

## 1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	963
IA/EA Project ID	RS-X1009; GRT/FM-9179-RS
Focal Area	International Waters
Project Name	Environmental Protection and Maritime Transport Pollution Control in the Gulf of Honduras
Country/Countries	Belize, Guatemala, Honduras
Geographic Scope	Regional
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	IADB
Executing Agencies involved	COCATRAM, CCAD
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Not involved
Involvement of Private Sector	UA- Unable to Assess
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	10 - Containment based Operational Program
TER Prepared by	Sunpreet Kaur
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	Mauricio Castro Salazar
Review Completion Date	
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	3/24/2005
Project Implementation Start Date	8/8/2005
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	6/30/2012
Actual Date of Project Completion	6/11/2012
TE Completion Date	8/28/2012
IA Review Date	NA
TE Submission Date	9/27/2012

## 2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	0.55	0.55
Co-financing for Project Preparation	0.17	0.17
Total Project Prep Financing	0.72	0.72
GEF Financing	4.80	3.42
IA/EA own	1.50	1.50
Government	2.40	3.58
Other*	2.60	2.26
Total Project Financing	11.30	10.76
Total Financing including Prep	12.02	11.48

\*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	MU	MS	Not reviewed	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	ML	Not reviewed	ML
Monitoring and Evaluation	NA	NA	Not reviewed	U
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	NA	Not reviewed	MU
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	Not reviewed	MU

### 4. Project Objectives

#### 4.1. Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the TE, the Global Objective of the project was "to support the implementation of a Strategic Action Plan (SAP) that should translate into benefits for the region, as it will contribute to stabilize water quality in the Gulf of Honduras and prevent the degradation of vulnerable marine and coastal ecosystems in the Mesoamerican Barrier Reef System (MBRS), which is threatened by pollution and constitutes the largest reef barrier in the occidental hemisphere. This shall be achieved by protecting international waters and their resources, as well as by promoting their sustainable use, in line with the objectives of GEF Operational Program 10.

No change was made to the Global Environmental Objectives of the project during the course of its implementation.

#### 4.2. Development Objectives of the project:

According to the TE, the Development Objective of the project was "to contribute to reverse the degradation of marine and coastal ecosystems within the Gulf of Honduras. This would be achieved by enhancing the prevention and control of maritime transport-related pollution within the Gulf of Honduras, by enhancing the prevention and control of maritime transport-related pollution in the major ports and navigation lanes, improving navigational safety to avoid groundings and spills, and reducing land-based inputs to the Gulf of Honduras."

No change was made to the Development Objectives of the project during the course of implementation.

#### 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 TE notes that the project objectives were determined to be a priority in all three countries through interviews, document review and field visits, and that these objectives have been incorporated in the work of the implementing agency. However, as pointed out in the Mid-Term Evaluation, the weakness is that the project gave a more national than regional approach. It is fair to recognize the efforts of civil society organizations and some government officials to find that the objectives of reducing the degradation and conservation of ecosystems of the Gulf are seen regionally.

### 5.2. *Effectiveness* – **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE notes that the project partially achieved the expected results. Although regional results were expected, however, those were more national in scope. At various instances, the TE has noted the difficulty in achievement of regional outcomes when there are differences between countries that do not favor the exchange of information or working together in activities outside the office.

The terminal evaluation makes a note of the results of the project, vis-à-vis its specific objectives:

- a) Create and consolidate a regional network to control maritime and land-based pollution within the Gulf of Honduras, which includes the development of institutional and economic frameworks that guarantee the Action Program's sustainability: Partially reached objective. New national institutional frameworks, UGAPs and similar bodies are in place and operational, and have funds to secure their sustainability, but the regional network has not been consolidated.
- b) Build long-term capacity to gather, arrange, analyze and disseminate marine environmental information as supplementary to the Environmental Information System (EIS) of the Mesoamerican Reef System (MBRS): Partly reached objective. Thanks to the Project, local capacity pertaining to information gathering, arrangement and dissemination remains in most ports, and the system is operative.
- c) To increase navigational safety in key ports and adopt innovative approaches in order to reduce marine environmental pollution related to operational and accidental spills into the sea: Partially reached objective. Studies on navigational safety were conducted, hydrographic work at ports was performed, but an electronic navigational chart for the Gulf was expected to be prepared and could not be done, nor a traditional chart. A particularly sensitive area under MARPOL Convention could not be delimited either.
- d) Conduct environmental management in the sub-regional network of five ports within the Gulf of Honduras, through the undertaking and execution of investments and action plans, including demonstration pilot activities and the involvement of the private sector: Partially reached objective. National and local management was conducted at the five ports, no local management was conducted, investment in equipment and training was made, and pilot projects were designed jointly with the private sector, but they were not executed.

Independently, it is noted that although the project has not reached 100% of its objectives, it is accepted by all respondents that the incidence reached has allowed the 5 ports to have now within the operational structure the Environmental Management Units or similar and that the consideration of the environmental issue both in the COCATRAM and port authorities as a reality.

### 5.3. *Efficiency* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

The TE notes that the project has not reached the expected efficiency, with utilization of only 71.3% of the budget at the time of evaluation - which is expected to rise to 84% at the closure. As mentioned in other sections, the project has had a low budget implementation every year. As a result, funds amounting to approximately \$750,000 remain unutilized.

In terms of time-efficiency, the project suffered from start-up delays. The project officially started in August 2005 and its closure was scheduled for August 2010. Due to delays in hiring the first coordinator and the “stay” originated by Honduras political situation, the project’s schedule suffered a phase lag and the Mid-Term Evaluation concluded that the actual time elapsed was 44 months. As a result of said conclusion, the Project’s Management Committee in its 7th Meeting held in San Pedro Sula in September 2010, set and recognized January 01, 2007 as the commencement date - in order to establish a date including all the weeks lost for different reasons, which were well justified and facilitate project’s programming according to real timing - and, therefore, the project’s technical closure would be on December 31, 2011, in order to complete the 60-month execution term provided for in the Project Document. Later on, at Management Committee’s 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting held in Belize in April 2012, it was agreed that the Project’s final closure would be on September 30, 2012, in order to extend the execution term to 69 effective months, and 85 months from the beginning of the Project.

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

The TE assesses four dimensions of risks for the project, i.e. financial risks, socio-political risks, institutional and governance risks and environmental risks and notes each of these in the ML category. It suggests that there are no additional risks to the project’s sustainability, than those identified at the project design phase. It is noted that the sustainability of the project, with information obtained through visits to places of operation of the project, interviews with key stakeholders and documentation reviewed, is guaranteed and the financial, socio-political, institutional and environmental risks associated with their achievement are moderate and is not expected to affect the results in the medium and long term.

## 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?

The Project Document provides a detailed break-up of the costs and financing of the project's overall budget, whereby it presents indicative figures for the GEF funds and Govt. co-financing allocated for each of the components as well as sub-components/activities. An assessment of this break-up helps to ascertain that the co-financing was deemed essential for the achievement of GEF objectives, and the components supported by co-financing were well-integrated into the project.

- 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 TE notes a higher level of actual co-financing materialized as compared to the figures promised for the same by each of the co-financing partners. However, the effect or consequences of higher materialization of co-financing are not noted.

## 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 was intended to have been executed from August 2005 until August 2010. The delays in hiring the first coordinator and Honduras political situation made the project's actual start from January 2007. No significant linkage between the delay and the outcomes is provided in the TE.

## 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 existing or established port authorities during the project have been mainly in charge of the local and national activities which have facilitated the objectives of the project. However, at the same time, the information was not shared among the countries and no significant cooperation activities were identified. The TE mentions that many of the project activities shall be executed at the national level by port authorities,

or regional level by COCATRAM. It seems, nonetheless, that many activities will be implemented at local or national level while it is not clear that regional activities shall be smoothly executed.

## **7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system**

### **7.1. M&E design at entry – Moderately Satisfactory**

In the project document, the monitoring plan was based on participatory methods through Project Management Committee, and verifiable indicators were divided into Management Performance and Project M&E indicators. They were put in the components and each indicator had a number or a percentage to be monitored and evaluated. The indicators also include the endorsement of ADA and PAE in order to activate stress reduction plans and collect monitoring data.

The weak part of the design is that it did not consider the process of establishing the mechanism to practically perform the actions of the planned M&E. To conduct data collection and technical measurement, the pre-conditions such as joint measurement standard, measurement schedules and personnel should have been settled in advance, which lacks in the project document. This could cause delays in the actual measurements.

### **7.2. M&E implementation – Unsatisfactory**

ADA and PAE for the project have not been endorsed by the time of the TE. This affected the conduct of data collection and many indicators had to be removed from the list. Only 13 out of the 29 indicators were still left in the list in 2012.

As the M&E indicators were a part of the project's components, the monitoring of each indicator would have helped give a better insight on what was achieved as an outcome of the project, rather than show progress with verifiable figures.

The TE provides only brief texts on each component as a whole, and short descriptions on what has changed and which indicators have survived in Spanish.

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

### **8.1. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution – Moderately Unsatisfactory**

### **8.2. Overall Quality of Implementation – Moderately Unsatisfactory**

According to the TE, it was the first GEF project that the IADB implemented, which might have caused confusion and adjustments at the early stage. Moreover, there was high staff turnover among international sectoral specialists in both the technical and the financial fields. In the documents provided, the bank's role seems to be limited to financial and administrative aspects by controlling budget, procurement and hiring process rather than to provide supervision and technical support. The TE comments that the bank's responses to the

requirements of the URCP were appropriate regarding the moderately swift responses. However, this could mean that the actions from the bank had always been passive.

There is no delimitation of the role of the bank in the project document and the others onward, meaning its role could be discussed or coordinated with executing agencies which does not seem to have happened.

### 8.3. *Overall Quality of Execution* – **Moderately Unsatisfactory**

CCAD as the co-executing agency had not been an effective partner. Even the COCATRAM, the main executing agency, did not take full leadership until its executive director took the lead and responsibility for the project directly with providing cash funds to cover unexpected expenses incurred by the project. Not mentioned in the TE, this late intervention could have affected regional coordination that was essential to the project from the beginning.

The role of the COCATRAM may be improved after the project closure because it will be the main body for the related activities in the Gulf of Honduras.

## 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 provides short but succinct descriptions of the relevant outcomes and impacts of the project, vis-à-vis the specific objectives of the project as outlined in the project design.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	MU	The TE discusses each aspect of the project's implementation with reference to the GEF-5 assessment criteria, in detail. It also makes note of the supporting evidences to substantiate the ratings provided against each of the criteria. No major evidence gaps are noted in the TE in this regard.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	MS	The TE analyses financial, sociopolitical, institutional and governance, and environmental risks together with the project's strengths and weaknesses, which can provide some insights and measures to be taken. The exit strategy is not directly mentioned, but when regarding the description on the improved role of COCATRAM and UGAPs of the ports, it was fair enough to expect the pattern of the future activities.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	S	The described lessons learned are based on the problems during the execution of the project and pertain to ideas on how to tackle similar completion. In this case, clear evidence is provided as the problems faced during the execution are often explained and described in the document.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	MS	The TE provides the expected and actual disbursements details only for the GEF funding while the other contributions are briefly introduced with the source of funding. Therefore, it is not possible to recognize the patterns of the other disbursements by timings and focus areas.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	S	The TE does not make any elaborate assessment pertaining to M&E of the project.

## 11. Other issues to follow up on

Budget overdrafts, unauthorized expenses, non-liquidation or delays in the liquidation of revolving funds, lack of foresight in fund requests had been detected during the first half of project execution, which was remedied with the recruitment of a financial expert within the URCP.

No further measure is deemed necessary in this case.



**Annex I - Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office**

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

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

One of the project outcomes contributing to knowledge generation was to "Build long-term capacity to gather, arrange, analyze and disseminate marine environmental information as supplementary to the Environmental Information System (EIS) of the Mesoamerican Reef System (MBRS)".

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

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

NA

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

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

Neither the intended electronic navigational chart, nor the traditional chart was produced. The COCATRAM operated the website for coordination, but it was not based on new information or collected data. On the other hand, information-sharing seems to be activated within a part of the project internally although the documents do not provide specific evidence.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?  
WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

NA

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

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

The TE notes that the project built local capacity pertaining to information gathering, arrangement and dissemination remains in most ports, and the system is operative.

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

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

Although the stakeholders' awareness increased, there is no evidence in the available documents indicating any specific change of behavior.

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

No

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

NA

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

NA

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

NA

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

No

Were these adopted?

NA

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

NA

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?

Yes

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

The project had established a Regional Project Coordination Unit (URCP) and the existing COCATRAM's (Central American Maritime Transport Commission) role became critical both for the coordination and sustainability. The TE makes note of a widespread perception that COCATRAM's role upon completion of the project will be critical to guarantee sustainability of the actions already executed by the project, especially the Local Stakeholders' Network (already published on COCATRAM's website), and exercises to control petroleum spills and emergencies. The importance of having the Regional Information Module already published on COCATRAM's website and an COCATRAM's official already designated to deal with the environmental issue within the organization has also been recognized.

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?

NA

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

No

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

The project could not overcome the frequently occurring regional project problems, featuring national interests, difficulties in establishing common rules and coordination shortage.

Did the project contribute to any of the following:

Technologies & Approaches Implementing	No
Mechanisms/Bodies	Yes
Financial Mechanisms	No

Please specify what was contributed:

COCATRAM has mandate to coordinate and maintain sustainability.

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)?

NA

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

No

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)?

NA

Did mainstreaming of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

No

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)?

NA

Did **removal of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place? No

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

NA

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?

Implementation Strategies <--dropdown menu

If "combination", then of which types?

& <--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? No

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? No

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**

NA

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

U  
A

Socioeconomic

U  
A

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

NA

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?

No

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

COCATRAM is supposed to be responsible to continue regional cooperation post-project, while local UGAPs or similar units are responsible for local/national implementation. The "Environmental Management Improvement" consulting issued relevant recommendations which have been delivered to the five local authorities. Currently, it is not possible to assess the changing or deepening role of the executing agencies due to the recent project completion.

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

No

Has the monitoring data been used for management?

No

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

The electronic navigation chart was to be prepared and utilized for navigation safety and bathmetries were to be performed, but neither of the two had been realized.

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

No

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**

NA

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

The TE puts forth a number of lessons learnt from the project implementation, covering various aspects that include:

- Design: Greater involvement of the Foreign Affairs Ministries is necessary at the design stage in order to solve ongoing disputes over border limits
- Participation Agreements and Commitments: Strong and effective commitments from the executors and co-executors are necessary
- Nationalities, Biases and Coordination: Unbiased regional coordinator is necessary for regional projects
- Project management, technical and scientific expertise: Need a balance between project management and technical/scientific expertise in the coordination unit
- Rules and proceedings: Project planning should allow for training activities on rules and proceedings
- Use of communication technologies: Projects should seek to use more virtual means of communication and information exchange

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The TE puts forth the following recommendations:

1. It is recommended that the Management Committee accept the results of the project. In order to increase commitment levels, it is recommended that the ProGOH Management Committee agree to provide the necessary resources to ensure sustainability of the results achieved over time and thus succeed in stabilizing water quality in the Gulf of Honduras and reduce degradation threats to existing ecosystems.
2. It is recommended that COCATRAM and CCAD increase their influence over governments to guarantee that the results obtained during project execution be duly institutionalized in the participating countries and in the programs of both entities. A final effort should be made to create result synergies between the countries involved, for instance, the preparation of a regional action protocol against spills, a protocol for communication between ports, hydrographic information sharing, among others. Not only should these protocols be “defined”, but they should also be put into practice jointly by the countries.
3. It is recommended that COCATRAM and CCAD undertake a concept clarification exercise at their highest management levels in order to define the meaning of regional, transboundary, and international waters, in order to have stronger grounds to decide whether they want to participate in new regional projects.