

1. Project Data

| | |
|--|---|
| GEF Project ID | 1515 |
| IA/EA Project ID | HO-X1003 (GRT/FM-8753-HO) |
| Focal Area | Biodiversity |
| Project Name | Consolidation of Ecosystem Management and Biodiversity Conservation Under the Environmental Management Program of the Bay Islands, Stage II |
| Country/Countries | Honduras |
| Geographic Scope | National |
| Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects | IADB |
| Executing Agencies involved | Ministry of Tourism (Secretaria de Turismo) |
| Involvement of NGO and CBO | Among the executing agencies |
| Involvement of Private Sector | (OP 2) Coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems |
| Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives | 1515 |
| TER Prepared by | Sunpreet Kaur |
| TER Peer Review by | Neeraj Negi |
| Author of TE | Ronny Muñoz |
| Review Completion Date | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval Date | 11/24/2003 |
| Project Implementation Start Date | 6/24/2004 |
| Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation) | 6/30/2012 |
| Actual Date of Project Completion | 12/31/2012 |
| TE Completion Date | August 2012 |
| IA Review Date | UA |
| TE Submission Date | 9/27/2012 |

2. Project Financing

| Financing Source | At Endorsement (millions USD) | At Completion (millions USD) |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| GEF Project Preparation Grant | 0.32 | 0.204 |
| Co-financing for Project Preparation | 0.135 | 0.135 |
| Total Project Prep Financing | 0.46 | 0.34 |
| GEF Financing | 2.50 | 2.20 |
| IA/EA own | 12.00 | UA |
| Government | 1.80 | 2.824 |
| Other* | 5.15 | 3.932 |
| Total Project Financing | 21.45 | 8.96 |
| Total Financing including Prep | 21.91 | 9.30 |

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

3. Summary of Project Ratings

| Criteria | Final PIR | IA Terminal Evaluation | IA Evaluation Office Review | GEF Evaluation Office TE Review |
|---|-----------|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Project Outcomes | MS | S | Not reviewed | Satisfactory |
| Sustainability of Outcomes | N/A | MU | Not reviewed | Moderately Likely |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | NA | S | Not reviewed | Satisfactory |
| Quality of Implementation and Execution | N/A | S | Not reviewed | Satisfactory |
| Quality of the Evaluation Report | N/A | N/A | Not reviewed | Satisfactory |

4. Project Objectives

4.1. Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Project Appraisal Document lists the project's global objective as: to strengthen the conservation of globally significant coastal and marine habitats and species under national jurisdiction, including linkages with ongoing regional programs such as the Mesoamerican Barrier Reef System (MBRS).

The PIRs and TE indicated no changes to the project's global objective.

4.2. Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Appraisal Document lists the project's development objective as: to consolidate the environmental management program created during the first stage, setting in place a self-sustaining institutional framework that supports ecosystems management and biodiversity conservation as well as environmentally sustainable tourism in the Bay Islands of Honduras.

No change to the project's development objective is noted in any of the documents available.

4.3. Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:

| Criteria | Change? | Reason for Change |
|---------------------------------|---------|-------------------|
| Global Environmental Objectives | No | |
| Development Objectives | No | |
| Project Components | No | |
| Other activities | No | |

5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

5.1. Relevance – Satisfactory

The Project was highly relevant with the GEF Operational Strategy, because it was in line with the need to preserve and protect globally significant ecosystems and it directly addressed those aspects which represented a threat.

At national level, the Project was highly relevant because it addresses needs concerning Honduras Protected Areas National System, national development plans and environmental policies, the national strategy for biodiversity and PAs management and conservation, and the

National Strategy for Sustainable Development of Tourism in Honduras (Estrategia Nacional de Desarrollo Sostenible del Sector Turismo en Honduras, ENTS-Honduras).

The Project is consistent with the Forest Law, the Honduras Land Management Law - Order No. 180-2003, the guidelines stated in the Country Vision 2010-2038 and National Plan 2010-2022, the National Forest, Protected Areas and Wildlife Program 2010-2030 (Programa Nacional Forestal, Áreas Protegidas y Vida Silvestre, PRONAFOR 2010-2030), the Honduras Protected Areas National System Strategic Plan 2010-2020 (Plan Estratégico del Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas de Honduras, PESINAPH 2010-2020), the ICF Strategic Plan 2009-2011 and the CIF Institutional Strategic Plan 2010-2015.

The Project is also consistent with GEF's biodiversity focal area, IDB's nationwide strategy, and national and international stakeholders' needs.

5.2. *Effectiveness* – **Satisfactory**

The effectiveness of the Project was satisfactory taking into consideration the political turmoil and the institutional weakness that affected its execution. Even if the critical issues were clearly identified, the Project had limited capacity in terms of time estimations and required resources to address every cause and change players' behavior.

However, the actions undertaken during the course of its implementation helped strengthen the conservation of globally significant coastal and marine habitats and species under national jurisdiction, including linkages with ongoing regional programs such as the Mesoamerican Reef Barrier System (MRBS). The specific objectives were satisfactorily fulfilled.

In spite of the fading-out and ineffectiveness of the CETS, the institutional structure for strengthening land and PAs management and biodiversity protection improved through the creation of new public policy instruments, land management, the PAs legal organization and financial mechanisms.

At organizational level, capacities were also increased through the creation of the ZOLITUR and its coordination unit, the execution of management agreements, and the involvement of various public and private stakeholders at the national, regional and local levels.

Investments in the Regional Conservation System enabled local capacity building at organizational and institutional levels. Consequentially, new instruments are now available that will help increase the financial sustainability of PAs management, implement conservation activities, conduct municipal capacity-building and enhance communications, awareness, and local residents' participation in the areas where these activities were carried out.

Improvements were also achieved as regards communities', UMAs' and co-managers' capacity and involvement in the control and monitoring of tourist activities and illegal fishing, the development of proposals and environmental project management.

Its catalytic effect was satisfactory in that it generated public policy instruments for biodiversity protection and it developed a significant public asset for PA management. The Project contributed to the demonstrability criterion through the experiences and knowledge acquired with the PAs management.

5.3. *Efficiency* – **Moderately Satisfactory**

Project efficiency is moderately satisfactory because the Project's execution suffered considerable delays. As a result of this, the completion term was extended several times and the closing date was postponed by 2.5 years.

The TE makes a note of the fact that the Project was weakly managed in its early years, its operation was adversely affected by political aspects in connection with changes of government and the halt occurred in 2009. Design aspects and a weak participation of other stakeholders also affected the project.

In spite of the institutional weakness, political and organizational problems, a high execution level was achieved.

5.4. *Sustainability* – **Low / Moderate risks**

There are risks against sustainability in financial, socio-economic, governability and environmental aspects, and in terms of the institutional framework.

Financial Resources: The project was successful in establishing a financial mechanism - Environmental Surcharge - for biodiversity conservation, and the Special Law for Bay Islands Protected Areas was enacted stating that management costs shall be financed by the ZOLITUR. Therefore, the baseline for the financial sustainability was facilitated. However, risks coming from the operational problems regarding how to effectively manage and spend the resources consistently with the objectives do not seem clearly described.

Sociopolitical Aspects: Although national interests in the operational framework have moved during the execution period, the policies supporting Bay Islands' conservation remained firm. Public awareness on the environment issues improved among the local stakeholders, and the coordination mechanism and local networks seem to have decreased the possibility of destructive activities both of locals and tourists.

Even regarding the possibility of another political turmoil, it may not seriously affect the major policies as a whole. It seems to have low risks in sociopolitical aspects accordingly.

Institutional Aspect and Governability: Since the project aimed to develop a highly participatory decentralized management model which seems to be successful in involving local stakeholders, the governability of the decentralized institution seems to become more stable and sustainable. The environmental management activities had been well supported by the rules, laws and regulations such as the Forest Law, the Honduras Land Management Law, the Country Vision 2010-2038, National Plan 2010-2022, the National Forest, Protected Areas and Wildlife Program 2010-2030 (Programa Nacional Forestal, Áreas Protegidas y Vida Silvestre, PRONAFOR 2010-2030), the Honduras Protected Areas National System Strategic Plan 2010-2020 (Plan Estratégico del Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas de Honduras, PESINAPH 2010-2020), the ICF Strategic Plan 2009-2011 and the ICF Institutional Strategic Plan 2010-2015. Minor risks may exist among local stakeholders during discussions if the coordination mechanism does not work properly.

Environmental Risks: Tourism and real estate development may benefit from the improved environment and attract more tourists to the Islands which will concern the environmental sustainability. Tourists can be both the supplier of the Environmental Surcharge resources and the potential factor of environmental degradation.

Another type of risks is natural disasters. Severe hurricanes may wipe out the physical facilities for conservation as well as cause other destructive events such as coral bleaching.

6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

6.1. Co-financing

6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

Although the TE provides a break-up of the co-financing expected and actually contributed by each of the sources, however there is no information on the activity/component for which it has been utilised.

6.1.2. If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The total amount spent from the co-financing accounts was USD 9,281,197.64, which represents 95% of the expected amount of USD 9,770,000. The country's contribution towards co-financing for the project was USD 2,824,289, which is 56% higher than expected. Although a few entities contributed lesser than the expected/committed

amounts, there were a number of newer entities that contributed to co-financing for the project. The actual co-financing contribution of local NGOs was also higher than the expected figures.

In addition, there is no evidence to ascertain the actual co-financing materialized against the expected amount of USD 12,000,000 from the IA.

6.2. Delays

6.2.1. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project suffered from inadvertent delays that are attributable to a number of factors, such as: political changes in the govt., reduced interest in CETS, administrative and managerial delays, 2009 political events causing halting of the project, execution level delays and approval related delays. The TE points out that the project was weakly managed in its early years and its operations were adversely affected by political aspects in connection with changes of government and the halt occurred in 2009. At the early stage of the project, the administrative and managerial immaturity affected timely disbursements of the budget. Since 2009, in addition to political turmoil, the disbursement rate of the GEF Funds had been quite low and political interest in CETS had declined. Later, GEF disbursement revived, public awareness increased, financial mechanism was established and local stakeholders' participation increased which prevented further delays of the project.

Although such exogenous factors caused delays of the project, it did not seem to affect overall performance at the project completion in 2012. Rather, a consolidated environmental management system with strengthening of local stakeholders decreased external risks.

6.3. Country ownership

6.3.1. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE notes that the public policy and the Protected Areas Management instruments as well as the land use planning are highly appraised by the organizations involved at the operative, managerial and political levels. Since this project is at the stage II, national and local stakeholders were aware of the project objectives which helped to further increase country ownership.

Nationally, the ICF was aware that they are responsible for applying the instruments generated. Also, the creation of ZOLITUR itself reflects the country's willingness to keep the responsibility despite its low level of ownership. The authority is aware of the proposals and plans on Bay Islands' biodiversity conservation through Protected Areas management by themselves.

Local stakeholders - co-managers and municipalities - not only performed well, but also even provided matching funds for the project activities.

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

7.1. M&E design at entry – Satisfactory

The M&E design set forth in the Project Document gives details of the two levels of monitoring planned for the project, involving different approaches. The Log-frame for the Program presented a mix of the two types of indicators - performance indicators and impact indicators. The Performance indicators were planned to be used for tracking progress and controlling quality in the implementation of the Program activities. These refer to quantitative targets set relative to the execution of each activity and focus primarily on the outputs and products expected under each activity. On the administrative side, performance indicators and tools used to assess monthly and annual progress include amounts expended as compared to amounts budgeted (monthly and annual budget conciliations), targets for procurement of goods and services, and annual personnel reviews. The monitoring and evaluation of impact indicators includes a system for monitoring selected environmental parameters as indicators of change over time including: coastal and marine water quality; health of coral reef, seagrass and mangrove communities; reef fish diversity and abundance; reef fisheries; and land use change. Data collected periodically on these parameters will be consolidated into the PMAIB GIS-based management system developed during the first stage and analyzed for trends (relative to a 2002 baseline) and using environmental quality standards as a reference. In addition, a plan for monitoring documentation was also set forth in the Project Document, including the quarterly technical reports and annual financial reports.

As per the TE, the M&E design at entry proved to be right in terms of threats, relevance, and objectives, and in judging the execution term as somewhat ambitious. The sequencing of activities was a weakness. However, it lacked an analysis of the initial project indicators and it did not revise or adjust the baseline. Monitoring of those indicators was performed within the structure of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), but the party responsible for it was not indicated in the Project Document.

7.2. M&E implementation – Moderately Satisfactory

Monitoring and evaluation was moderately satisfactory. Following the project's operational framework and the GEF and IDB procedures, the monitoring and evaluation process included the participation of stakeholders involved at the different management levels. The appropriate

mechanisms were applied according to the strategy and requirements established in the Project Document (PD).

According to the mid-term evaluation, there was little monitoring by the IDB to ensure a greater focus on the execution of the GEF activities. However, the terminal evaluation noted the opposite due to the fact that the IDB carried out 3 missions, made field visits, inspections, held regular coordination meetings with the PCU and revised contracts and project documents (POAs, Technical Reports, etc.). Although a contingency plan was established on the basis of the Mid-term Evaluation, in spite of the relevance of its recommendations, very few were actually implemented.

Annual audits were conducted covering issues related to financial management, administrative structure, contracts, the substantive and financial planning, PD design, monitoring of the execution reports, internal control procedures, equipment, budget spending, expenses combined report, financial and administrative management risks and compliance with the recommendations. Such audits had greater influence on the execution than the Mid-Term Evaluation, possibly due to the strict way of controlling the operations and the financial aspects of the project.

During the project execution, the original log-frame was barely used as a management tool. Even certain indicators actually used were different from those defined in the PD. However, they are in line with the adaptive management mechanism allowed by GEF projects.

There is no available database about the project outputs, and the half-yearly reports and the Project Implementation Review (PIR) used for monitoring the actions and supporting the management of the project results are incomplete and fail to provide a detailed account of the activities included in the component.

The TE also notes that M&E plan of the project was a powerful element which provided evidence for supporting decision-making when it was necessary. Weaknesses were found in the preparation of half-yearly reports by the PCU and the PIR. Yearly audits improved transparency, and joint-managers reports, IDB's support and PCU and IDB's field visits proved essential.

8. Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution

8.1. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution – Satisfactory

8.2. Overall Quality of Implementation – Highly Satisfactory

The Project's performance was affected by great changes in the implementation context, the organizational structure and repeated halts, as well as political authorities' decisions. However, due to the efforts made by the implementing agencies, adaptive management and several extensions, difficulties were tackled and the project and its resources could be leveraged for strengthening Bay Islands' biodiversity conservation.

IDB's role as Implementing Agency was important in overcoming critical times during the Project; it supported the IHT in monitoring and technical aspects.

8.3. *Overall Quality of Execution* – **Moderately Satisfactory**

Regarding the quality of execution by the EA, the TE notes that the IHT and SERTUR provided all necessary resources available to them for a smooth development of the Project. Decisions taken by top authorities limited their institutional capacity to continue with component 1. National policy aspects adversely affected the execution program. Budget spending was unsatisfactory.

The disbursements, the procurement of goods, services, equipment and the contracting of consultancies were made and authorized by the program coordination unit. All of them were aspects subject to the IDB's revision processes in relation to the GEF resources.

In spite of the checkered execution and the complicated institutional environment, the IHT kept playing its leadership role throughout the execution. The participation at all management levels was key to achieving the objectives and enduring the external blows suffered by the program, especially the changes of government and the political events occurred during 2009. Given the weakness of the CETS, the IHT took over its functions.

The Secretariat for Natural Resources and Environment (Secretaría en el Despacho de Recursos Naturales y Ambiente, SERNA) and the National Institute for Forest Development and Conservation, Protected Areas and Wildlife (ICF) had limitations as regards the presence and availability of the human resources in the Islands necessary to assume the project. However, all outputs generated had their approval and participation. In general terms, the program was supported by the Municipalities and the Municipal Environmental Unit (Unidades Ambientales Municipales, UMAs).

The IDB was in charge of managing the GEF funds as well as supporting the management of the project and monitoring its operations and results. It provided its support during key times of the project with a view to implementing the necessary solutions and measures to help solving the execution problems detected in the mid-term evaluation. It also helped taking contingency measures as a result of the effects of the pause caused by the country's political situation in 2009.

9. **Lessons and recommendations**

9.1. *Key lessons*

9.2. *Key recommendations*

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

| Criteria | Rating | GEF EO Comments |
|---|-----------|--|
| To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? | S | The TE assesses the project's effectiveness on a number of parameters laid out in the project design itself, and also rates the each of the specific objectives of the project vis-à-vis their achievement. The evidences presented to support the claims are satisfactory. |
| To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? | S | The TE provides a detailed account of performance ratings on a number of criteria such as M&E, IA & EA Execution, Outcomes (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency), Catalyzing role, Sustainability, etc. It also presents supporting evidences to substantiate the ratings appropriately. |
| To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy? | S | The TE notes various aspects to assess the project's sustainability: financial resources, socio-political aspects, institutional framework and governability, and environmental risks. It presents evidence on the performance ratings provided against each of these categories and also provides recommendations to increase sustainability. It suggests the status of the current institutions with the level of involvement which allows to predict operational mechanisms in the future, but it does not indicate the exit strategy of the IA and the GEF. |
| To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? | MS | The lessons learned noted in the TE are insightful, but not supported by evidence. |
| Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? | MS | An entity-wise break-up of the expected and actual costs is provided in the TE. Further, a break-up of the annual budget spending of the GEF funds is also provided. However, there is no mention of the actual co-financing realized from IADB whereby only the expected figures are given. |
| Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems: | MU | The M&E design set forth in the Project Document listed the periodic monitoring requirements for the project, apart from the details of the mid-term and final evaluations mandated. However, the TE presents no clear evidence on how the M&E design proposed was implemented. The ratings provided for the M&E implementation and execution are not fully supported with verifiable evidence. |

Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

The project generated public policy instruments for biodiversity protection and developed a significant public asset for PAs management. It enabled establishing a biodiversity database and Management Plans. Greater knowledge and capacities for biodiversity estimation and management were developed.

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance?

UA

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

No such evidence is provided in the TE.

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

The project enabled establishing a biodiversity database and Management Plans.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?

No

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?

WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

No description of use of the project outputs is available.

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised?

Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

Information sharing and public outreach was included in the sub-component 3 of the project: "Public outreach, participation and local destination management". The project activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised included: Operation of the PMAIB website, Establishment and use of data transmission and management system by several stakeholder groups, Creation and broadcast of radio material for dissemination of information on PMAIB II, Conduct of the six workshops for disseminating the Special Law on Bay Islands Protected Areas and its regulation, Printing of information/educational material about Bay Islands Protected Areas Regional System and its distribution at education centers in the archipelago.

Was any *positive* change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?

UA

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

Although no specific measurements are available about attitudinal and behavioral changes among local residents, the memorandums and records of attendance to different activities organized by the Project suggest that the Project helped raise awareness and understanding of the value and singularity of the archipelago and the need for environmental management. This was achieved through training provided to local organizations, NGOs, hotel businessmen and tourism and fishermen chambers, consultations with local residents, and dissemination of the different Project outputs. Other specific projects such as the communications consultancy, the development of educational material for Guanaja airport and the educational, environmental recovery, and labeling programs - among others - developed by the co-managers, also contributed to achieving this objective.

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmental management skills?

Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO **TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS** BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

Through the project, the training in environmental management issues provided to the officers of ICF and the municipalities helped in improving their capacities in terms of public policy instruments, proceedings, and practices for managing PAs and their territory.

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained?

No

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

No such evidence of application of the skills is noted in the available project documents.

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks?

Yes

Were these adopted?

Yes

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

- With the inception of the National Program for Sustainable Tourism (Programa de Turismo Sostenible, PNTS), the original organizational structure was modified to integrate it with the PMAIB II into a single PCU.
- In 2006, Order No. 181-2006 introduced the Law on the Bay Islands Free Tourist Zone (ZOLITUR) and the Regulations of the Customs and Special Fiscal Regime.
- In 2004, General Rules for Bay Islands Development Control (Executive Agreement No. 002-2004) was created to orderly articulate the activities that had an impact on tourism, residential, commercial and industrial activities.
- Passed by the National Congress of the Republic of Honduras, Order No. 75-2010 declared the creation of the PNMIB and established two of the three new Terrestrial Protected Areas.

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures?

Yes

Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?

UA

WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

According to the TE, ZOLITUR was created in 2007 by the government and will work to finance and implement the biodiversity conservation through coordinating co-managers and other local stakeholders. The financial mechanism was not properly operated at the time of preparing the TE because the revenues from the environmental surcharge had not been fully transferred to the organization, and the ownership of the organization was still lacking. Therefore, the sustainability of the organization's function needs to be monitored in order to ascertain if it is a permanent structure.

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

No

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

NA

WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?

No evidence is available to ascertain the project's contribution towards development of structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance.

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

UA

WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION?
WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?

No evidence on this aspect is noted in the TE.

Did the project contribute to any of the following:

Technologies & Approaches

UA

Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies

Yes

Financial Mechanisms

Yes

Please specify what was contributed:

ZOLITUR and the four co-managers

Environmental Surcharge

Did **replication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place?

No

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.

WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

The TE noted a good potential of the project for disseminating good practices among other PAs. However, there is no evidence towards actual application of the same.

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

UA

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.

HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

No evidence is available to ascertain the project's contribution to this effect.

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

UA

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

No evidence is available to ascertain the project's contribution to this effect.

Did **removal of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place?

UA

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

No evidence is available to ascertain the project's contribution to this effect.

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

Combination

<--dropdown menu

If "combination", then of which types?

Institutional Capacity (governance)

&

Implementation Strategies

<--dropdown menu

QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED** OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **STATUS HAS CHANGED** AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.

Was stress reduction achieved?

Yes

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local

Intended (local)

Unintended (local)

Systemic

Intended (systemic)

Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured

Anecdotal

Was there a change in environmental status?

UA

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local Intended (local) Unintended (local)

Systemic Intended (systemic) Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?

Measured Anecdotal

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

Special Marine Area (SMA) was established during the project with an estimated area of 52,408.70 ha consisting of Special Marine Protected Area (SMPA), Restricted Area (RA), Restricted Fishing and Fish Farming Area (RFFFA), and Economic Development Zone and Multiple Use Zone (EDZ-MUZ). There are two more areas established: Buffer Area (BA) with twelve nautical miles (22.2 km) starting from the external line of the SMA accounting for 594,400.34 ha; and Coastal Area (CA) which is from the High Tide Line to 10 m inside the island territory comprising 343.45 ha.

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

NA

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**

NA

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

NA

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

NA

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

NA

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental

UA

Socioeconomic

UA

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

Although the Project Document lists a number of environmental and socio-economic indicators, there is no evidence of follow-up of achievements against the same or collection of data on those indicators at any level.

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

NA

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

UA

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

UA

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

No evidence of engagement of any government body / other permanent organisation for monitoring environmental and/or socio-economic status is available.

Has the monitoring data been used for management?

NA

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

NA

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

NA

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

NA

"SOCIOECONOMIC" REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE "BEFORE" AND "AFTER" NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts?

UA

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local Intended (local) Unintended (local)

Systemic Intended (systemic) Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained? Measured Anecdotal

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts?

UA

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local Intended (local) Unintended (local)

Systemic Intended (systemic) Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained? Measured Anecdotal

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

There is no evidence noted in the available project documents about socio-economic impacts.

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at **systemic level**

NA

Evidence on unintended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

NA

Evidence on unintended socio-economic impacts at **systemic level**

NA

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

Following are the lessons learned from the project, as noted in the TE:

1. The development of a self-sustaining institutional framework may hardly be achieved in a short period of time in a country with a weak institutional framework for managing wild protected areas.
2. The wide-ranging interests and political agendas that affect the legal organization of new PAs are aspects that need to be identified at project design stage.
3. In projects where execution levels are low and their net execution term is shortened, management should focus on the achievement of the strategic results.
4. When projects are to be executed in a context of institutional weakness, managers should seek solutions through agreements entered into with strategic partners, which may allow them to overcome those factors which limit or prevent execution.
5. A project needs to be developed in a context of prevailing dialogue and social awareness, but this does not guarantee that the social aspects as a whole will favor conservation in the future.
6. With appropriate policy instruments which govern tourism activities and resources it is possible to monitor, control and reduce actions that adversely affect marine and terrestrial ecosystems, increasing the application of best tourism practices.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

Following are the recommendations noted in the TE for the project:

1. It is important to have public institutions, concerned with protected areas, consider establishing their local office on the Bay Islands. This is especially true for the ICF - the institution responsible for enforcing the Special Law for the Bay Islands Protected Areas.
2. Surcharges applied to the airlines serving the Islands and revenues from the Coxen Hall Port should be effectively collected.
3. Amendments should be introduced to the Creation Law in order to have the Finance Secretariat transfer 100% of the proceeds of the application of the Environmental and Security Surcharge transferred to ZOLITUR.
4. Actions should be undertaken to improve the socio-environmental condition of people living in Cayitos. The Bay Islands Artisanal Fishery Management Plan should be developed.
5. Programs should be implemented for managing and controlling surface waters and erosion in real estate and road network development areas which lack conservation measures.
6. It is of great priority to establish an agenda jointly with the ZOLITUR (political level and technical unit), the municipalities, the IHT and ICF in order to make progress in terms of governability and strategic aspects.
7. Tourism, real estate development and tourism infrastructure surcharges have been increasing, which put further pressure on ecosystems. As a result of this, the implementation of Environmental Management Plans and AP Management Plans is not deferrable.
8. The ICF has been provided with instruments to increase PAs governability and spaces for participating in the development of an environmental management model which should be promoted in the future.