production and Climate Change and Nutrient Pollution Mitigation (Katoomba Indicator)
Jaguar Conservation Program, Osa Peninsula
Natural Resources Vigilance Committees in Southern Costa Rica
Osa Conservation Dialogues
Osa Sea Turtle Study (OSTS)
Planning Grant for Water Quality Analysis of the Sierpe Wetlands System
Preventing Hunting in the Corcovado National Park and the Golfo Dulce Forestry Reserve
Program to Strengthen Natural Resource Watch Committees
Responsible Oil Palm Production Practices
RESECOP (Piro Community Ecological Reserve)
Rural Energy and Communications Program, Solar-for-Nature
Sea Turtle Conservation Program on the Osa Peninsula, Costa Rica
Selva Nueva
Support for the Ngabe Indigenous Community
Sustainable Development Opportunities in the Osa Conservation Area ECOTICOS Project
Sustainable Production Alternatives and Participatory Environmental Management of the Mangroves, Coastal, and Marine Areas of Golfo Dulce, Costa Rica
Sustainable Timber Harvesting in the Osa Peninsula Forests
Testing appropriate technologies for wetlands remediation using stakeholder approach in southern Costa Rica
VERDEA Project (Valorization and Conservation of Tropical Rain Forest Plant Resources)
Youth Entrepreneurial Leadership
Extra Form
REGIONAL INITIATIVES AND SUB-COMPONENTS

The Osa Biological Corridor
REGIONAL INITIATIVES

**Project Name:** Mesoamerican Biological Corridor (MBC) Consolidation Project

**Organizations Involved:** Comisión Centroamericana para el Ambiente y Desarrollo (CCAD); UNDP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: Mesoamerica (ACOSA)</th>
<th>Thematic Area: Terrestrial Conservation</th>
<th>Time Period: 2000-2006</th>
<th>Time Duration: 6 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Funding Organizations:** Global Environment Facility (GEF); German International Development Agency (GTZ); Mesoamerica (governments)

**Funding Goal:** Funding Received: $16.6 million

**Project Synopsis:** This regional strategy is attempted to conserve the region’s biodiversity by encouraging local and national government participation to establish a network of protected areas across Mesoamerica. This project also worked to integrate biodiversity into sustainable economic and social development priorities. Finally, the project created a biodiversity monitoring system integrated into a regional environmental information system.

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Created regional training instruments, communication plans, biodiversity information and monitoring systems and work proposals to help increase the sustainability of the MBC. Created a regional biodiversity strategy and corridor management criteria, both approved by the Council of Ministers. Worked toward integrating biodiversity and environmentalism into health and agricultural sectors.

**Project Impact:** Establishment of a regional biodiversity conservation corridor that spans Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama. Increased awareness of the need for conservation across the region.

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** When working across country boundaries, need to establish criteria and requirements that can be incorporated into each country’s regulations and activities. Also, to have active participation across countries the organizing entity must encourage active participation from all parties.
| **Project Name:** Osa Biological Corridor | **Organizations Involved:** ACOSA del Sistema Nacional de Áreas de Conservación, CEDARENA, Fundación Corcovado, Fundación Neotrópica, INBio |
| **Location:** Osa Biological Corridor (OBC) | **Thematic Area:** Terrestrial Conservation |
| **Time Period:** 2001-2011 | **Time Duration:** 10 years |
| **Funding Organizations:** Campana Osa, CI, CRUSA, Moore Foundation, TNC, PPD | **Funding Goal:** |
| **Funding Received:** $26,460 |

**Project Synopsis:** The goal of the project is to connect nationally protected areas in an effort to create a conservation area to preserve populations of tapirs, jaguars, and other large mammals. The project maintains and re-establishes the biological corridor between Corcovado and Piedras Blancas NP, and provides technical information regarding animal biology, conservation and sustainable development strategies to improve the decision-making process.

**Methodology:** The coalition organized community workshops, scientific research and a biological monitoring program. The coalition holds regular meetings to evaluate results from various projects.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Developed digital land tenure map and identified/implemented community projects within the OBC core. Compiled a database of publications featuring the Osa since 1995, which was made accessible to the public. Cleared 16 miles of trails in national parks to help facilitate an increase in park security. Compiled and standardized maps on land use, forest cover, ecosystems, species data, etc.

**Project Impact:**

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Set clear roles and responsibilities for potential partner groups prior to assigning membership. Design a good communication strategy that provides transparency and easy access to information.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Conservation Trust for the Osa Peninsula, Costa Rica (“The Osa Campaign”)</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> CI, CRUSA, MINAET, TNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> ACOSA</td>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> ACOSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Terrestrial Conservation</td>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong> January 2003-? (not updated since July 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 5 years (at least)</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong> $32.5 million (over 5 yrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organizations:</strong> IADB, Moore Foundation, UNDP, UNESCO, World Bank, CRUSA (also some private donors, tourists, etc)</td>
<td><strong>Funding Received:</strong> $1.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** CI, CRUSA, MINAET and TNC partnered to establish the Conservation Trust Fund for the Osa Peninsula. The goal of the project was to create a biological corridor to connect Corcovado NP and Piedras Blancas NP.

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Raised more than $20 million as of May 2008 ($3 million from CRUSA, $8 million from Moore Foundation). Established an operational structure to execute objectives and activities of the campaign as well as a national committee that supports the fundraising initiative.

**Project Impact:** The Osa Campaign has raised a lot of money for conservation in the Osa.

**Project Limitations:** Reports from within the Osa indicate that not much has been done in the way of producing tangible value from the fundraising effort – they have not reached the objectives of protecting biodiversity (by creating new ranger stations and park management plans), establishing a biological corridor between Corcovado NP and Piedras Blancas NP, establishing an integrated protection program for coastal and marine resources or strengthening local carrying capacity. The Osa Campaign has raised significant funds with minimal positive impact. [This is based on the report that I still need to receive!!]

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Need transparency in how funds have been distributed and utilized. Need to create a tangible/visible product from the fundraising efforts in order to win the goodwill of the local communities.
**REGIONAL INITIATIVE SUB-COMPONENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name: Atta Biodiversity Information System</th>
<th>Organizations Involved: INBio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Osa Peninsula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Terrestrial Conservation, Biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong> April 2006- present</td>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 5 years (permanent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organizations:</strong> Control Electrónico (CESA); Environmental Systems Research Institute; Global Environment Facility (GEF); Norwegian Agency for Development (NORAD); Oracle; Países Bajos/the Netherlands; Soluciones Integrales (SOIN)</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong> Funding Received: information not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Synopsis:</strong> Atta is a Biodiversity Information System developed by INBio to record, generate and disseminate information on the country’s biodiversity. This system collates information on all specimens that have been collected and studied by INBio since 1989. The goal of the project was to record and disseminate all biodiversity data quickly and accurately – to make it more available to policy makers, scientists and the common man alike. (<a href="http://www.inbio.ac.cr/atta/index.htm">http://www.inbio.ac.cr/atta/index.htm</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology:</strong> Utilized the Atta information system to collect and catalogue all data inventory collected by INBio. Gave an individual bar code number and label to each collected specimen, which was then organized and made available publicly through a web interface. The methodology used was an object-oriented approach (Rumbaugh’s OMT methodology).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Results and Outcomes:</strong> Collected and catalogued species information into an easily accessible, web-based format. Were then able to integrate biological information with GIS data, images, publications, etc for more holistic knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Impact:</strong> Allows for access to a wide database of information for school groups and scientists on both a national and international level. The integration of GIS and other mapping technologies increases the potential for this data to be used by policy makers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Limitations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:</strong> Need a coordinated approach in order to make this sort of extensive project work – it is not possible to complete a project at this level as an individual organization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name: Biological Corridors and Protected Areas in the Osa Peninsula</th>
<th>Organizations Involved: TUVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Location:** Corcovado NP (buffer zone)  
**Thematic Area:** Terrestrial Conservation  
**Time Period:** 1992-present  
**Time Duration:** 18 years (permanent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Organization:</th>
<th>The assembly of Fundación TUVA sponsors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Goal:</td>
<td>Funding Received: information not provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** TUVA carries out sustainable management of the buffer zone of Corcovado NP, manages the natural forest and the consolidation of a biological corridor between the Piro River and Corcovado. The overarching goal is to protect wildlife from human activities and maintain ecological processes that sustain the high biodiversity in the region. Further goals include developing low-impact economic activities for locals and increasing their awareness of the benefit of the corridor.

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:** The declaration of the Osa National Wildlife Refuge and Río Oro National Wildlife Refuge. Also digitalized land tenure data in the Piro-Corcovado Biological Corridor.

**Project Impact:** Raises awareness of the economic and biological importance of conservation.

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Conservation of land requires unified initiatives at the national level to support local projects – it is suggested that government-sponsored parks provide economic incentives for displaced locals.
**Project Name:** Collection of Ecological Data and Maps of the Distribution of Ecosystems for Five Conservation Areas – ECOMAPS Project

**Organizations Involved:** INBio, SINAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: ACOSA</th>
<th>Thematic Area: Terrestrial Conservation, Biodiversity</th>
<th>Time Period: 1998-2005</th>
<th>Time Duration: 7 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Funding Organization:** Países Bajos/the Netherlands (government)

**Funding Goal:** $100,000

**Project Synopsis:** ECOMAPS was a joint initiative between INBio and MINAET to identify, classify and map all ecosystems and vegetation of Costa Rica – focusing on the conservation areas of ACOSA, Amistad Pacifico (ACLAP), Amistad Caribe (ACLAC), Tempisque (ACT) and Arenal (ACA). The goal was to utilize this information to create a national development plan that retains the countries biodiversity. More info here: (http://www.inbio.ac.cr/ecomapas/ecomapas.html).

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Identified, catalogued and mapped all the ecosystems of ACOSA, ACLAP and ACOPAC. All information was made available online. Only the data about ACOSA was published.

**Project Impact:**

**Project Limitations:** The scale of work/inputs was not consistent, which made cataloguing more difficult. It was suggested that future research be completed with standardized metrics to reduce issues.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Establish a clear focus for the project as well as clear expectations for the final product. Over-perfecting work due to lack of consensus over data inclusion can delay publication date and potentially halt the process all together.
**Project Name:** Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Production in the Osa Biological Corridor

**Organizations Involved:** CEDARENA, Comisión Local del Corredor Biológico Osa, Fundación Corcovado, Fundación Neotrópica, TUVA, INBio (Osa Biological Corridor Coalition) – Managed by Fundación Neotrópica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: Osa Biological Corridor</th>
<th>Thematic Area: Terrestrial Conservation, Economic Development</th>
<th>Time Period: October 2003-September 2006</th>
<th>Time Duration: 2 years, 11 months (35 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Funding Organization:** CEPF

**Funding Goal:**

**Funding Received:** $70,000

**Project Synopsis:** Engaged 15 families that live in the core zone of the OBC to incorporate conservation activities into their farms (eg: agro-forestry, silvo-pastoralism, agro-ecotourism, sustainable ranching, bio-digesters, and reforestation). The project also included environmental education within the 6 regional schools, reforestation and home garden projects. The goal was to protect 405 acres (1,000 hectares) of forest.

**Methodology:** The project activities were developed by the Local Commission for the OBC in conjunction with the local communities. The project offered technical training and limited financial support in exchange for the participants’ time, labor and land. After analysis by the commission, 15 out of 40 families were identified as interested participants. Background information was collected about each farm, from which a technical plan was developed. Baseline ecological and agricultural data were collected to measure the project’s progress.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Protected approx 5,434 acres on 17 participating farms. Reforested 124 acres of pastures and degraded land. Implemented agroforestry and silvopastoral systems on 10 farms in total. Installed 5 biodigestors and planted better pasture grass on 13 farms (59 acres). Diversified production on 11 farms, created organic gardens in 5 schools and tree nurseries at 3 schools within the OBC. Held 17 training activities regarding PES, sustainable agriculture and conservation.

**Project Impact:** Increased environmental awareness, provided farming families with a more sustainable and environmentally-friendly source of income.

**Project Limitations:** Not enough funds to include 30 additional families in the same program. Currently there is not an accessible market for participants’ products.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Maintain transparency and communication with locals. Messages and actions need to be consistent to prove the organization is reliable. Verify informally-discussed information. Check project status personally rather than receiving information second-hand. The project needs to be flexible to adapt to unforeseen economic, social and environmental factors.
**Project Name:** Establishing the Biological Boundaries of Costa Rica’s Biological Corridor (Phase I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Organizations Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Osa Biological Corridor</td>
<td>INBio, Technical Coalition of the Osa Biological Corridor (CTCBO)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Time Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial Conservation</td>
<td>April 2004-November 2004</td>
<td>7 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Organizations</th>
<th>Funding Goal</th>
<th>Funding Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CI, Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF)</td>
<td>$26,402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** Research project to increase knowledge about biodiversity and human activities in the Osa Biological Corridor. This knowledge was used to redefine conservation goals and ecological boundaries.

**Methodology:** Conducted an in-depth review of all research carried out in the Osa; interviewed residents of the proposed corridor area; conducted a workshop with researchers to define the conservation goals of the area, stakeholders and threats; decided on 26 research projects to be completed related to conservation goals. Decided to prioritize projects that would help define boundaries, primarily those related to animals with larger home ranges (felines, spider monkeys, prey of both). Workshop minutes were distributed to participants, CI and the OBCTC.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Learned that in order to preserve high levels of biodiversity for the future, especially in a region of rapid changes in land use and fragmentation, they need more scientific data. Phase II will work to officially define the boundaries and baseline information for future monitoring.

**Project Impact:** Laid the groundwork for establishing successful boundaries for the Osa Biological Corridor (to be done in Phase II) – collected background data and filled information gaps.

**Project Limitations:** Limited action – mostly conversing with locals and scientists to establish future steps. While gathering this information and hosting the workshop was important, it did not guarantee future action.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
**Project Name:** Establishing the Biological Boundaries of Costa Rica’s Biological Corridor (Phase II)

**Organizations Involved:** INBio, Technical Coalition of the Osa Biological Corridor (CTCBO)/Fundación Neotrópica, UCR (Escuela de Biología), Instituto Internacional en Conservación y Manejo de Vida Silvestre (ICOMVIS) de la Universidad Nacional (UNA) and Escuela de Ingeniería Forestal del Instituto Tecnológico de Costa Rica (ITCR)

**Location:** Osa Biological Corridor

**Thematic Area:** Terrestrial Conservation

**Time Period:** June 2005 – September 2007

**Time Duration:** 2 years, 3 months (27 months)

**Funding Organizations:** Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund (CEPF), Instituto Tecnológico de Costa Rica, Universidad de Costa Rica (UCR), Universidad Nacional (UNA)

**Funding Goal:**

**Funding Received:** $300,000

**Project Synopsis:** InBio and OBCTC proposed a redefinition of the Osa Biological Corridor boundaries, taking into account scientific research conducted to establish the conservation priorities. The project’s goal was to connect the protected areas of the OBC while meeting the conservation and land-use goals established in Phase I.

**Methodology:** Conducted 3 research projects: population distributions of felines, spider monkeys and their prey; distribution and abundance of 34 canopy tree species; gene flow in three species of timber trees in fragmented environments. Formed advisory committee (incl. representatives from CATIE, Tech Institute of Costa Rica, UCR and INBio). Used data from research studies to determine conservation strategies, establish routes of connectivity, produce maps of species abundance, and develop a monitoring system. Also gathered information regarding conservation easements for displaced farmers, determined a baseline for PES, and developed integrated zoning in Golfo Dulce Forest Reserve.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Data collected in this project was used to create management plans for Piedras Blancas NP, Corcovado NP and Terraba-Sierpe Wetland.

**Project Impact:** Developed a useful set of baseline data for future conservation and scientific needs. Also created an advisory scientific committee to assess the future of management in the area as well as potential changes to the baseline statuses of endemic species.

**Project Limitations:** Indicator species (spider monkeys, felines, prey) continue to have low populations in Golfo Dulce Forest Reserve despite study results.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** A multi-disciplinary approach was utilized with much success; teamwork and open communication contributed to this success. The report did not say whether or not the project was able to establish new boundaries for the OBC. If this did not occur, the main objective of the original initiative was not achieved. This project needed to establish clearer goals and actually accomplish those original goals.
**Project Name:** Institutional Strengthening of the Osa Conservation Area

**Organizations Involved:** MINAET, Fundación Corcovado Lon Willing Ramsey Junior

**Location:** Osa Peninsula (Drake, Matapalo-Piro Corridor)

**Thematic Area:** Terrestrial Conservation, Infrastructure

**Time Period:**
- Phase I: Jan. 2003 – Feb 2005
- Phase II: April 2005 – August 2005

**Time Duration:**
- Phase I: 2 years
- Phase II: 4 months
- Total: 28 months

**Funding Organization:** CEPF (Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund); CRUSA; TNC; La Compana de Osa

**Funding Goal:**
- Funding Received:
  - $149,127 (CRUSA 2003-2005)
  - $19,965 (CEPF 2005)
  - $20,056 (TNC 2005)
  - $2,200 (CRUSA 2005)
  - $10,000 (Campana de Osa 2005)
- Total: $201,348

**Project Synopsis:** Hired and funded security of the Biological Corridor according to the requirements set forth by the Moore Foundation. Planned and implemented a conservation plan for the Osa Biological Corridor. Prepared the management staff for their duty protecting the OBC.

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:** This initiative helped to create a more confident, trained and consistent park staff for the OBC. Have worked with the community of Drake Bay to reduce tourist impact on Corcovado NP and Isla de Cano Biological Reserve. Worked with Friends of the Osa and Women of the Osa to establish the Matapalo Piro Biological Corridor. Have also made several agreements (with UCR, FOO) to work toward sustainable development. Also formed a Regional Council (16 members of different institutions in the Osa) to oversee policy enforcement.

**Project Impact:** Now working with TNC, CRUSA, La Campana to continue the operation and initiatives. Also improved communication and relations with government institutions, such as MINAET. The project generated technical equipment and improved administration of ACOSA.

**Project Limitations:** Lacks a stable, long-term source of funding (the project ended in 2005).

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Find a stable, multi-year funding source to increase job security and continuity. Find a better way to fund ACOSA as a regional initiative, instead of passing funding through sections of the region. The writer of the report hopes that the government can institute PES in this region to increase funds for conservation.
**Project Name:** Proposed Methodology for Design and Validation of a Biological Corridor in Costa Rica’s Golfo Dulce Forest Reserve

**Organizations Involved:** CATIE, SINAC, WWF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: Osa Biological Corridor (OBC)</th>
<th>Thematic Area: Terrestrial Conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong> 2000-2001</td>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 1 year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Organizations:** Germany (government), Corredor Biológico Mesoamericano, Fundación para el Futuro de Colombia, WWF

**Funding Goal:** **Funding Received:** $4,000

**Project Synopsis:** Evaluated the function of a proposed corridor between Corcovado NP and Piedras Blancas NP, then defined critical protection areas for the connection of the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor. The goal of this corridor is to protect the habitat and prey of felines *Panthera onca* and *Puma concolor*.

**Methodology:** Assessed the habitat used by felines and their prey using GIS, benefits of the corridor and establish management guidelines

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Identified (on maps) the habitat quality and regions that have sufficient habitat to house feline species. Designed potential routes of wildlife migration between the two parks. Created an initial proposal of activities for conservation strategy in the Osa Conservation Area; designed monitoring methodology.

**Project Impact:**

**Project Limitations:** Lack of funds meant that the project could not be completed.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Have a secure source of long-term funding.
### Project Name:
Protection and Control Plan for Corcovado and Piedras Blancas National Parks and Adjacent Areas, Costa Rica

### Organizations Involved:
Fundación Corcovado Lon Willing Ramsey Junior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>Osa Biological Corridor (OBC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Area:</td>
<td>Terrestrial Conservation, Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Period:</td>
<td>May 2003-July 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Duration:</td>
<td>2 years, 2 months (26 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Organization:</td>
<td>CEPF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Goal:</td>
<td>Funding Received:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Synopsis:</td>
<td>Hired park rangers to strengthen enforcement of the OBC, provide environmental education to local communities so they understood the importance of the project. Also raised funds for gasoline and other necessities that would strengthen MINAE protection of the park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Methodology:

### Key Results and Outcomes:
Hired 8 park rangers for the OBC, increased protection especially in Piedras Blancas and Corcovado NP. Increased environmental education activities in communities adjacent to Piedras Blancas and Corcovado NPs. Helped support COVIRENAS.

### Project Impact:
Decreased poaching, illegal extraction and general infringement on park resources.

### Project Limitations:

### Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:
Work with communities, not for them. Begin the hiring and negotiation process before receiving funds because governmental bureaucracy can slow the process.
**Project Name:** Study of Land Tenure and a Conservation Strategy for Private Lands in the Core Area of the Osa Biological Corridor  

**Organizations Involved:** CEDARENA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: Aguitas, Drake, los Planes, Rancho Quemado (OBC)</th>
<th><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Sustainable Development, Terrestrial Conservation, Land Tenure</th>
<th><strong>Time Period:</strong> March 2001-February 2004</th>
<th><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 2 years, 11 months (35 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong> CI; CRUSA; TNC</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Funding Received:</strong> information not provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** CEDARENA was working to conserve the Osa Biological Corridor. The aim of this particular project was to compile farm land tenure data within the core area to identify how best to conserve resources. The end goal was to develop and implement a private land conservation strategy.

**Methodology:** Conducted surveys to determine land tenure history of each property within the core zone and discuss with farmers how they can best conserve their land. Survey results, registered lands and maps will be compiled into a database.

**Key Results and Outcomes:**
- **Phase I:** First land tenure survey (Aguitas, Drake, los Planes, Rancho Quemado) – 20% of farmers would sell their land and move. Surveyed 100% (41,990 acres) of core zone.
- **Phase II:** Partner with ACOSA to obtain land tenure info for Golfo Dulce Forestry Reserve
  - Provided incentives (PES) for more than 3,952 acres in the Osa, helped landholders become recognized by FONAFIFO. Developed a land tenure mosaic, mapped it to show priority areas.

**Project Impact:** Increased the amount of data regarding land tenure in protected areas in the Osa. Attempted to use that knowledge to form a new conservation and management strategy for the OBC.

**Project Limitations:** Phase II could not be completed because of lack of funding from ACOSA.
- Need to solve land tenure issues before conservation can be successful. Costa Rica’s registered surveys are severely lacking information for this region – the Osa often gets discounted. It is hard to gain sufficient funding from organizations to support studies in the Osa (it is relatively large and difficult to get around).

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** The main issue in the Osa is that most people do not have land titles. This requires legal and economic action. PES contracts last no more than 5 years, which does little to guarantee long-term conservation. Remove IDA settlements in the Forestry Reserve to set an example for other farmers.
OTHER INITIATIVES
**Project Name:** Archaeological Conservation in the Diquis Delta


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>Palmar Sur</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture, Economic Development, Cultural Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong></td>
<td>November 2009-October 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong></td>
<td>1 year, 1 month (13 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong></td>
<td>SURCOOP, R.L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong></td>
<td>Funding Received: $50,086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** Established a banana production cooperative (Cooperativa de Produccion Agropecuaria Industrial y de Servicios Multiples del Sur - SURCOOP, R.L.), which helped to finance the preservation of archaeological artifacts in the Diquis Valley.

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Were able to preserve Pre-Colombian archaeological artifacts.

**Project Impact:** May have increased tourism to the region.

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
**Project Name:** Bamboo Collective (?)  
**Organizations Involved:** Friends of the Osa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>La Palma, Puerto Jimenez</th>
<th>Thematic Area:</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Time Period:</th>
<th>2006-2008 (at least)</th>
<th>Time Duration:</th>
<th>2 years?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Funding Organization:** Blue Moon Fund, Albert Foster  
**Funding Goal:**  
**Funding Received:** $239,000 from Blue Moon Fund

**Project Synopsis:** Two bamboo agricultural cooperatives were established in 1998 by Steve and Margaret Bell. The program provided necessary plant capital, training, facilities and access to local markets for contributing farmers. This project was utilized in collaboration with the Biochar Project/Katoomba Indicator.

**Methodology:** 5-week workshop to teach local men and women how to create bamboo furniture. Also educated local schoolchildren about the sustainable nature of bamboo harvesting.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Project Goal: offer alternative source of revenue other than hardwoods. In 2008, the Osa Bamboo Club (a bamboo nursery and cooperative) produced 2,750 seedlings, of which 1,170 were distributed to farmers for sustainable cultivation. Blue Moon Fund donated sufficient funds in 2008 to create a green energy, water management and alternative building demonstration program at the OBC.

**Project Impact:**

**Project Limitations:** Lacking many details about this project.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name: BOSCOSA (Program for Forest Management and Conservation on the Osa Peninsula, Costa Rica) Project</th>
<th>Organizations Involved: WWF, Fundación Neotrópica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location: Golfo Dulce Forest Reserve</td>
<td>Thematic Area: Sustainable Development, Terrestrial Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Period: 1987-1992</td>
<td>Time Duration: 5 years (60 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Organization: Conservation Foundation, WWF, USAID, USFS, CRS, Fondo de Preinversión (MIDEPLAN), Dirección General Forestal (DGF), Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA)</td>
<td>Funding Goal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Received: $1,100,000 (USAID) $250,000 (WWF) $44,628 (WWF/USFS) $72,100 (CRS) $48,527 (MIDEPLAN) $20,509 (DGF) $1,200,000 (DANIDA) TOTAL: $2,735,764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Synopsis: Project was started to stop the destruction of 70,000 ha of natural forests adjacent to Corcovado National Park by stabilizing land-use around CNP. The project goals were to develop and demonstrate natural forest management, sustainable agricultural practices, ecotourism and biodiversity technologies that retain forest cover and are economically viable.

Methodology: Trained 72 women and 114 men, conducted 80 training events in handicrafts over 4 years.

Key Results and Outcomes: More than 6,500 ha were targeted for improved land use. Created 8 grassroots organizations (including ECODES) and leveraged national and international support for conservation and land-use in the Osa. Increased employment – created 56 jobs. 290 ha of degraded pasture was reforested, 160 ha were switched from annual to perennial crop production.

Project Impact: Improved social and ecological sustainability and promoted positive attitudes toward forest conservation. Decreased the risk of forest conversion in areas surrounding Corcovado National Park.

Project Limitations: Short project lifespan. Limited institutional support for the initiative – no change in land tenure laws or other supporting legislative devices. The project was also too ambitious and tried to cover too large an area; the project had relatively low impact given the area it attempted to cover. Too many components, too little staff.

Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report: Improve integration with communities and amongst field staff. Reduce the size and complexity of projects so that they are manageable – improve follow-through and technical training. Emphasize projects that improve the economic productivity of forestry products so that communities improve their source of income. More suggestions and recommendations can be found in Cabarle et al. 1992.
**Project Name:** Bottlenose and Spotted Dolphins as Indicators of Pesticides in Golfo Dulce, Costa Rica, and Their Value as Ecosystem Protectors  

**Organizations Involved:** Fundación Promar, Instituto Regional en Sustancias Tóxicas de UCR, Centro de Investigaciones en Biología Celular y Molecular de UCR, Laboratorio de Toxicología Ambiental de la Universidad de Amsterdam

|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|

**Funding Organizations:** Ford Motor Company; Beyond Productions Barco de Investigaciones “The Quest”  

**Funding Goal:**  
**Funding Received:** $148,000 (for Phases I and II)

**Project Synopsis:** This study analyzes bottlenose and pantropical spotted dolphin as indicators of pollution in Golfo Dulce. Previous studies, completed in 1998, revealed the presence of pesticides in the sediment and water of Golfo Dulce. This study checked the regional top predators (dolphins) to see if they experience high levels of toxicity.

**Methodology:** The project is three phases.  
Phase I: (completed) preliminary study that takes samples of blubber and skin to determine levels of organochloride pesticides and PCBs in dolphins.  
Phase II: (pending) a larger study of the same nature as Phase I.  
Phase III: (future) creating a protection framework for the Golfo Dulce ecosystem including the management of agricultural activities that impact the oceanic ecosystem (banana cultivation yields the highest level of toxicity of all agriculture practiced in the region).

Analyzed DNA of blubber to determine levels and types of pesticides present in the Golfo Dulce. Identified main pollution focal points around the gulf. Launched measures to protect the biodiversity and local human populations of the region.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** The main sources of pollution come from agricultural activity in the southern Pacific region that deposit waste (DDT and PCB) into main rivers. The bottlenose dolphin is particularly threatened because it frequently feeds at the mouth of rivers and resides in the gulf throughout the year. Organochloride pesticides and PCBs can be found at all levels of the ecosystem in Golfo Dulce.

**Project Impact:**

**Project Limitations:** The funds obtained for Phase I ($50,000) only covered a small sampling. Need more funds to produce sufficient data (Phase II)

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
**Project Name:** Building Regional Conservation Capacity

**Organizations Involved:** Friends of the Osa (Osa Conservation)

**Location:** Osa Peninsula (Puerto Jimenez, Piro)

**Thematic Area:** Terrestrial Conservation, Capacity Building

**Time Period:** July 26, 2006

**Time Duration:** Information not provided

**Funding Organization:** Blue Moon Fund (year 1)

**Funding Goal:** Information not provided

**Funding Received:** Information not provided

---

**Project Synthesis:**
Phase I: Construct the Osa Biodiversity Center (OBC) – a center of research and environmental education within the rainforest of the Osa Peninsula.
Phase II: work with Stroud Water Research Center to build a stream ecology laboratory to study the Osa’s watershed health.

**Methodology:**

---

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Created the Osa Biodiversity Center and Friends of the Osa Science Plan. The Plan focuses on species inventory, wildlife monitoring, landscape ecology and ecosystem services. The Center’s trails extend for 800 acres, encompassing both coastal and tropical rainforest environments.

**Project Impact:** Increased the amount of scientific research occurring in the region. This research may contribute to increased rainforest protection or sustainable development initiatives.

**Project Limitations:**

---

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
### Project Name: Campanario Biological Station

#### Organizations Involved:
Companario S.A.,
Investigaciones Ambientales de la Osa S.A.,
Asociación Proyecto Campanario

#### Location:
Campanario Biological Station, Osa Peninsula

#### Thematic Area:
Terrestrial Conservation, Environmental Education

#### Time Period:
1990-present

#### Time Duration:
Permanent (21 years)

#### Funding Organization:
The project is sustainable due to course tuition and ecotourism. Previous funders not listed.

#### Funding Goal:

#### Funding Received:
$175,000

### Project Synopsis:
Teaching tropical ecology courses for national and international students (from 4-21 days at a time) at Campanario Biological Station. Courses are available for both high school and university students. The project’s goals are to use funds received from ecotourism and educational programs to help conserve the rainforest and purchase other lands for conservation – to extend the network.

### Methodology:

### Key Results and Outcomes:
Constructed a biological station, complete with a research laboratory, and trail system through the surrounding rainforest. Have designed and implemented courses for educational programs and camps for younger children. The operation has expanded into San José where the Campanario Biological Station now has an office.

### Project Impact:
Have set an example for sustainability and conservation education. Also became members of the Private Reserve Network in Costa Rica.

### Project Limitations:

### Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:
**Project Name:** Canopy Research Facility  
**Organizations Involved:** TUVA, Western Canada Wilderness Committee

| Location: Rio Piro Valley | **Thematic Area:** Terrestrial Conservation, Research  
| **Time Period:** 1991 | **Time Duration:** 1 year |
| **Funding Organization:** Private funding | **Funding Goal:**  
**Funding Received:** Information not provided |

**Project Synopsis:** Canadian experts built a system of canopy platforms in three different locations in the Rio Piro forests.

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Were able to monitor changes in forest dynamics and create a natural history analysis. Learned specifically about light gaps. According to a 1992 article, the National Museum of Costa Rica and the Universidad Nacional de Costa Rica’s Forest Research Institute (INISEFOR – Instituto de Investigación y Servicios Forestales) are going to conduct canopy research here. Will also start a “Trees and Seeds of Piro” applied research program in 1993 – the focus will be on the autoecology and reproductive biology of 10 endangered tree species that live in the Osa.

**Project Impact:** Helped to establish and maintain the 5,000 acre Piro Community Forest Reserve (PCFR), which was created in 1993. Also provided the platforms for a LIFE Magazine photo shoot to help document the rainforest’s unique biodiversity. This magazine article likely increased awareness of conservation issues in the rainforest. Increased research and cash flow into the Piro region of the Osa.

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Cerro Osa Land Purchase: a conservation priority for the Osa Peninsula</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> Friends of the Osa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Cerro Osa</td>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong> April 23, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Terrestrial Conservation (land purchase)</td>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong> Information not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong> Blue Moon Fund (year 1); TNC; CI; American Bird Conservancy; Beneficia Foundation; Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Received:</strong> $273,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** Financial support for land purchase of the Cerro Osa in the Osa Peninsula in an effort to expand the area under FOO conservation. Have purchased more than 1,600 acres of land adjacent to the 800 acres originally owned by FOO within the Osa National Wildlife Refuge. The Cerro Osa parcel itself was only around 100 acres, 2/3 of which was primary forest, 1/3 of which was plantations.

**Methodology:** Bought land from farmers for conservation. Created native nursery and hosted workshops for local communities on the merits of reforestation and native plants.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Have conserved roughly 4,000 acres of multi-use protected area. Supports 2,000 acres of old-growth rainforest and are reforesting 500 acres in Pochote and Teak Plantation. Have planted more than 19,000 native trees. In the process of building a new education center at Cerro Osa, the Greg Gund Conservation Center, to host international and local student groups – the goal is to connect this building to the OBC and other conservation areas.

**Project Impact:** This land purchase helps to establish the Matapalo Biological Corridor.

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
### Project Name: Coastal Marine Management in the Osa Peninsula

| **Location:** | Golfo Dulce |
| **Thematic Area:** | Marine Conservation |
| **Time Period:** | 1994-present |
| **Time Duration:** | 17 years (permanent) |

| **Funding Organization:** | Agencia Espanola de Cooperacion Internacional (AECI), Amigos de la Tierra (Espana), Université de la Rochelle (France), Further Foundation |
| **Funding Goal:** | Funding Received: currently no budgeted funds, undergoing fundraising |

**Project Synopsis:** Participatory research of marine resources in the Osa Peninsula. Supports Asociación de Desarrollo y Conservación de Río Oro (ADECORO), which manages and researches sea turtles on beaches near Corcovado NP. The project’s goal is to increase community participation in conservation and management in the Golfo Dulce.

**Methodology:** Influenced the development of the curriculum for the Masters program in Management of Tropical Coastal Areas at UCR. Also encouraged community participation in programs. Hosted participatory workshop on “Hacia el manejo sostenible del Golfo Dulce” and another on Biodiversity and Development.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Declaration of the Rio Oro Natural Wildlife Refuge (currently under successful community management) to protect 4 species of sea turtles for a period of 6 years. Supported a campaign fighting against the construction of a wood chip mill in Golfo Dulce (Ston Forestal).

**Project Impact:** Increased community awareness and action toward marine conservation.

**Project Limitations:** The government’s lack of interest in the process slowed progress.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Need governmental support of positive community initiatives in order to spur nature conservation and income generation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Coastal Tourism Development in Costa Rica: Environmental, Social &amp; Economic Impact</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> Center for Responsible Travel (CREST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Osa Peninsula</td>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Economic Development (Tourism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong> Blue Moon Fund</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** To support research regarding environmental, social and economic impacts of coastal tourism development in Costa Rica.

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:**

**Project Impact:**

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Community Agroforestry Program (CAP)</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> TUVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Rio Piro and Alto Laguna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Agriculture, Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong> 1992 – 1994?</td>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 2 years (at least)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong> GEO (Germany)</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Received:</strong> $22,500 ($20,000 received as part of the VERDEA Project)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** Sub-component of the VERDEA action-research initiative *(See VERDEA Project).* Worked with community members to organize a vanilla cooperative.

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Created the local Vanilla Producers Cooperative in 1993 – 13 members who cultivated more than 8 hectares of vanilla. Made 4,500 pounds of green vanilla by early 1994.

**Project Impact:**

**Project Limitations:** Lack of sufficient information to determine project limitations, duration and success.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
**Project Name:** Community Sustainable Self-Development in the Buffer Zone of Piedras Blancas National Park and Golfito Wildlife Refuge, Costa Rica  

**Organizations Involved:** Fundación Neotrópica

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location:</th>
<th>Communities of La Gamba and La Julieta</th>
<th>Thematic Area:</th>
<th>Capacity Building, Sustainable Development</th>
<th>Time Period:</th>
<th>January 2002-August 2005</th>
<th>Time Duration:</th>
<th>3 years, 8 months (44 months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Funding Organization:** Cooperación Austriaca, through the Oficina Regional de Cooperación Técnica in Managua, Nicaragua

**Funding Goal:** Funding Received: $100,000

**Project Synopsis:** The goal of the project was to transform the community of La Gamba (100 families) into a self-sustainable community through organization, production and community outreach.

**Methodology:** Defined indicators, both quantitative and qualitative, to see whether or not goals had been met. Conducted workshops, meetings, periodic evaluations and technical reports. Integrated systematic monitoring into the structure of the program.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Created a part-time health clinic and other community development projects. Built a teacher’s house, the Bonito Aqueduct and remodeled the community hall. Helped 18 families diversify their income through small business ventures and encouraged the establishment of a youth-run monthly newsletter. Set up a Community Credit Fund to help access small loans.

The project was replicated in the communities of La Julieta and Los Angeles as well.

**Project Impact:** Worked to promote self-sufficiency, sustainable production and the generation of small businesses. Helped to diversify income within the community and create an organizational structure that includes the youth and women of the community in more prominent roles.

**Project Limitations:** At the outset, La Gamba community members were used to paternalistic approaches of past initiatives and therefore lacked organizational skills and education, had poor health standards and had difficulty meeting their baseline needs. They also showed low self-esteem.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Work with other groups toward a common goal. Engage the community from the outset so that they agree with the goals of the project. Assess the community’s needs first and then evaluate the project regularly to ensure that goals and needs are being met. Nothing should be given outright to a community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Community-based Coastal Restoration and Sanitation in the Golfo Dulce</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> Asociacion Centroamericana para la Economia, la Salud y el Ambiente (ACEPESA), Friends of the Osa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Golfo Dulce (La Palma, Guadeloupe, Puerto Escondido)</td>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Infrastructure, Environmental Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong> October 2010 – August 2011</td>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 10 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong> Blue Moon Fund</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong> Information not provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** To support the creation of a regional model of sustainable management of solid and liquid waste in coastal communities of the Golfo Dulce. The program educates students and teachers of 10 Osa schools (in the communities of La Palma, Guadeloupe, and Puerto Escondido) about the importance of watershed protection.

**Methodology:** FOO's Environmental Education program conducted workshops to raise awareness about appropriate water management. Encouraged the production of bio-boxes to treat gray water.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Students learned about sustainable management of water resources.

**Project Impact:** Hoping to conserve the rivers and mangroves of the Golfo Dulce by decreasing pollution of these ecosystems.

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Environmental Education for the Conservation of Flagship Species in the Osa Peninsula</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> MINAET, Universidad Estatal a Distancia (UNED), Universidad Nacional (UNA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Corcovado NP</td>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Environmental Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong> CEPF, WWF</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** Trained residents of the Osa Peninsula to work as environmental educators in their communities, with a focus on conservation of endangered species. The indirect goal was to reduce logging and hunting pressures by encouraging conservation.

**Methodology:** Surveyed, conducted workshops on communication methods, created educational material, wrote the region’s natural history, wrote environmental legislation and conducted an assessment of the status of fauna in the Osa. Completed a visit to Corcovado NP as an educational opportunity for the participants. Developed bulletins, fact sheets, posters and table games.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Trained 30 Osa community members as environmental educators and completed the other objectives (trip to Corcovado, creation of printed materials, etc).

**Project Impact:** Convinced community members who did not believe in endangered species or turning in poachers that animal populations are declining.

**Project Limitations:** Lessons learned: It is easier to work with groups that have environmental experience.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Need to connect with the younger generations by incorporating youth into the program.
**Project Name:** Environmental Education Program Emphasizing Solid Waste Management and Disposal at Drake Bay, Costa Rica

**Organizations Involved:** Fundación Corcovado Lon Willing Ramsey Junior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: Drake Bay</th>
<th><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Infrastructure (waste), Environmental Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong> November 2004 – December 2010</td>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 6 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding Organizations:** TNC; Hotel Casa Corcovado Jungla Lodge; Hotel Aguila de Osa Inn

**Funding Goal:** Funding Received: $24,000

**Project Synopsis:** This project attempted to address waste management issues in Drake Bay. At the beginning of the initiative there was no waste collection system, which means that people had to burn or bury their waste. The poor waste disposal techniques had large negative environmental impacts.

**Methodology:** Fundación Corcovado built a recycling center of local high school, Tele Secundaria de Sierpe with funding from Empresa Casa Corcovado. The parents association manages the collection center, generating an income of $265 US/month for the school. High school students store and pack the recyclable material (cardboard, plastic, aluminum).

**Key Results and Outcomes:** This program has increased community awareness and knowledge of waste management and its effect on conservation. They built a recycling center, installed recycling containers in local stores and have since expanded into Agujitas, Los Planes, El Progreso and Los Ángeles (in 2007).

**Project Impact:** These efforts reduced waste generated by hotels and the general community. In 2006, the program collected 16,370 pounds of recyclable materials. In 2007, it collected 20 tons of waste. Also raised general community awareness and participation in waste management and conservation.

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Spread the waste management movement across the Osa – waste is a large issue across the peninsula because most cities lack management centers. Also, organizations need to work toward offering products that are more environmentally-friendly.
| **Project Name:** Extractive Reserves for Fallen Wood  
*part of the regional initiative: Sustainable Timber Harvesting in the Osa Peninsula Forests* | **Organizations Involved:** TUVA (Fundación Tierras Unidas Vecinales por el Ambiente) |
|---|---|
| **Location:** Osa Peninsula  
(various locations) | **Thematic Area:** Sustainable Development |
| **Time Period:** 1992-1999 | **Time Duration:** 7 years |
| **Funding Organizations:** Conservation and Research Foundation, GTZ, GTZ-GATE, National Audubon Society, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, PPD, Rockwood Leadership Program, Threshold Foundation, Turner Foundation, World Land Trust, USAID, HP Kendall Foundation, Further Foundation, Rosenthal Foundation, Fondo W-Chamberlin | **Funding Goal:**  
**Funding Received:** information not provided. |

**Project Synopsis:** Pilot project for natural forest management – sustainably harvesting fallen trees to create a sustainable business opportunities for locals as a means of supplementing their income. Another goal was to conserve the forest resources in the biological corridor between Cabo Matapalo and Corcovado National Park.

**Methodology:** Extraction and marketing of the wood was conducted by forest landowners and residents of project areas.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Established a business and market for sustainable wood products in the Osa. Created the Osa Fallen Timber Extractive Reserves (OF TER) to protect nearly 1,000 hectares of forest within Corcovado’s buffer-zones. Have sold more than 300 cubic meters of tropical hardwoods ($40,000 worth) without cutting a single tree – each producer received approximately $2,500 in income.

**Project Impact:** Some participants abandoned other economic activities in favor of fallen wood products, due to the lucrative nature of the project.

**Lessons Learned:** Need to have a legal framework to support management of forestry products (especially in protected areas); to get further support, need to conduct research that shows the low environmental impact of the activity. Additionally, there is a minimum management area needed in order to have sustainable production for this type of activity. The producers and landowners need to be organized and adequately trained in business management, quality control and other capacity building arenas.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Include sufficient training modules in allocation of resources, funding and time. Ensure government-backing prior to activity in protected areas. Essentially, include more forethought in the initial grand plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Field-based Analysis of Biochar for Agricultural Production and Climate Change and Nutrient Pollution Mitigation (Katoomba Indicator)</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> Forest Trends, International Biochar Initiative, Centro de Producción Nacional Más Limpia of Costa Rica, CATIE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Osa Peninsula (non-specific)</td>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong> 2008-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Agriculture, Economic Development</td>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong> Blue Moon Fund</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Received:</strong> Information not provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** Assess the use of biochar as a tool to combat climate change, boost agricultural productivity, reduce nutrient or pollution run-off, and generate income for biochar producers through direct sale and carbon payments. Also wants to help promote conservation of biodiversity. Biochar is the practice of using charred animal waste and wood (in this case Melina trees planted by Ston Forestal) to create “terra preta” (black earth) soil fertilizer. This project is testing the agricultural response of plants to different doses and types of biochar.

**Methodology:** Started as two separate grants from the Blue Moon Fund (for Sustainable Development and for Agricultural Production, Climate Change and Nutrient Pollution Mitigation).

**Key Results and Outcomes:** The goal is to create a business plan for on-going biochar production with the possibility of eventually purchasing carbon credits for terrestrial carbon sequestration through the use and creation of biochar. As of 2009, have created small test kilns and eventually selected the desired design. Designed agricultural research methodologies and selected trial sites to measure and monitor plant growth. Collected approximately 11 tons of forest and agricultural wastes to convert to biochar.

**Project Impact:** Has the potential to provide economic incentive for use of agricultural waste products, thereby reducing environmental pollution. Also may help solve the region’s issue of low agricultural yield due to poor soil quality.

**Project Limitations:** Currently in pilot stage. Needs to retain funding long enough to gather research data and make an economic case for biochar.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
**Project Name:** Jaguar Conservation Program, Osa Peninsula  
**Organizations Involved:** Universidad Nacional (UNA), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location: Corcovado National Park</th>
<th>Thematic Area: Terrestrial Conservation (mammals), Biodiversity</th>
<th>Time Period: 1994-2003</th>
<th>Time Duration: 9 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding Organization: CRUSA</td>
<td>Funding Goal: $45,000</td>
<td>Funding Received: $40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** Part of the Panthera project (led by the WCS) to determine the status of the jaguar population in Costa Rica. The goals of the project are to determine the conservation status of jaguars in different areas, determine the absolute and relative populations of the feline and the type of prey it consumes (specifically the white-lipped peccary).

**Methodology:** Camera placement (3 km apart) according to GPS systems, used to determine how many animals are being photographed and if camera trap units are working.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Increased the knowledge base about jaguars and their interactions with both white-lipped peccaries and sea turtles. Extensive hunting has diminished the population from 75-100 individuals to approximately 40. Peccary and sea turtles populations have also decreased dramatically over the duration of the study.

**Project Impact:** Results from this study are helping to establish improved and more complex management protocol for the protection of large feline species.

**Project Limitations:** Camera theft, limited support from Costa Rica (get more support from abroad), lack of preparation on the part of Costa Rican universities (need better training).

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Include locals and Costa Ricans from the get-go so you are not perceived as a foreigner imposing ideals onto the local community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong></th>
<th>Natural Resources Vigilance Committees in Southern Costa Rica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong></td>
<td>Consejo Indígena Regional del Pacífico Sur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>Osa Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong></td>
<td>Terrestrial Conservation, Capacity Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong></td>
<td>May 2003-May 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong></td>
<td>2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong></td>
<td>Programa de Pequenas Donaciones (PPD) – Fondo para el Medio Ambiente Mundial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Received:</strong></td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** Southern Pacific Regional Indigenous Council (Consejo Indígena Regional del Pacífico Sur) formed natural resources vigilance committees (COVIRENAS) in eight indigenous territories throughout Costa Rica. The committees were trained in environmental legislation so that they may file complaints against those violating protected area boundaries. An additional goal was to have the committees act as resolution tribunals for issues within/between indigenous groups.

**Methodology:** A representative of each COVIRENAS group came together for monthly meetings and progress reports. Financial reports were prepared quarterly for the donors and COVIRENAS members. In its final stage, the project was evaluated by 20 COVIRENAS representatives.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Have consolidated COVIRENAS groups. Also filed 50 complaints (illegal logging, fishing) across the region -- 45% of offenses were controlled. Constructed an office with basic equipment and library on indigenous rights and environmental conservation.

**Project Impact:** Increased vigilance for conservation of natural resources and biodiversity by empowering local actors, namely indigenous groups. The project strengthened the relationship within indigenous communities and facilitated their interaction with other organizations. Is thought to have reduced corruption because it increased community accountability.

**Project Limitations:** The project was slow to mature – it was a cultural adjustment for COVIRENAS participants to express their opinions and raise questions in public.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Use open discussions in an informal setting to encourage participant interaction and generate discussion. Maintain open communication with communities. Obtain aid from other organizations to deal with serious offenses – violent reactions endangered COVIRENAS members.
**Project Name:** Osa Conservation Dialogues  
**Organizations Involved:** Rainforest Alliance, INBio

| Location: Osa Peninsula (non-specific) | Thematic Area: Terrestrial Conservation | Time Period:  
Phase I: July 2003-December 2003  
Phase II: May 2009-May 2010 | Time Duration:  
Phase I: 5 months  
Phase II: 1 year  
Total: 1 year, 5 months (17 months) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Funding Organization:  
Phase I: CRUSA  
Phase II: MINAET, Iniciativa Paz con la Naturaleza | Funding Goal:  
| Funding Received:  
Phase I: $3,000 (Rainforest Alliance)  
Phase II: $36,864 (Iniciativa Paz con la Naturaleza)  
Total: $39,864 |

**Project Synopsis:** Phase I: Workshop to learn about the types of projects that are currently underway in the region, what the needs of local organizations and groups are.  
Phase II: To do an intercambio specifically in regards to development and tourism in coastal regions. This was a continuation on the national mandate to discuss matters in the Osa.

**Methodology:** Workshop and discussion section between participants and speakers. Coordinated with the Technical Coalition for the Support of the Osa Biological Corridor to determine the workshop topics and logistics. The topics included ecotourism, land tenure and forestry management/PES. Held the project in the Osa Peninsula, rather than San Jose.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Brought together 49 representatives of different conservation organizations, local organizations and governmental institutions from around the nation to participate and listen to each others’ points of view. Published the main ideas that came out of the Dialogues online so all members of the conservation community could have access.

**Project Impact:** Increased communication between individuals and organizations working in the Osa. Also increased transparency in regards to the projects that are being conducted in the region. The goal of Phase II was to start creating solutions to present issues of unsustainable development.

**Project Limitations:** The people of the Osa are highly opinionated, and so it is hard to get them all to listen to each other. Technology issues (computers failing, etc) slowed down the presentations. It was hard to nail down a list of participants – everyone responded at the very last minute. No action plan was created (not necessary, but helps future progress if one exists and is followed-up on).

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Need to have people from the Osa/working in the Osa on the project – it is difficult to work in a region in which no member of the organization is directly involved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Osa Sea Turtle Study (OSTS)</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> TUVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location:</strong> Rio Oro Community</th>
<th><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Marine Conservation, Environmental Education</th>
<th><strong>Time Period:</strong> 1993 – present(?)</th>
<th><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 18 years (at least)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Funding Organization:</strong> Ministry of Education (small fund), Rio Oro community members</th>
<th><strong>Funding Goal:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Funding Received:</strong> Information not provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** Worked with the community of Rio Oro to monitor turtle populations that use their beaches for nesting purposes. The Ministry of Education endorsed the project and gave a small grant to encourage environmental education for small children.

**Methodology:** Followed the Ostional and Gandoca-Manzanillo project management strategies.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Utilized local knowledge of turtle nesting behavior and population dynamics to launch a formal study of the 4 species of turtle that use Rio Oro beaches. Organized the community around a common cause and increased environmental education and conservation awareness.

**Project Impact:** In 1995, this community initiative became the Association of Conservation and Development of Rio Oro (ADECORO), which received financial support from the Spanish Cooperation Agency (SECIPI), Friends of the Earth, the Chelonia Institute, etc.

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** This program worked because the community wanted to refute the negative stereotype that locals destroy sea turtle populations – it is important to improve the region’s sense of community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Planning Grant for Water Quality Analysis of the Sierpe Wetlands System</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> Stroud Water Research Center, Inc.; Rainforest Alliance; Sustainable Agriculture Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Sierpe Wetlands</td>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong> Blue Moon Fund</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong> Information not provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** This project works to support the rapid assessment of water and habitat quality of streams and rivers in the Sierpe watershed that represents the full array of current land use. Studying the effect of agriculture (especially pesticide contamination and runoff) on the surrounding watershed.

**Methodology:** Because contaminant levels in drinking water supplies will likely be too low to detect using standard techniques, researchers will collect fish and invertebrates and measure contaminant content in their fat stores (analysis of bioaccumulation). Will compare local and regional threats by examining sedentary species and mobile species alike. Testing will run for the next year and specimen collections will be taken once in the fall and once in the summer (to compare the results from the wet and dry seasons).

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Established a set of baseline data on human land-use impacts. Also set conservation targets and guidelines. Designed a monitoring plan to provide baseline of human-induced impacts and set conservation targets.

**Project Impact:** Looking into the feasibility of conducting a multi-year mentoring program to establish relationships with local individuals and organizations. Also hoping to help create a watershed management plan for the region. Received a second grant in June of 2011 to continue research (see press release).

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Preventing Hunting in the Corcovado National Park and the Golfo Dulce Forestry Reserve</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> Asociación de Funcionarios del Área de Conservación Osa (AFACOSA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> ACOSA (Corcovado NP and Golfo Dulce Forestry Reserve)</td>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Terrestrial Conservation, Environmental Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong> July 2004-April 2006</td>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 1 year, 8 months (20 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong> MINAET; PPD; SINAC</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong> <strong>Funding Received:</strong> $20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** AFACOSA worked with 24 communities located within the buffer zone of Corcovado NP and Golfo Dulce Forestry Reserve to promote awareness of the need for conservation. Special focus on limiting the practice of hunting jaguar and peccary.

**Methodology:** Conducted talks and school visits, held workshops and developed educational materials to spread their message. Also worked with churches in the region. Provided follow-up to project activities; all documents and photos were put into the archives. Held meetings with staff to discuss the progress of project activities and subsequently write reports.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Decreased the prevalence of hunting in Corcovado National Park.

**Project Impact:** Included communities in finding solutions to reduce hunting. Promoted conservation-mindedness and an interest in protecting biodiversity through environmental education.

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Define the level of commitment from all institutions before defining a target area for the project – it can be hard to shift staff and funding to other regions after the project has started. Focus the project on a few communities that will embrace the project and experience more visible results.
### Project Name:
Program to Strengthen Natural Resource Watch Committees

### Organizations Involved:
Fundación Corcovado Long Willing Ramsey Junior

### Location:
Corcovado and Piedras Blancas NP

### Thematic Area:
Capacity building, Terrestrial Conservation

### Time Period:
2003-December 2004

### Time Duration:
2 years, 11 months (35 months)

### Funding Organization:
CRUSA, Programa de Pequenas Donaciones (PPD) – Fondo para el Medio Ambiente Mundial

### Funding Goal:

### Funding Received:
$42,000

### Project Synopsis:
Formed and strengthened 6 COVIRENAS (groups of 6 adults interested in conservation and stewardship of natural resources, morally reliable, respected in community). Acquired the technical support needed to protect the OBC and integrate COVIRENAS into ACOSA conservation activities. Taught and trained community members about conservation concepts so they could pass the information along to their communities.

### Methodology:
Committees held meetings and facilitators submitted their notes to Fundación Corcovado to check on the groups’ progress.

### Key Results and Outcomes:
Committees had more than 55 adults from different communities. Provided food, transport, training, and the communication equipment necessary for protection work. Identified illegal activities in the protected areas and created ASCOCOVIRENAS (non-profit, umbrella organization for COVIRENAS in the region)

### Project Impact:
Strengthened the capacity of local groups, grassroots organizations. Also strengthened their relationship with MINAE. Local members learned how to begin new projects, implement new ideas.

### Project Limitations:
Members of ASCOCOVIRENAS had differing opinions, which in some cases created schisms between members.

### Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:
Need community involvement to enhance socioeconomic growth, natural resource conservation. Also need a common goal to ensure long-term survival of the organization. Volunteers must be provided with necessary equipment and technical training in order to be successful.
**Project Name:** RESECOP (Piro Community Ecological Reserve)  
**Organizations Involved:** TUVA

|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Organization: Membership fees from being a part of RESECOP</th>
<th>Funding Goal:</th>
<th>Funding Received: $1,3000/month (membership fees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** Community-based, integrated conservation and development program in the Piro River region. The goal is to develop a model for buffer-zone ecosystem management. This project is based on the information from the VERDEA Project.

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Bought a traditional sugar mill (trapiche) from Miguel Sanchez with the intent to begin a community-based sustainable sugar operation on Sr. Sanchez’s farm. Sr. Sanchez also provides housing for farmers interested in being a part of the agroforestry experiment – they are growing new crops such as vanilla, pejibaye, raicilla, etc.

**Project Impact:** Encouraging community support and entrepreneurial spirit. Also diversifying crops in a sustainable fashion to increase income to rural farmers.

**Project Limitations:** Because of economic pressure, farmers are hesitant to try new crops or change agricultural practices as they might destabilize yield patterns.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong></th>
<th>Responsible Oil Palm Production Practices</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong></th>
<th>Rainforest Alliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
<td>ACOSA</td>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong></td>
<td>2008-?</td>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong></td>
<td>Information not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong></td>
<td>Blue Moon Fund</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong></td>
<td>Funding Received:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$74,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$148,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total: $222,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** To support responsible African oil palm production practices. Rainforest Alliance was working with the Sustainable Agriculture Network to establish a certification system for oil palm based on SAN's cattle and agriculture standards.

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:**

*The organization, Compania Industrial Aceitera Coto Cincuenta y Cuatro Sociedad Anonima applied to be certified as a part of the Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil (RSPO) in 2010. Not sure if this is a byproduct of the same initiative. (http://www.rspo.org/?q=om/1716)*

**Project Impact:**

**Project Limitations:** Lacking information about the project. It is therefore difficult to determine the level of success this initiative has achieved.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Rural Energy and Communications Program and “Solar-for-Nature” Initiative (component)</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> TUVA, US National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association (NRECA), Instituto Costarricense de Electricidad (ICE), Fundación AMBIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Rio Piro Community</td>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong> 1991 - 1998</td>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong> Private individuals, Turner Foundation</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong> $125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Received:</strong> $20,000 (Turner Foundation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** Program provided energy for illumination and radiotelephones using PV solar systems on Piro community homes. Started after a TUVA-created pilot project validated the feasibility of using solar technology as an energy source.

**Methodology:** Started with pilot project and small-scale installations (by 1997 had installed 8 domestic systems). Held workshop in 1993 on solar energy in the Osa with 12 national, US and Central American solar energy organizations. Received funding in 1996 from the Turner Foundation to continue installations. Looked to install 15 additional systems by 1997.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Solar-for-Nature, a smaller subcomponent, intended to subsidize rural electrification in exchange for conserving forest tracts in the ecological corridor. Goal is to install 50 PV systems across the Osa – have currently installed 8 domestic systems in the Piro Valley and Osa Guaymi Indigenous Reserve. Starting in 1995, the program extended beyond Piro Valley into the Indigenous reserve.

**Project Impact:** Saved community members travel time, allowed for easier dissemination of information. Also reduces pressure on the forest to provide all resources for local residents.

Hope to protect up to 2,000 acres of primary rainforest through the Solar-for-Nature initiative.

**Project Limitations:** No recent reports to suggest whether or not the goal of 50 houses was met.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
**Project Name:** Sea Turtle Conservation Program on the Osa Peninsula, Costa Rica

**Organizations Involved:** Wider Caribbean Sea Turtle Conservation Network (WIDECAST)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Location:</strong> Puerto Jiménez, Tigre, Sándalos, Blancalas (beaches)</th>
<th><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Marine Conservation</th>
<th><strong>Time Period:</strong> January 2010-present</th>
<th><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 1 year, 7 months (permanent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Funding Organization:** TNC, El Tigre Fund, La Leona Ecolodge, Lapa Rios, El Remanso Lodge, Junta de la Escuela de Río Oro, Bosque del Cabo Lodge, Terrapin Lodge

**Funding Goal:** Funding Received: Information not provided

**Project Synopsis:** This project aims to protect, monitor and provide environmental education about sea turtle nesting. The species included in this study are the olive ridley, Pacific green turtle, leatherback and hawksbill turtles.

**Methodology:** Activities are developed between January and December when biologists, local assistants, national/international volunteers work on offshore research studies to better understand species’ population dynamics. Methods for research include tagging, collecting data, patrolling beaches during nesting season with MINAE authorities.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Protects beaches (30% of nests are protected each season), gave lessons to high school students in Puerto Jiménez and Golfito about sea turtle biology and ecology. Developed a volunteer program to support the project.

**Project Impact:** Trains and educates local stakeholders in sea turtle management and conservation. Reduces nest predation by humans and domesticated animals. Produces scientific data about sea turtles that nest in the included beaches.

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Standardize methodology to replicate successful initiatives in other locations. Need a consistent, responsible and trustworthy volunteer base in order to be sustainable. Conservation projects need to have an environmental education component to raise awareness in the greater community. Meeting project goals is easier if you develop alliances with other organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Selva Nueva</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> Permaculture Research Institute (Australia)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Osa Peninsula</td>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Agriculture, Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong> 2005-2008</td>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** Created a model farm system based on integrated land management to increase sustainability and stability in rural communities of Costa Rica. The primary focus of this project was agriculture – including the generation of a seed bank, marketing surplus harvest and establishing new agroforestry technologies.

**Methodology:** Detailed methodology, including future plans for the farm, can be found in the project report (See Mendeley).

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Created a regional seed bank. Installed new water system on the farm, which can irrigate up to 10 acres through drip technology. Also created nurseries in which to grow perennial foods, plants and medicines as well as experiment with crop technologies. Looking to use bamboo and reforestation as long-term solutions to sustainable building and conservation practices.

**Project Impact:** Unclear if there are any.

**Project Limitations:** Built one farm (without disclosing location), which likely employs no local farmers. Lacking information to judge the success and impacts of the project.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:** Does not seem to involve the local community at all –seems like this farm is imposing ideals onto the community. Lack of integration means that the community is less likely to utilize agricultural techniques that are being practiced here.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Support for the Ngabe Indigenous Community</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> Amazon Conservation Team, TUVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Ngabe Indigenous Community</td>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Capacity building, Youth Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong> 1997-2004</td>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organizations:</strong> Biomass Users Network, Ford Motor Company, CRUSA, Países Bajos/the Netherlands government, Programa de Pequenas Donaciones (PPD) – Fondo para el Medio Ambiente Mundial</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong> Information not provided</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** (This project is TUVA’s main focus)

The project taught nature, health, culture and institutional strengthening in an effort to build capacity and self-sufficiency for youth and local leaders of the Ngabe indigenous population. The eventual goal was to promote initiatives for self-sufficient development.

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Goals: support the collection of cultural history, strengthen legal capability to defend territory and own rights, encourage use of sustainable forestry and alternative energy.

**Project Impact:** Strengthened the organization for the Ngabe Jiron Day group; trained locals in traditional handicrafts and traditional medicine; published several books/pamphlets about tribal history and legal institutions; looked into improving water quality and solar energy systems.

**Project Limitations:** Need to not create a permanent dependency and instead inspire self-sufficiency.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Sustainable Development Opportunities in the Osa Conservation Area (ECOTICOS Project)</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> Earth Economics (University of Vermont Gund Institute for Ecological Economics), ECOTICOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Térraba-Sierpe Wetlands</td>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Terrestrial Conservation, Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong> 2008-2010</td>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong> 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong> Blue Moon Fund</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong> <strong>Funding Received:</strong> $82,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** This project supported the integration of technical, institutional and conceptual solutions to promote the sustainable development of the Terraba-Sierpe mangrove of Costa Rica. Evaluated the value of ecosystem goods and services present at the Térraba-Sierpe National Wetlands (HNTS) to help visualize the value of the region’s natural capital to improve conservation and development efforts.

**Methodology:** Used GIS data provided by PRIAS-CENAT (San José-based NGO) to determine vegetation types in order to derive value estimates for the wetlands. Included a discount rate in all calculations. Hosted a 3-day workshop in October 2009 during which Sierpe residents identified the region’s natural goods and services.

To read the ECOTICOS methodology: [http://issuu.com/fundacionneotropica/docs/ecoticos_case_study](http://issuu.com/fundacionneotropica/docs/ecoticos_case_study)

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Determined that the Térraba-Sierpe ecosystem services are worth between $302 million and $1.9 billion, annually.

**Project Impact:** By 2008, had helped create the Térraba-Sierpe National Wetlands Management Plan with stakeholders in the Térraba-Sierpe community. Are encouraging the use of ecosystem valuation to ensure appropriate management of the wetlands.

**Project Limitations:** Not all ecosystems of the region have been well studied or valued – the given economic values may be an underestimation. Did not map or model the region’s ecosystem services to show how ESV may change over time with different management plans. This study only provided a snapshot of Térraba-Sierpe’s current value – ecosystem value assessments need to be dynamic in order to be realistic. In addition, the value estimates are not necessarily based on sustainable use levels. As of the date of publication of the project report, MINAET had not inserted ESV into management or development plans for the region.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name: Sustainable Production Alternatives and Participatory Environmental Management of the Mangroves, Coastal, and Marine Areas of Golfo Dulce, Costa Rica</th>
<th>Organizations Involved: Asociación de Piangueros de Purruja (APIAPU)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location: Golfito, Golfo Dulce</td>
<td>Thematic Area: Marine Conservation, Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Period: May 2005-March 2007</td>
<td>Time Duration: 1 year, 10 months (22 months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Organizations: PPD – Fondo para el Medio Ambiente Mundial; Asociación de Comités de Vigilancia de los Recursos Naturales (AsoCOVIRENAS)</td>
<td>Funding Goal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Received: $20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Synopsis: APIAPU established a stock center for the processing and trade in fishery products under existing regulations for low income families from the community of Purruja. Also promoted participatory environmental management of the mangroves through the creation of a COVIRENA committee to work in surrounding protected areas. The objectives of the project were to create equitable and sustained income growth for piangua clam-harvesting families through improved production activities and ecotourism, and to facilitate community environmental management of the mangrove ecosystem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology: Underwent weekly project evaluation sessions, aided by the APIAPU board of directors. Also held workshops to document progress and undergo training sessions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Results and Outcomes: Created a local COVIRENA group; conserved the mangroves of Purruja; offered training sessions on fishery resource management, clam processing, food handling and mangrove conservation. Also created a stock center that is in compliance with sanitary regulations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Impact: Raised awareness about sustainable piangua clam extraction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Limitations: Lack of unification among the group members. Lack of prior knowledge of business management protocol and strategy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report: Request more training in resource administration from the donor. Work responsibly on fund management with the group. Analyze the group’s capacity for project management and administration prior to starting a project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Project Name: Sustainable Timber Harvesting in the Osa Peninsula Forests (regional program) | Organizations Involved: TUVA |
|------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|


**Funding Goal:** Funding Received: Information not provided

**Project Synopsis:** Pilot project for natural forest management – sustainably harvesting fallen trees. Also implemented solar electrification project as an incentive for sustainable forest management in the Ngabe Indigenous Territory, Alto Laguna. Finally, obtained certification for the sustainable management of timber resources in Piro and Alto Laguna Guaymi de Osa.

**Methodology:** Set by professional, applied to each unit of managed forest.

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Were able to achieve certification by the SmartWood Program (Rainforest Alliance); developed Project of Fallen Timber Extractive Reserves in Piro and in Alto Laguna; Solar electrification in homes of the indigenous territory of Alto Laguna

**Project Impact:** Generated another source of income for locals; access to electricity for a set of communities; improvements in fallen timber extraction techniques

**Project Limitations:** Lack of demand for sustainably harvested/managed forest products, need more government support.

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong> Testing appropriate technologies for wetlands remediation using stakeholder approach in southern Costa Rica</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong> Asociacion Centroamericana para la Economia, la Salud y el Ambiente (ACEPESA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong> Terraba-Sierpe Wetlands</td>
<td><strong>Thematic Area:</strong> Environmental Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Period:</strong> March 30, 2009</td>
<td><strong>Time Duration:</strong> Information not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Organization:</strong> Blue Moon Fund</td>
<td><strong>Funding Goal:</strong> Information not provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding Received:</strong> Information not provided</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:** Use local stakeholders, institutions and organizations to identify and stop wetland contamination. Construct a bio-garden to promote environmental education and the importance of mangrove ecosystems. (http://www.acepesa.org/)

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:**

**Project Impact:**

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
**Project Name:** VERDEA Project (Valorization and Conservation of Tropical Rain Forest Plant Resources)

**Organizations Involved:** TUVA, Agronomy School of the University of Madrid, Anthropology Department of the Natural Museum of Costa Rica

**Location:** Rio Piro Community, Alto Laguna

**Thematic Area:** Agriculture, Sustainable Development

**Time Period:** 1990-1998

**Time Duration:** 8 years

**Funding Organization:** GEO (Germany), Office for Indigenous Affairs (Spain)

**Funding Goal:**

- Funding Received: $25,000 (GEO)
- $15,000 (Office for Indigenous Affairs, Spain)
- Total: $40,000

**Project Synopsis:** Applied research project to identify and recover indigenous agroecological systems, characterize strategies for in-situ conservation and apply a management scheme for vegetation resources. The end goal was to identify, validate and upgrade the existing Guaymí and Chiricano resource management strategies through small pilot projects.

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:** Experimented with multiple-use milpas (corn-bean-rice initiated fields) by integrating vanilla and pejibaye palm into the farm plans. Created the Community Agroforestry Program (CAP) to subsidize traditional practices for successful management of successional agroecosystems and secondary forests. *(See CAP Project)*. Set up the Verdea Community Fund to disperse grant money.

**Project Impact:**

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Name:</strong></th>
<th>Youth Entrepreneurial Leadership</th>
<th><strong>Organizations Involved:</strong></th>
<th>ASEDER (Asociación de Emprendedores para el Desarrollo Responsable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Location:**    | Osa Peninsula (non-specific)    | **Time Period:**            | Phase I: June 2002-Nov 2004  
Phase II: Jan 2006 – May 2007 |
| **Thematic Area:** | Capacity Building, Economic  
Development               | **Time Duration:**      | Phase I: 2 years, 5 months (29 months)  
Phase II: 1 year, 4 months (16 months)  
Total: 3 years, 9 months (45 months) |
<p>| <strong>Funding Organizations:</strong> | Avina Group, Inc; TNC       | <strong>Funding Goal:</strong>            | Funding Received: $90,000 |
| <strong>Project Synopsis:</strong> | Encouraged youth entrepreneurial leadership in the Osa Peninsula by training rural youth in sustainable production activities and determining the environmental, social and economic benefits of said activities. Helped to develop small ranching, farming and service businesses. |
| <strong>Methodology:</strong> | Based on principles of Pedagogical Meditation developed by Gutiérrez and Prieto of the Instituto de Investigaciones and Mejoramiento Educativo. Also implemented an apprenticeship program that provided hands-on experience and allowed generation of participants’ ideas, values and aptitudes. |
| <strong>Key Results and Outcomes:</strong> | Trained 40 youth (20 men, 20 women) in entrepreneurial skills, designed flyers for each member community, developed an environmental education program with Intel for 6 regional schools, helped 17 youth establish small legal businesses. |
| <strong>Project Impact:</strong> | Established collaborative networks between organizations, companies and individuals at regional, national and international levels. Also improved participant self-esteem, business capabilities (negotiation, research, managing, accounting, marketing, etc). |
| <strong>Project Limitations:</strong> | Some participants lacked the motivation and/or drive to complete a reasonable and successful business plan. |
| <strong>Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:</strong> | They suggest developing capacity and skills using physical, spiritual, mental and social/emotional means. Training should also be relevant to participants and help enforce collaboration. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>Organizations Involved:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Thematic Area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Period:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Duration:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Organization:</td>
<td>Funding Goal:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funding Received:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Synopsis:**

**Methodology:**

**Key Results and Outcomes:**

**Project Impact:**

**Project Limitations:**

**Suggestions for Improvement from Final Project Report:**
**Ugalde 2005.**

**Appendix Two: Inversiones internacionales realizadas en ACOSA 1995-2005**

*From Núñez, Borge and Herrera 2007*

### A. Proyectos con influencia al nivel de ACOSA (general)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Localización</th>
<th>Proyecto</th>
<th>Período de Ejecución</th>
<th>Ejecutor</th>
<th>Monto de inversión US$</th>
<th>Fuente Financiamiento</th>
<th>Temática</th>
<th>Categorización por grupos temática</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACOSA</td>
<td>Colección de datos ecológicos y mapas de distribución de ecosistemas para cinco Areas de Conservación (ECOMAPAS)</td>
<td>1998-2005</td>
<td>INBIO, SINAC</td>
<td>100000 *proporción financiera para ACOSA se calcula en 20000</td>
<td>Gobierno Holandés</td>
<td>Conservación y manejo de hábitat</td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apoyo a la gestión del director de Área de Conservación Osa</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>Fundación Corcovado</td>
<td>149127</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>Apoyo financiero a la campaña de conservación PN Corcovado y PN Piedras Blancas</td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Fortalecimiento ACOSA-Campaña de Osa</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,680,000</td>
<td>Campaña de Osa</td>
<td></td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Depósito Capacitación ACOSA</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,866,036.94</td>
<td>TNC</td>
<td></td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Apoyo a MINAE</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>881,698.20</td>
<td>Donaciones de Horizontes, Pienneman y venta de CDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Apoyo al Programa de Control y Protección</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,202,920.29</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Apoyo al pago de guardaparques para Golfito</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>ACOSA</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>Refugio VS Golfito</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apoyo al pago de guardaparques</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>ACOSA</td>
<td>4,562,700</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pago de salarios de 67 personeros de MINAE</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>ACOSA</td>
<td>283,315,064</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pago de Salario de una Educadora Ambiental ACOSA</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>ACOSA</td>
<td>5,192,000.00</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pago de publicidad para apoyo al programa del Agüila Arpia</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>402,974.20</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortalecimiento institucional</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Fundación Corcovado, MINAE</td>
<td>19965</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instalación de biodigestores en la zona sur</td>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>Fundación para el desarrollo de las comunidades del sur</td>
<td>25000</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferencia de conocimiento a la sociedad</td>
<td>7 AÑOS</td>
<td>SINAC, ACOSA, INBIO</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacia un INBIO sostenible, 2 fase.</td>
<td>2.5 AÑOS</td>
<td>SINAC, ACOSA, INBIO</td>
<td>1800000</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situación de industria primaria y secundaria</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Pro-Osa, GTZ</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortalecimiento de concertación y planificación</td>
<td>2002-2004</td>
<td>Pro-Osa, MINAE, ARRUKÓ</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservación de la biodiversidad y desarrollo ACOSA-ACLAP</td>
<td>1993-98</td>
<td>MINAE, SINAC, ACOSA, ACLAP</td>
<td>8000000</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 50% para ACOSA</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400000</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proyecto</td>
<td>Descripción</td>
<td>Año</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Ocupación/Participantes</td>
<td>Financiadores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantón Corredores</td>
<td>Plan de desarrollo municipal</td>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>Pro-Osa, MINAE</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantón Golfito</td>
<td>Plan de desarrollo municipal</td>
<td>2004-2009</td>
<td>Pro-Osa, MINAE</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantón Osa</td>
<td>Análisis económico financiero de fincas integrales</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Pro-Osa, SINAC</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Estrategias y acciones para desarrollo local</td>
<td>2003-2007</td>
<td>Pro-Osa, MINAE</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Palma</td>
<td>Protección de la cuenca Quebrada Blanca</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>Asociación Cultural Ngöbegue</td>
<td>14380</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Palma</td>
<td>Mejoramiento del salón multiusos</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Asociación del Desarrollo Integral de La Palma</td>
<td>1,296,589</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Ángeles de Osa</td>
<td>Fortalecimiento de las actividades productivas alternativas que integren la visión ambiental de desarrollo de la asociación femenina de La Palma, Pto Jiménez</td>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>Asociación Femenina de La Palma</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Ángeles de Osa</td>
<td>Mejoramiento de unidades productivas mediante el uso de tecnologías limpias</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>Fundación Neotrópica</td>
<td>7900</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmar Sur</td>
<td>Plan estratégico de desarrollo SURCOOP</td>
<td>2004-2010</td>
<td>Pro-Osa, MINAE</td>
<td>5756</td>
<td>GTZ, CNP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmar Sur</td>
<td>Fortalecimiento y consolidación de la labor</td>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>Consejo regional de la zona sur</td>
<td>17765</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notas:
- **GTZ**: GTZ (Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit)
- **FI**: Fondo Internacional
- **PNUD**: Programa de Desarrollo de las Naciones Unidas
- **CNP**: Corporación Nacional del演艺
- **PR**: Programa Regional
- **PD**: Programa de Desarrollo
- **ASN**: Asociación Nacional
- **FRA**: Fondo de Fomento para la Región
- **CNP**: Corporación Nacional del演艺
- **PNUD**: Programa de Desarrollo de las Naciones Unidas
- **CRUSA**: Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo
- **MINAE**: Ministerio de Agricultura y Desarrollo Rural
- **ASAN**: Asociación Nacional
- **CNP**: Corporación Nacional del演艺
- **PNUD**: Programa de Desarrollo de las Naciones Unidas
- **CRUSA**: Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actividad</th>
<th>Año</th>
<th>Organización</th>
<th>Monto</th>
<th>Organización de financiamiento</th>
<th>Tipo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apoyo al Programa de Control y Protección</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>ACOSA</td>
<td>25,437,667.70</td>
<td>Fondo para Ecosistemas Críticos</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortalecimiento del movimiento COVIRENA en la zona sur</td>
<td>2004-06</td>
<td>Asociación de COVIRENA en la zona sur</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Fortalecimiento institucional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## B. Proyectos con influencia al nivel de PENINSULA DE OSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Localización</th>
<th>Proyecto</th>
<th>Periodo de Ejecución</th>
<th>Ejecutor</th>
<th>Monto de inversión US$</th>
<th>Monto de inversión colones</th>
<th>Fuente Financiamiento</th>
<th>Temática</th>
<th>Categorización / grupo temática</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Península de Osa</strong></td>
<td>Aprovechamiento forestal sostenible</td>
<td>1992-1999</td>
<td>TUVA</td>
<td>200000</td>
<td>*800000</td>
<td>GTZ, PNUD, USAID y otros</td>
<td>Certificación orgánica y eco-etiquetas Silvicultura Micro-empresas Conservación en comunidades de base</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecomercados</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>FONAFIFO</td>
<td>80000000</td>
<td>8000000</td>
<td>Gobierno de Costa Rica, BIRF, GEF</td>
<td>Pago por servicios ambientales</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papel del desarrollo local en el manejo de un ASP; un caso de estudio comparativo de ecoturismo en CR</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cornell University, NSF</td>
<td>Conservación en comunidades de base Ecoturismo Parques y ASP</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proyecto Boscosa</td>
<td>1988-1996</td>
<td>Fundación Neotrópica</td>
<td>7000000</td>
<td>Mas de 20 donantes - Principal WWF con $3 millones</td>
<td></td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sistematización de experiencias proyecto Boscosa</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Fundación Neotrópica</td>
<td>2162</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Fortalecimiento institucional</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turismo rural comunitario en los Planes de Drake</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>Asociación conservacionista Tesoro Verde</td>
<td>20317</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Ecoturismo</td>
<td>Mejorar infraestructura</td>
<td>ECO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jardín Botánico y Albergue Ecológico Los Planes</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>APREFLOFAS</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Planificación de proyectos</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Reserva Biosfera</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,011,960</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td></td>
<td>FIs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Salario de un Educador Ambiental - Nectandra</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,930,050</td>
<td>Nectandra</td>
<td></td>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Construcción del Centro</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,635,600</td>
<td>Horizontes</td>
<td></td>
<td>FIs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operativo de Los Planes</td>
<td>Promotor Local para Matapalo</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>ACOSA</td>
<td>4,032,500</td>
<td>Amigos de la Osa</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Donación hecha por Japón para la compra de seis cuadracícllos para el Minae Golfito $38400.00</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>ACOSA</td>
<td>38400</td>
<td>Embajada de Japón</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Liderazgo juvenil</td>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>Fundación Neotrópica</td>
<td>58000</td>
<td>AVINA, S.C Johnson</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Grupo Los Juvenil Jaguares</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>9,388,668.45</td>
<td>Avina</td>
<td>Comunicación Ecoturismo Pago por servicios ambientales Tenencia de tierras</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Diálogos de conservación</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Rainforest Alliance</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Diálogos de conservación Corredor Mesoamericano</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Rainforest Alliance</td>
<td>18000</td>
<td>Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Educación ambiental para la conservación de especies insignias</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>MINAE</td>
<td>UNED</td>
<td>22500</td>
<td>Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, WWF</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Programa de fortalecimiento de comités de vigilancia de los recursos naturales (COVIRENAS) en Península de Osa</td>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>Fundación Corcovado</td>
<td>42000</td>
<td>CRUSA, PNUD</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN Piedras Blancas, Refugio de vida silvestre Golfito</td>
<td>Desarrollo comunal Sostenible en la zona de amortiguamiento del PN Piedras Blancas</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Fundación Neotrópica</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td>Cooperación Austriaca</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

hábitat Valoración y reducción de amenazas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proyecto</th>
<th>Periodo de Ejecución</th>
<th>Ejecutor</th>
<th>Monto de inversión US$</th>
<th>Monto de inversión colones</th>
<th>Fuente Financiamiento</th>
<th>Temática</th>
<th>Categorización / grupo temática</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Propuesta para la recuperación y control de los territorios de los indígenas Guaymí</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Amazon Conservation Team</td>
<td>13600000</td>
<td></td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>Indígenas</td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integridad territorial de la RI Guaymí de Alto Laguna de Osa</td>
<td>2000-05</td>
<td>FUNDECHO</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td></td>
<td>PNUD/Fondos Británicos</td>
<td>Conservación biodiversidad</td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proyecto eco turístico comunal basado en la organización comunitaria en la RI Guaymí de Osa</td>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>Asociación de Desarrollo Sostenible Guaymí</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td></td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Indígenas Ecoturismo</td>
<td>ECO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proyecto eco turístico comunal</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Asociación de Desarrollo Guaymí</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Ecoturismo Fortalecimiento</td>
<td>ECO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracción de Madera Caída en la RI Guaimí de Osa</td>
<td>1997-1999</td>
<td>TUVA</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td></td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Silvicultura Habitats,</td>
<td>PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viabilidad y plan de mercadeo para la artesanía Guaymí</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>TUVA</td>
<td>2235500</td>
<td></td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>Indígenas Producción y comercialización artesanías</td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescate de plantas medicinales</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>ASODERGUAY</td>
<td>2962500</td>
<td></td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>Plantas medicinales Indígenas</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortalecimiento organizativo</td>
<td>Año</td>
<td>Entidad</td>
<td>Año</td>
<td>Entidad</td>
<td>Fortalecimiento institucional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestión local para control y conservación del medio ambiente y banco de semillas para el rescate de la agricultura tradicional de los pueblos Ngöbe</td>
<td>1997-2004</td>
<td>TUVA</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
<td>TUVA</td>
<td>1999-2001</td>
<td>TUVA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programa de recuperación de la medicina tradicional en el Pueblo Ngöbe-Bugle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortalecimiento de las mujeres indígenas de Yimba Caj (Rey Curré)</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>Asociación de mujeres indígenas con espíritu de lucha de Rey Yimba Caj</td>
<td>18022</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Indígenas Organización de Comunidades Capacidades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turismo rural integrado</td>
<td>1994-1995</td>
<td>ACEDCOD</td>
<td>17935</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Ecoturismo Fortalecimiento institucional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planificación, capacitación y educación ambiental</td>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>ORGUT, RNT</td>
<td>250000</td>
<td>ASDI</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adquisición, distribución y facilitación de tela y artículos de pasamanería para confección de vestimentas y artesanías tradicional a</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Asociación de desarrollo integral (ADI) Guaymi de Conte Burica</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>Fondos suizos</td>
<td>Conservación</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indígenas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| mujeres indígenas Guaymíes de Conte Burica | 1997-1999 | ADI Conte Burica | 20000 | PNUD | Conservación y manejo de RN  
Conservación de comunidades de base | PD |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Conservación de 500 Ha. de bosque | 2000-01 | ADI Conte Burica | 12000 | PNUD | Conservación y manejo de RN  
Conservación de comunidades de base | PD |
| Establecimiento de un Fondo Rotatorio para Conservación de 600 ha de bosque adicionales en la RI Guaymi Conte Burica (incentivos estatales para conservación bosque) | 1998-99 | ADI Conte Burica | 50000 | PNUD/fondos Británicos | Pago por Servicios Ambientales  
Conservación y manejo de RN  
Conservación de comunidades de base | PD |
D. Proyectos con influencia al nivel de RECURSOS MARINO COSTEROS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Período de Ejecución</th>
<th>Ejecutor</th>
<th>Monto de inversión USD</th>
<th>Monto de inversión colones</th>
<th>Fuente Financiamiento</th>
<th>Temática</th>
<th>Categorización / grupo temática</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>Asociación de Damas Artesanas de Bahía</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td></td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Recuperación ambiental Ecosistemas marinos</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>ASOPARQUE</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td></td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Protección y conservación de biodiversidad Educación ambiental Conservación de comunidades de base</td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-03</td>
<td>ASOPARQUE MINAE</td>
<td>70000</td>
<td></td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Parques y ASP, conservación y manejo de hábitat, conservación en comunidades de base, recursos costeros</td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-</td>
<td>TUVA</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td></td>
<td>AECI, Amigos de la Tierra, Université de la Rocherie, Further Foundation</td>
<td>Recursos costeros Manglares Mares y océanos Vida silvestre Manejo</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2006</td>
<td>Fundación KETO UNA</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td></td>
<td>CONCIT PROJECT AWARE FOUNDATION Rufford Foundation</td>
<td>Mamíferos Especies Migratorias Mares, océanos Vida silvestre Investigación</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-02</td>
<td>Fundación PROMAR, UNA, UCR, Universidad Amsterdam</td>
<td>148000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ford Motor Co. Billon Production Barcos de “Investigaciones de Quest”</td>
<td>Investigación vida silvestre Contaminación de agua Mamíferos Pesticidas y agroquímicos</td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2005</td>
<td>ASOMANGLE</td>
<td>16282</td>
<td></td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Fortalecimiento institucional Manejo de RN Mejoramiento de condiciones</td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Año</td>
<td>Proyecto</td>
<td>Importe</td>
<td>Agencia</td>
<td>Objetivos</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Asociación Piangüeros de Purruja</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Manejo de RN, Educación ambiental, Conservación</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-</td>
<td>Escuela de Biología-UNA</td>
<td>6000000</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>Manejo de recursos naturales, Investigación vida silvestre, Conservación</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2003</td>
<td>Asociación Piangüeros de Purruja</td>
<td>17075</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Manejo de RN, Conservación en comunidades de base</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-06</td>
<td>COOPEMANGLE</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Conservación, Ecoturismo, Fortalecimiento institucial</td>
<td>ECO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1995</td>
<td>UICN</td>
<td>500000</td>
<td>Gobierno de Dinamarca</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1996</td>
<td>CATIE / OLAFO</td>
<td>500000</td>
<td>Gobierno de Noruega</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>UICN</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. Proyectos con influencia al nivel de CORREDORES BIOLOGICOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Localización</th>
<th>Proyecto</th>
<th>Período de Ejecución</th>
<th>Ejecutor</th>
<th>Monto de inversión US$</th>
<th>Monto de inversión colones</th>
<th>Fuente Financiamiento</th>
<th>Temática</th>
<th>Categorización / grupo temática</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corredor Biológico Osa</td>
<td>Gente y la naturaleza</td>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>UICN</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Embajada Real de los Países Bajos</td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Propuesta Corredor Biológico</td>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>CATIE, SINAC, WWF</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>1336511</td>
<td>Gobierno de Alemania, WWF</td>
<td>Corredores biológicos</td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corredor biológico Osa Fase 1.</td>
<td>2000-?</td>
<td>INBIO</td>
<td>46229200</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>Hábitat de conservación Parques y ASP</td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corredor Biológico Osa</td>
<td>2001-2011</td>
<td>Coalición Técnica CBO</td>
<td>100000</td>
<td></td>
<td>CRUSA, CI, TNC, PNUD, Fondo para el medio ambiente mundial</td>
<td>Corredor Biológico Uso de la Tierra Parques y ASP Vida silvestre Investigación</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corredor Biológico Osa fase 1</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Coalición Técnica CBO</td>
<td>97324</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corredor Biológico Osa fase 2</td>
<td>2002-2004</td>
<td>Coalición Técnica CBO</td>
<td>76957</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estudio Tenencia Tierra y Estrategia de Conservación de Tierras Privadas</td>
<td>2001-04</td>
<td>CEDARENA</td>
<td>N/D</td>
<td>CI, CRUSA, TNC</td>
<td>Asuntos legales Corredores biológicos Reservas privadas Tenencia de la tierra</td>
<td></td>
<td>FI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Límites Corredor Biológico Osa</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Coalición Técnica CBO, INBIO</td>
<td>120000</td>
<td>CI, CEPF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establecimiento Límites Biológicos Corredor Biológico Osa, Fase I</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Coalición Técnica CBO, INBIO</td>
<td>26402</td>
<td>CI, CEPF</td>
<td>Corredores biológicos</td>
<td>Hábitat, conservación y manejo Vida silvestre</td>
<td>PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proyecto</td>
<td>Año</td>
<td>Organismos</td>
<td>Monto</td>
<td>Organismos</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Fuente</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establecimiento de Límites Biológicos Corredor Biológico Osa, Fase 2</td>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>Coalición Técnica CBO, INBIO</td>
<td>300000</td>
<td>CEPF, CI, ITCR, UCR, UNA</td>
<td>Zonas de amortiguamiento</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desarrollo del plan estratégico para el área de medioambiente</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Campaña Osa</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>Política</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan estratégico medioambiente</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Campaña Osa</td>
<td>30000</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>Medio Ambiente</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementación de la etapa preliminar del plan estratégico para el fortalecimiento de la capacidad institucional de la Fundación Corcovado</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Fundación Corcovado</td>
<td>4037600</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>Medio ambiente</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservación de la biodiversidad y producción sostenible</td>
<td>2003-2006</td>
<td>CEDARENA, Fundación Corcovado, INBIO, TUVA, Fundación Neotrópica</td>
<td>70000</td>
<td>CI, Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund</td>
<td>Corredores biológicos</td>
<td>PD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foro ambiental nacional</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>Campaña Osa</td>
<td>12860655.5</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>Gastos operativos</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>ASANA</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capacitación</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corredor Biológico Paso de la Danta</td>
<td>Centro de Facilidades Socioambientales</td>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>ASANA</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>PNUD, Fondo para el medio ambiente mundial</td>
<td>Capacitación Conservación en comunidades de base Corredores biológicos</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corredor Biológico Paso de la Danta</td>
<td>1997-</td>
<td>ASANA</td>
<td>45000</td>
<td>CBM, PNUD, donaciones de socios</td>
<td>Hábitat, conservación y manejo Corredores biológicos Restauración de ecosistemas Agua y conservacion</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corredor Biológico Paso de la Danta</td>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>ASANA</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Hábitat, conservación y manejo Corredores biológicos</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estrategia de conservación corredor biológico Paso de la Danta a través de un programa de educación ambiental con participación de organizaciones locales y escuelas</td>
<td>2004-06</td>
<td>Fundación para el corredor biológico Paso de la Danta</td>
<td>19228</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Corredores biológicos Educación ambiental</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manejo comunitario de la reserva biológica Playa Hermosa</td>
<td>1998-2000</td>
<td>APREFLOFAS</td>
<td>21000</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Manejo de RN Conservación de comunidades de base</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apoyo al Corredor Biológico Paso de la Danta</td>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>Asociación de desarrollo de Dominical de</td>
<td>5945</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Corredores biológicos Educación</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manejo ecoturístico comunitario de la reserva biológica playa hermosa</td>
<td>Osa</td>
<td>Asociación Ecológica Playa Hermosa</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Aprovechamiento Sostenible de RN Ecoturismo Conservación de comunidades de Base</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortalecimiento de COVIRENAS en Corredor Biológico Osa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fundación Corcovado</td>
<td>19733</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Fortalecimiento institucional Parques y ASP</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaña para la conservación de Corcovado</td>
<td>2001-05</td>
<td>Campaña Osa</td>
<td>1148068</td>
<td>33000000</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>Gastos operativos</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## F. Proyectos con influencia al nivel de PARQUES NACIONALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Localización</th>
<th>Proyecto</th>
<th>Periodo de Ejecución</th>
<th>Ejecutor</th>
<th>Monto de inversión</th>
<th>Fuente Financiamiento</th>
<th>Temática</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fundación de PN en la península de Osa</td>
<td>1998-?</td>
<td>Fundación de Parques Nacionales</td>
<td>36,515,875 US$</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>Fortalecimiento institucional Usos de recursos naturales Desarrollo sostenible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN Corcovado</td>
<td>Conservación de Tortuga Marinas y educación ambiental</td>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>Amigos de la Tierra</td>
<td>30700 (24000 euros)</td>
<td>SECIP</td>
<td>Educación ambiental Protección biodiversidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protección y conservación de la biodiversidad en el PN Corcovado</td>
<td>2004-06</td>
<td>Asociación Tesoro Verde</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Parques y ASP Cacería Conservación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protección de la biodiversidad en el PN corcovado a través de acciones de educación ambiental</td>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>Asociación de funcionarios de ACOSA</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td>PNUD</td>
<td>Educación ambiental Parques y ASP Cacería Conservación</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Protección y manejo de la biodiversidad y los RN del PN Corcovado y la Reserva Biológica Isla del Caño</td>
<td>2001-</td>
<td>MINAE</td>
<td>26,455,000 US$</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>Protección y manejo de RN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programa de conservación del</td>
<td>1994-</td>
<td>UNA, Wildlife Conservation</td>
<td>40000</td>
<td>CRUSA</td>
<td>Investigación vida silvestre Mamíferos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categorización / grupo temática</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jaguar</td>
<td>1994-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efectos de los cangrejos terrestres (<em>Gecarcinus quadratus</em>) en la diversidad florística de un bosque lluvioso neotropical de bajura (EB Sirena)</td>
<td>1993-2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Arreglos Instalaciones - Estación Sirena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Apoyo al pago de guardaparques para Corcovado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Apoyo al pago de guardaparques para Corcovado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Apoyo al pago de guardaparques para Corcovado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Apoyo al pago de guardaparques para Corcovado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**</td>
<td>Apoyo al pago de guardaparques para Corcovado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corcovado</strong></td>
<td><strong>Apoyo al pago de guardaparques para Corcovado</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apoyo al pago de guardaparques para Corcovado</strong></td>
<td>ACOSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apoyo al pago de guardaparques para Corcovado</strong></td>
<td>ACOSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pago de 2 1/2 guardaparques para Corcovado y 1 1/2 para Matapalo</strong></td>
<td>ACOSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depósito para Limpieza de Senderos</strong></td>
<td>ACOSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donación para Centro Acopio Sierpe</strong></td>
<td>ACOSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donación para Centro Acopio Sierpe</strong></td>
<td>ACOSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PN Corcovado y PN Piedras Blancas</strong></td>
<td><strong>Plan de control y protección</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoreo de la conectividad entre el</strong></td>
<td>UNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>****</td>
<td>PN piedras blancas y el PN corcovado utilizando especies clave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>****</td>
<td>Apoyo al pago de guardaparques para Piedras Blancas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>****</td>
<td>Plan de control y protección para los PN Corcovado y PN Piedras Blancas y sus áreas aledañas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B: Methodology

This appendix describes the collection of social data gathered by INOGO between January and April of 2012 and the subsequent analysis of those data. The Stanford-led research team, in conjunction with locally contracted and trained fieldworkers, contributed to the larger INOGO effort by carrying out extensive surveying and interviewing in the study region. The goals of this social analysis were:

a) to assess the perceived resources and strengths of human communities in the Osa, particularly with respect to organizations and leadership;
b) to assess the perceived challenges and threats facing those communities as well as to explore possible solutions; and
c) to assess the perceived health, nutrition and educational needs of the same communities.

Our effort builds on the approach to assessing the capital, capabilities, and constraints of rural livelihood proposed by other development scholars (Bebbington 1999; Bebbington et al 2007; Sen 1999a; 1999b). The analysis in this report draws mainly on our interview data with corroborating observations and discussions that took place during fieldwork, though it also includes secondary information where relevant.

In January 2012 INOGO personnel identified and assessed several candidate fieldworkers, trained the selectees, and collaboratively initiated data collection. Three local residents were also contracted by CRUSA on behalf of INOGO to conduct the bulk of survey data collection within the sub-regions in which they reside--Drake’s Bay, Piedras Blancas, and Golfito. An experienced fieldworker on leave from the Center for Responsible Travel (CREST) was contracted to gather data in the remaining areas. During this time the
regional coordinator also arranged several meetings with local development associations, watershed cooperatives (ASADAs), NGOs, and territorial action groups. Following these meetings, the draft questionnaire was pilot tested and revised. A final version of the interview protocol is available in Appendix C. The field team conducted interviews during four months, January to April, and were assisted by the Stanford team who helped with a survey of photographic landscape preferences (under instructions from GeoAdaptive, for use with scenario building), the gathering of additional key informant interviews during additional site visits, and attending locally-organized meetings about the proposed Diquis hydroelectric project. The combined efforts resulted in 310 completed interviews.

To devise an appropriate sampling strategy many discussions were held with local NGO collaborators. Their input helped the team identify over-studied areas to minimize research fatigue, especially in the peninsula towns of Puerto Jiménez and La Palma. The intention was to generate as comprehensive a perspective as possible by accessing heretofore unstudied local populations in Punta Banco, Pavones, La Gamba, Piedras Blancas, Sábalo and Los Mogos in addition to the populated centers of Golfito, Río Claro, Drake Bay and Sierpe. Our in-country coordinator, working with the interview team, then targeted known organizational contacts in these communities. These organizations included local, national, and regional NGOs, local integrated development associations, land management agencies, territorial action groups, business owners, and indigenous communities among others. From these interviews the field team was directed toward other leaders making important contributions to the community, thus generating a modified “snowball” sample where possible and a door-to-door convenience sample otherwise.
Figure 1: Number of surveys completed by district (total n = 310) by the INOGO field team (with deliberate undersampling of previously overstudied areas, see text)
Appendix C: Questionnaire guide

Encuesta: Las organizaciones locales y los desafíos para el bienestar en la región Osa y Golfito

I. Información demográfica.
   - Entrevistado/a: [ Masculino / Femenino ]
   - ¿Cómo se llama la comunidad donde vive usted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿Dónde nació usted?</th>
<th>País</th>
<th>Provincia/Departamento</th>
<th>Cantón/Municipio</th>
<th>Distrito/Comunidad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrevistado/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Su esposa/o o pareja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿Por cuánto tiempo ha vivido acá?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrevistado:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esposa/o:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿Cuántas personas viven en su casa?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adultos masculinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adultos Femeninos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menores de edad varones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menores de edad mujeres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Educación

1. ¿Qué es lo que más valora de la escuela primaria de su comunidad?

   ____________________________________________________________

2. ¿Qué considera que es lo peor de la escuela primaria de su comunidad?

   ____________________________________________________________

3. En una escala de uno a cinco, ¿qué opina de la calidad de la educación escolar que reciben los niños? (hoja a)
   i) muy mala  ii) mala  iii) más o menos  iv) buena  v) muy buena

4. En su opinión, ¿cómo es la calidad de los maestros? (hoja b)
   i) Muy malos  ii) malos  iii) más o menos  iv) buenos  v) Muy buenos

5. ¿Cuántos alumnos asisten a las clases todos los días? (hoja b)
6. ¿A qué colegio asisten los jóvenes de la comunidad? Dónde se ubica?

7. En una escala de uno a cinco, ¿qué opina de la calidad de la educación de colegio que reciben los jóvenes? (hoja a)
   i) muy mala   ii) mala   iii) más o menos   iv) buena   v) muy buena

8. ¿Qué proporción de jóvenes de la comunidad asisten actualmente al colegio? (hoja b)
   i) Ninguno   ii) muy pocos   iii) la mitad   iv) la mayoría   v) todos

9. ¿Qué proporción de jóvenes de su comunidad que ingresan al colegio terminan el bachillerato? (hoja b)
   i) Ninguno   ii) muy pocos   iii) la mitad   iv) la mayoría   v) todos

10. ¿Qué proporción de jóvenes bachilleres asisten actualmente a la universidad? (hoja b)
    i) Ninguno   ii) muy pocos   iii) la mitad   iv) la mayoría   v) todos

11. ¿A qué universidad/es asisten?__________________________________________________

III. Salud

1. ¿Qué problemas de salud suelen afectar más a la gente?
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   Y en particular a las mujeres?____________________________________________________

2. Ahora vamos a hablar de ciertas condiciones, ¿cuando las personas tienen_________,
   dónde las atienden?

Daño físico/quebradura:____________________________________________________________
Fiebre______________________________________________________________
Tos_______________________________________________________________
Diarrea______________________________________________________________
Embarazos______________________________________________________________
Malestar general (se siente mal)________________________________________________
Otras: (dolor de muela, etc.)______________________________

3. ¿Qué es lo que más le gustaría mejorar de los servicios médicos y de salud que
    ustedes utilizan?____________________________________________________________
    ____________________________________________________________________________
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4. ¿Cómo obtiene/recibe el agua que utiliza en su casa para beber, lavar y cocinar?

______________________________________________________________________________

5. ¿Qué le parece la calidad del agua que llega a su casa?
   i) Muy sucia   ii) Sucia   iii) Regular   iv) Aceptable   v) Muy limpia

6. Ahora vamos a hablar sobre la alimentación:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿Cuántas veces a la semana usted come (______)?</th>
<th>¿Dónde lo consigue?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pollo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pescado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariscos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leche/queso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huevos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verduras</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frutas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arroz, frijoles, maíz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. Organizaciones Locales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>¿De cuáles organizaciones es usted miembro actualmente?</th>
<th>¿Con qué frecuencia asiste a las reuniones?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Me puede describir un poco más de cada una de esas organizaciones:
Organización:_________________________________________________________________
¿Formal?_________¿No Formal?______________________________
¿Cuántos miembros hay en total?_____________________________
¿Cuántas personas de esta comunidad participan?________________
¿Cuál es el área geográfica en la que trabaja la organización?___________
¿Cuál es el propósito de la organización?__________________________
¿Cuáles son las actividades principales de la organización?______________
¿Quiénes son las personas más activas en la organización. Ocupan algún puesto esas personas?____
¿Cuáles son las fuentes de financiamiento de la organización?______________

Organización:__________________________________________

¿Formal?_________¿No Formal?______________________________
¿Cuántos miembros hay en total?_____________________________
¿Cuántas personas de esta comunidad participan?________________
¿Cuál es el área geográfica en la que trabaja la organización?___________
¿Cuál es el propósito de la organización?__________________________
¿Cuáles son las actividades principales de la organización?______________
¿Quiénes son las personas más activas en la organización. Ocupan algún puesto esas personas?____
¿Cuáles son las fuentes de financiamiento de la organización?______________
Organización: __________________________________________________________

- ¿Formal?_________________¿No Formal?______________________________
- ¿Cuántos miembros hay en total?_____________________________________
- ¿Cuántas personas de esta comunidad participan?_______________________
- ¿Cuál es el área geográfica en la que trabaja la organización?___________

- ¿Cuál es el propósito de la organización?______________________________

- ¿Cuáles son las actividades principales de la organización?______________
  ________________________________________________________________

- ¿Quiénes son las personas más activas en la organización. Ocupan algún puesto esas personas?_____
  ________________________________________________________________

- ¿Cuáles son las fuentes de financiamiento de la organización?____________
  ________________________________________________________________

¿Además de las que ya mencionó, hay otras organizaciones en la comunidad en las cuales usted no es miembro?

Organización:

- ¿Cuál es el área geográfica en la que trabaja la organización?___________

- ¿Cuál es el propósito de la organización?______________________________

- Quiénes son las personas más activas en la organización, ocupan algún puesto esas personas?_____

Organización:

- ¿Cuál es el área geográfica en la que trabaja la organización?___________

- ¿Cuál es el propósito de la organización?______________________________

- Quiénes son las personas más activas en la organización, ocupan algún puesto esas personas?_____

Organización:

- ¿Cuál es el área geográfica en la que trabaja la organización?___________

- ¿Cuál es el propósito de la organización?______________________________
Quiénes son las personas más activas en la organización, ocupan algún puesto esas personas?_____
__________________________________________________________________

7. ¿Hay otras organizaciones que Usted quisiera tener aquí? Cómo cuáles?_____
__________________________________________________________________

8. ¿En su opinión cuáles son las tres fortalezas más importantes de su comunidad?
   i. __________________________________________________________________
   ii. __________________________________________________________________
   iii. __________________________________________________________________

9. Por favor describa lo que usted personalmente ve como los tres desafíos principales para el bienestar de su comunidad.
   i. __________________________________________________________________
   ii. __________________________________________________________________
   iii. __________________________________________________________________

10. ¿Con qué otras tres comunidades interactúa más esta comunidad? ¿Por qué?
    i. __________________________________________________________________
    ii. __________________________________________________________________
    iii. __________________________________________________________________

V. Desafíos al bienestar familiar

Ahora vamos a conversar sobre las fuentes de ingresos en su casa.
1. Actualmente, y empezando con lo más importante, cuáles son las fuentes de ingresos en su casa?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVIDAD</th>
<th># de personas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Hace cinco años, ¿cuáles otras fuentes de ingresos existieron en su casa?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVIDAD</th>
<th># de personas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Ahora vamos a hablar de las actividades que son fuentes de ingreso para esta zona:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No sé</th>
<th>Muy baja</th>
<th>Baja</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Alta</th>
<th>Muy Alta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida la palma africana produce ganancias?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida el cultivo de la palma africana se puede mantener como una actividad económicamente productiva a largo plazo sin afectar el ambiente?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida otros cultivos producen ganancias? (arroz, plátano, frijoles y otros)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida esos otros cultivos se pueden mantener como actividades económicamente productivas a largo plazo sin afectar el ambiente?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida el turismo produce ganancias?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida el turismo se puede mantener como una actividad económicamente productiva a largo plazo sin afectar el ambiente?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida otras actividades comerciales (por ejemplo artesanías, tiendas de ropa, etc.) producen ganancias?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida esas otras actividades comerciales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida la pesca produce ganancias?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida la pesca se puede mantener como una actividad económicamente productiva a largo plazo sin afectar el ambiente?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida la minería produce ganancias?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida la minería se puede mantener como una actividad económicamente productiva a largo plazo sin afectar el ambiente?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida la ganadería produce ganancias?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida la ganadería se puede mantener como una actividad económicamente productiva a largo plazo sin afectar el ambiente?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida los productos forestales producen ganancias?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¿En qué medida la cultivación de los productos forestales se puede mantener como una actividad económicamente productiva a largo plazo sin afectar el ambiente?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## VI. Preguntas adicionales

1. ¿Ha escuchado acerca del proyecto para construir un **Aeropuerto Internacional** para el sur de Costa Rica? ¿Qué le parece esta iniciativa? ¿Porqué? 

2. ¿Ha escuchado acerca del **proyecto hidroeléctrico Diquís**? ¿Qué le parece esta iniciativa? ¿Porqué? 

3. ¿Cree usted que la existencia de la Reserva Forestal Golfo Dulce tiene algún beneficio o perjuicio para los pobladores de Osa? ¿Porqué?
Appendix D: Coding Keys

“Fortalezas” Coding Key:
- Nature/Natural Resources – any reference to beaches, water, forest, etc often in reference to its beauty. Nature for the sake of nature.
- Community Organizations – references to strong community organizations
- Tourism – benefits, employment from tourism
- Health – positive aspects of health care
- Education – positive aspects of the education system or quality of education
- Community Identity – references to strength of the neighborhood/community, references to people looking out for each other, general positivity about where they live
- Infrastructure – good roads, good water systems (aqueducts, etc.), good government
- Culture – strong feeling of culture or strong cultural organizations
- Security – feeling safe, good police/neighborhood watch systems (physical safety)

“Desafíos” Coding Key:
- Employment – lack of jobs, wish for more sources of employment, instability
- Poverty/Financial Security – remarks specifically about cash inflow or money and any instability surrounding that
- Education – references to poor teaching, education system or quality of education
- Infrastructure – any issues with infrastructure (roads, electricity, etc)
- Drugs/Alcoholism – concerns about drug culture and associated violence/physical security issues
- Health – problems with the health system, quality of care or water quality issues
- Diversions/activities for you – bored children/lack of structured after-school programming for youth. Concerns that this will lead to poor education and drug use/violence
- Government failure – corruption, failings of the municipality or federal government. Includes issues with the Caja.
- Loss of culture – insignificant emphasis on cultural elements of the Osa community
- Community mentality, unit and action – community members are disjointed, do not participate enough/are not active enough to enact positive change, there is no cohesive community identity
- Environmental Degradation – concerns that there is not enough concern being placed on the environment, recycling or protection
- Industry-specific improvements – issues/challenges surrounding specific industries, such as fishing, palma, rice-growers, etc.
Appendix E: Organizations identified

- ASADA
- Acueducto Rural/Acueducto AYA
- ASADAGOL
- ASADA El Almendro
- Acueductos KM 18
- ASADA KM 20
- ASADA La Gallega
- ASADA La Gamba
- ASADA Olla Cero
- ASADA Santa Rosa
- ASADA Villa Briseño de KM 37
- ASADA Villa Colón
- Comité de Tratamiento de Agua de Desecho
- ASADA KM 40 La Guaria
- ASADA Los Angeles KM 40 y La Guaria
- ASADA Piedras Blancas
- ASADA Rural de Sierpe
- ASADA Viquillas
- Asociación de Acueducto
- AIPONSO (Asociación Indígena de la Naturaleza Social)
- Asociación Ambiental
- Comité de Ambiente
- Asociación de Conservación de Tortugas Marinas
- Asociación del Hogar de Ancianos
- Comité del Hogar del Adulto Mayor
- Asociación para los Animales
- Asociación Probienestar Animal de Drake
- ASCO VIRENAS
- Asociación de Mujeres
- Asociación de Vecinos
- Asociación ProCiudadanía
- Camanance de Arena (Amigos y Egresados de Golfito)
- Camanance de Arena (Group de Adultos Mayores)
- Comité de Emergencias
- Comité Adulto Mayor
- Comité de Ancianos
- Comité de Apoyo
- Comité de Bandera Azul Ecológica Playa Blanca
- Comité de Mujeres
- Comité de Seguridad
- Comité de Seguridad Comunitario Barrio Llano Bonito
- Comité de Seguridad del Pueblo Civil
- Comité de Seguridad de Cocal Amarillo
- Comité de Seguridad Comercial Communal del Pueblo Civil (Fuerza Publica)
- Comité de Seguridad de la Playa
- COLOSEVI (Consejo Local de Seguridad Vial)
• Comité de Vigilancia en CIPA
• Comité Local MINAET
• Casa de la Juventud
• Red de Jóvenes
• COOPEATRAGOL
• Cordinador del Ayudo Social de IMAS
• De Lucha Campesino de Finca 9
• Derecho de Mujeres
• GAT-SUR
• Grupo de Egresados del Colegio
• Junta del Cementerio
• Junta Protección de la Niñez y la Adolescencia
• Junta Vial Cantonal
• La Ley 218 Asociación Consejo Regional Guaymí
• McKee Foundation
• PANI
• Supermercado Río Esquinas SA
• Alcoholicos Anonymos
• Asociación de Punta Banco
• Asociación de Río Claro
• CENCINAЕ
• Comité de Recyclaje
• Comité de Titular de Menores
• Proyecto Vivero
• Organización de Guía Scout
• Organización para Eventos Culturales
• Organización para Mujeres Abusadas
• Tesoro Verde
• Asociación de Gimnasia Rítmica
• Asociación Gimnasia y Afines Zona Sur
• Comité Cantonal de Deportes
• Comité de Boxeo
• Comité de Deportes
• Comité de Deportes Comunal
• Comité de Deportes Distrital
• Comité de Fútbol
• Comité de Deportes de Bambel
• Grupo de Caminata de Mujeres
• Junta Administrativa del Polideportivo
• Comité Cantonal de Deportes
• ADI
• Comité de Desarrollo de la Zona Sur
• ADI de Alto Laguna
• ADI de Drake
• ADI de Golfito
• ADI de Punta Banco
• ADI de Playa Cacao
• ADI de Purruja
• ADI de Conte Burica
• ADI de La Mona
• ADI de Piedras Blancas
• ADI de Venecia
• ADI de Cocal Amarillo
• ADI de La Palma
• Asociación Conservacionista Tesoro Verde
• ADI de Rancho Quemado
• ADI de Rio Claro
• ADI de Rio Claro, Pavones
• Comité de Caminos
• Comité de Caminos de Finca Guanacaste
• Comité de Enlace Cooperativas del Sur
• Comité de la Torre
• Comité Pro Mejoras
• Comité Pro Mejoras del Barrio Progresso La Mona
• Consejo del Distrito
• Consejo de Federaciones Regionales de ADI
• Consejo Desarrollo Humano IMAS
• Junta de Desarrollo La Palma
• Union Cantonal
• Union Cantonal de ADI
• Junta de Desarrollo de Vecinos
• Comité de Ornato
• Comité de Puentes
• Comité de la Escuela
• Junta de Educación
• Children’s Library
• Comité del Grupo del Sexto Grado
• Comité Tutelar de Menores
• Consultiva de INA
• junta Administrativa del Colegio
• Junta de Padres del Colegio
• Maestro en Casa
• Junta de Padres de la Escuela
• Patronato de la Escuela
• Proyecto Carey
• Universidad Estado a Distancia (UNED)
• Club 4 Ojas
• Junta Administrativa del Liceo Finca Alajuela
• Junta de Educación de Punta Banco
• Junta de Escuela La Purruja
• Unda de la Escuela Pavones
• Junta de la Escuela Sierpe
• Empresa de Credito Comunal (ECC)
• ASOPROVI
• Asociación de Empresarios
• CIPA
• Comité de Salud La Campina
• COOPEALIANZA
• COOPECVOI
• IMAS
• UPA Nacional
• Zancudo Unidos
• JUDESUR
• Consejo Pastoral
• Asociación Cristiana Asamblea de Dios
• Asociación Cristiana Aguas Cristalinas
• Comité de Iglesia
• Confraternidad de Ministros de Golfito
• Equipo Ministerial Metodista
• Grupo de la Iglesia Asamblea de Dios
• Iglesia Metodista Piedras Blancas
• Junta Administrativa de la Asamblea de Dios La Florida
• Junta Directiva Iglesia Asamblea de Dios
• Junta Directiva Iglesia Metodista
• Lideres Metodistas
• Consejo Pastoral de Finca Alajuela
• Asociación de la Iglesia Evangélica
• Comité de la Iglesia Católica
• AMUGO
• APEBAPA (Asociación de Pescadores Bahía Pavones)
• APIAPU
• ASBAPROFA
• ASOESTON (Asociación Solidarista)
• Asociación de Mujeres Productoras Agropecuarias
• ASPROCA
• ANAGA (Asociación No a los Granjas Atuneras)
• Centro Agrícola
• Centro Agrícola de Osa
• Comité de Artesanías
• COOPEGAMGBA
• COOPEMARINA
• Cooperativa SERVICOOP
• COOPETRIUNFO
• COOPROSUR
• COPEREINA
• Corporación Grupo Río Esquina
• FECOPT (Federación Costarricense de Pesca Turística)
• Organización de Hombres y Mujeres
• Asociación de Pescadores
• COOPERENA
• INCOPESCA
• ATAGOL (Asociación de Taxistas de Golfito)
• FOCASI (Federación de Centros de Restauración)
• CANAIMA
• FENOPEA
• Corporación Arocera
• CNE (Comisión Nacional de Emergencias)
• Consejales de Distritos
• Asociación de Vecinos de Punta Banco
• Asociación Cívica/Comité Cívico
• Comité de la Torre Claro
• Comité de Transporte
• Frente Cívico Osa
• Fuerza Viva de Golfito
• Municipalidad de Golfito
• Asamblea General de la Comunidad
• Asociación Civil
• Comisión de Electrificación
• Asociación Civil de Alto de Conte
• Asociación con Fines Específicos Escuadra/Comte
• Comité de Golfito
• Comité de Salud
• EBAIS
• Centro de Rehabilitación
• Comité de Estudio de Niños y Adolescentes Agredidas del Hospital de Golfito
• Cooperativa de Recyclaje
• Cruz Roja
• Puesto de Salud
• Comité de Salud Ngobe GWE
• Puesto Salud de Punta Banco
• ASETURS (Asociación de Empresarios Turísticos de Sierpe)
• AGITUR (Asociación de Guías de Turismo)
• Asociación de Guías Naturalistas
• Asociación Guías Piedras Blancas
• Asociación Camara de Empresarios de Turismo
• Asociación de Empresarios de Turismo
• Asociación de Guías de Turismo
• Camara Costariccense de Hoteles
• Camara de Turismo de Osa
• Camara de Turismo Golfo Dulce
• Cooperativa de Ser. Turísticos Casa Drake
• ASOLITO (Camara de Guías)
• Fundación Guaria de Osa
• Tiskita Lodge
• ICT (Instituto Costariccense de Turismo)