Terminal Evaluation- Golden Stream Watershed Project

November 2011

Alexandra Fischer

Table of Contents

ACRONYMS

APAMO	Association of Protected Areas management Organizations
BAPPA	Belize Association of Private Protected Areas
BD	Biodiversity
CBO	Community-Based Organization
CRFR	Colombia River Forest Reserve
EA	Executing Agency
FD	Forest Department
FFI	Flora and Fauna International
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GoB	Government of Belize
GSCP	Golden Stream Corridor Preserve
GSW	Golden Stream Watershed
GSWAC	Golden Stream Watershed Advisory Committee
GSWP	Golden Stream Watershed Project
IA	Implementing Agency
ILM	Integrated Landscape Management
L	Likely
ML	Moderately Likely
MNRE	Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment
MS	Moderately Satisfactory
MSP	Medium-Sized Project
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
NPAPSP	National Protected Areas Policy and Systems Plan
NPAS	National Protected Areas System
PA	Protected Area
PAMO	Protected Areas Management Organizations
PDF-A	Project Development Facility-A
PEG	Project Execution Group
PHMR	Port Honduras Marine Reserve
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PM	Project Manager
PMU	Project Management Unit
PPA	Private Protected Areas
ProDoc	UNDP Project Document
S	Satisfactory
ToR	Terms of Reference
TIDE	Toledo Institute for Development and Environment
TPR	Tripartite Review
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
WWF-WB	World Wildlife Fund- World Bank
YCT	Ya'axché Conservation Trust

LIST OF TABLES

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- **Brief description of project**

The overall objective of the project is to "function as a replicable example of how multiple protected areas working within an ecologically interconnected and interdependent area can jointly achieve conservation and sustainable use objectives, thereby catalyzing the sustainability of Belize's national protected area system". The project was designed to overcome a number of barriers that are undermining the sustainability of the National Protected Areas System (NPAS), including the fragmented nature of the system, the fact that its management is not cost-effective and does not ensure biological protection and the exclusion of private protected areas.

The Golden Stream Watershed Project (GSWP) design established the following four Outcomes: 1) Protected area management authorities are implementing a complementary set of management plans for the Golden Stream's Watershed four protected areas; 2) Protected area management authorities, local government bodies, private sector landholders, and local communities are co-operating in the implementation of sustainable development strategies over the long-term; 3) Fiscal and legislative environments affecting private protected areas enhanced by specific changes in the policy environment; 4) Protected area management authorities and other stakeholders throughout Belize have benefited from, and are beginning to apply, lessons learned from the GSWP experience.

- **Context and purpose of the evaluation**

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) is a requirement of both UNDP and GEF and followed the evaluation Terms of Reference (see Appendix 1) and the UNDP/GEF Policies and Evaluation Guidelines. The overall objective of the TE is to analyze the design and implementation of the project, as well as review the achievements made by the project to deliver the specified objective and outcomes. It analyzes the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the project, including the sustainability of results. The evaluation also presents specific lessons learned and recommendations pertaining to the strategies employed and implementation arrangements, which may be of relevance to other projects in the country and elsewhere in the world.

The evaluation took place from July- September 2011. The methodology included an in-depth review of project documentation, interviews with key stakeholders in Belize, a field-trip to the project site, follow-up phone interviews and correspondence, detailed analysis of findings and preparation of the draft and final reports.

- **Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned**

Project formulation
The project conceptualization/design is considered satisfactory. The project proposal was well-formulated and stemmed from a sound analysis of threats and barriers. In addition, the Project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs followed a logical progression. However, the original logical framework had certain deficiencies, most of which were addressed during the course of project implementation. The project explicitly considered the replication approach in its design, and in fact included an entire outcome to promote information dissemination, the sharing of lessons learned and replication, with significant budgetary allocations for this component. The project is in line with Belize's commitments, policies and strategies. Linkages with other projects and interventions in the sector were made and the project fit well with the government's National Protected Area Policy and System Plan. Overall, the project design was thorough, but may have been somewhat overambitious for a four-year project.

While stakeholders were extensively consulted during the initial project development stages, some of the later adjustments were made by the project designer, the Implementing Agency (IA) and Executing Agency (EA), without full consultation with community groups, government and other NGOs. In addition, the long delays in project development led to a reduced level of stakeholder support. For these reasons, stakeholder participation in project formulation is considered moderately satisfactory.

UNDP had a strong comparative advantage as the IA due to its in-country presence, extensive network of contacts and previous experience in implementing protected areas projects and supporting natural resource legislation in the country. Management arrangements were clearly outlined in the Project Document, however it might have been useful to provide greater clarity on the role of the government as "owner" of the project, particularly because this was the first time a Medium-Sized UNDP/GEF (MSP) project was being executed by an NGO on behalf of the government of Belize.

Project Implementation

The overall implementation approach used in this project is considered satisfactory. The logical framework, once the necessary revisions were made, served as an effective management tool. Furthermore, the project consistently employed adaptive management to deal with situations that arose on the ground. The project established a strong monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system, rated as satisfactory, which followed the standard UNDP/GEF monitoring requirements. Once the logframe was revised, the baselines and indicators were generally appropriate to adequately measure project progress. All recommendations provided in the MTE, with the exception of two, were implemented. A number of studies were commissioned to monitor project progress on different indicators and appropriate data analysis was undertaken. The total budget for M&E was deemed sufficient.

The project's financial management was considered sound. In terms of human resource management, the technical capacities of project staff and consultants were generally strong, and in the event that expectations were not met, timely changes were made.

The NGO execution modality for a MSP was a first for Belize and there were some initial misunderstandings between the Implementing Agency (IA) and Executing Agency (EA) as to their respective roles and responsibilities. The EA became accustomed to UNDP/GEF procedures and policies and the IA learned to adopt a more flexible approach when working with an NGO as EA. The operational relationship between the two organizations therefore became stronger over time and was marked by consistent communication. Some interviewees commented that this execution modality led to difficulties maintaining government engagement with the project, and there were varying opinions about the level of government ownership of the project. The Forest Department, responsible for protected area management in the country, provided valuable input into the project and chaired the Project Board. However, human resource constraints were an issue, particularly in the later stages of project implementation. In addition, there were some who felt that the government did not provide sufficient support in terms of the policy elements of the project.

Project products, such as the watershed-level strategy and protected area management plans, were developed with the extensive participation of stakeholders. There was also a significant level of information dissemination to stakeholders, although some interviewees commented that more could have been done in the earlier stages of the project. Local resource users held a position on the Board, however, it was difficult to maintain consistent representation from the communities. The larger Golden Stream Watershed Advisory Committee, which was established in order to facilitate broad stakeholder participation, did not function as well as expected, with inconsistent attendance at meetings and infrequent meetings. Apart from this committee, local resource users participated with interest in a

number of capacity building sessions and implemented sustainable development activities, such as beekeeping, agroforestry with cacao and agro-processing activities. Interviews suggest that TIDE's sense of project ownership and level of project participation, particularly on the Project Board, could have been greater. Overall, stakeholder participation in project implementation is rated as moderately satisfactory.

Results:

Achievement of Project Objective: "For the Golden Stream Watershed (GSW) to function as a replicable model of how multiple protected areas working within an ecologically interconnected and interdependent area can jointly achieve conservation and sustainable use objectives, thereby catalyzing the sustainability of Belize's national protected area system."

The project served as an important pilot in the implementation of an integrated landscape management approach to protected areas management in Belize in an area of high conservation value. In so doing, the project achieved some conservation gains as well as uptake of sustainable development activities in buffer communities. Significant progress was made in demonstrating the viability of the operational aspects of implementing an ILM approach to PA management on the ground, and in validating the assumptions of the NPAPSP. However, while the groundwork for legislative revisions to incorporate private protected areas in the national protected area system was laid, the legislation has not yet been adopted by the government. In addition, limited implementation of strategies and management plans occurred during the project and there remain funding constraints for project follow-up. Overall, achievement of the Project Objective and Outcomes can be said to be moderately satisfactory.

Outcome 1: Protected area management authorities, with the support and participation of buffer area stakeholders, have jointly developed and are collaborating to implement a standardized and complementary set of management plans for the GSW's four protected areas.

For the most part, Outcome 1 was achieved by the project, with the development of an overarching watershed-level strategy and standardized management plans for GSW's protected areas, as well as collaborative joint implementation of two of the three management plans, including joint biodiversity monitoring and enforcement. The management plan for Colombia River Forest Reserve is the only plan that is not yet being implemented, due to political, social and funding issues that were generally outside of the control of the project. The development of the PA management plans took longer than anticipated and less time remained for implementation than was hoped.

Outcome 2: Protected area management authorities, local government bodies, private sector landholders and local communities have jointly developed a strategy for sustainable development of the GSW landscape that strengthens the financial sustainability of the protected area system and provides widespread benefits to the communities at large, and are co-operating to sustain its implementation over the long-term

This Outcome was partially achieved, with the joint development of a watershed strategy, including a Business Planning Strategy, to provide benefits to the communities in the Golden Stream watershed area, as well as uptake of initiatives identified in the Business Planning Strategy as part of the landscape approach, such as agroforestry and beekeeping. As the promotion of sustainable development activities in the communities of the area is part of Ya'axché's (YCT) activities as an organization (the NGO has even established a Community Outreach and Livelihoods Programme), the execution of the Business Planning Strategy is ongoing. However, it should be noted that the different stakeholders were not able to establish a sustainable watershed advisory body and funding limitations in terms of the long-term implementation of the strategy remain. More effort in socializing the Business Planning Strategy among communities, more time and additional resources are required.

Outcome 3: Fiscal and legislative environments affecting private protected areas have been clarified and improved as a result of collaborative NPAPSP /BAPPA / GSW efforts, providing mechanisms to effectively integrate private protected areas and private lands within landscape level management systems

This Outcome was only partially achieved, owing to factors generally outside of the control of the project. The groundwork was laid in terms of development of recommendations for the legislation to incorporate private protected areas into the national protected areas system through a collaborative effort with BAPPA. In addition, a proposed Conservation Covenant Act was prepared which would allow for private landholdings to establish conservation easements. The project Executing Agency felt that it took the issue as far as it could and that it succeeded in putting the issue back on the agenda for discussion. However, the proposed legislative amendments have not yet been adopted by the government and incorporated into the legislative framework, and are being considered as part of a larger effort to revise the National Protected Areas Act.

Outcome 4: Protected area management authorities and other stakeholders throughout Belize have benefited from, and are beginning to apply, lessons learned from the GSW experience, thereby consolidating the NPAS

The project succeeded in disseminating a substantial amount of information on the GSW experience to relevant stakeholders across the country, several of which have expressed interest in the model developed. Some elements of the integrated landscape management approach modeled by the project are beginning to be applied in different parts of the country, although greater replication and application of lessons learned would have been desired.

Sustainability

There is sufficient momentum at the national level in terms of policy reform that it is likely that the integrated landscape management approach to protected areas management will continue to be promoted and increasing replication will occur over time. Ongoing work to operationalize Belize's protected areas system will continue to draw on lessons learned from this project. Furthermore, the project succeeded in raising the level of awareness and building capacity in this field, both locally and nationally. In terms of the Golden Stream Watershed, the continued implementation of joint management activities between co-managing NGOs are expected, as well as ongoing work with local communities to promote sustainable activities in the areas buffering the protected areas, in line with the integrated landscape management approach. The project contributed significantly to the institutional strengthening of YCT and led to the development of products that continue to guide the organization's work. In addition, the capacity of FD technicians was increased. The extent of implementation will be dependent, however, on the level of financial resources available to further implement the planning tools produced by the project and undertake integrated protected areas management using a landscape approach, as well as on the level of political support to promote uptake of the concept and establish the necessary supportive policy and legislative framework.

While some funding is available to the Protected Area Management Organizations (PAMOs) in the area, YCT, TIDE and to a lesser extent, FD, there is a risk that the level of financial resources will not be sufficient to permit the full implementation of the management plans for the GSW protected areas and for the implementation of activities proposed in the Business Planning Strategy. The level of support for the project outcomes among stakeholders is generally high, including among community groups and the government, which is currently revising the entire Protected Areas Act based on a landscape management approach and preparing a Land Use Policy for the country. Local governors tend to be less supportive of

such initiatives and need to continue to be engaged by PAMOs to solicit their support. There remain a number of policies and legislative issues whose adoption would strengthen the framework for implementing the Golden Stream Watershed Management Strategy. It is hoped that some of the most critical issues will be addressed through the revision of the National Protected Areas Act. While the project succeeded in raising the level of awareness among decision makers, technicians and PAMOs about ILM, further socializing and capacity building are needed to fully institutionalize the concept in Belize.

Recommendations based on lessons learned:

Project design

- Develop strong logframe with baselines, SMART indicators and realistic targets to avoid need for later revisions and loss of time
- Hire project designer(s) who are familiar with GEF requirements to speed up the process of project development and approval
- Establish project outputs and outcomes that are achievable in the national context
- Do not underestimate the length of time it can take to bring about significant changes, including those related to policies and legislation
- Design projects with short planning periods and ensure sufficient time is dedicated for implementation
- Make project attractive at local community level
- Ensure sufficient time and funds allocated to obtain community buy-in and to work closely with communities
- Ensure that PAMOs participate in project design from the outset so the project is consistent with organizational goals
- Consider gender issues in design and budget of project
- Ensure that the government's role in an NGO executed project is made explicit in the UNDP Project Document

Project implementation and results

- Establish strong communication lines with government to promote national ownership of projects
- Attempt to keep non-project related issues from affecting relationship between NGO/EA and Government
- Flexibility on the part of UNDP is required
- Clarify roles and responsibilities of key partners early on
- Make sure ToRs of staff and consultants are tight and make timely changes if required
- Hire staff and consultants with the necessary experience
- Verify that the logframe is adequate to track progress
- For projects spanning a change in the national administration, carry out a resocialization process
- Ensure that government ownership resides in the institution itself, rather than only in particular individuals
- Promote the GEF Operational Focal Point's role in consolidating government support
- Socialize the project with local politicians from the outset to solicit their support
- Dedicate sufficient time to raise funds for project follow-up
- Be careful not to raise communities' expectations
- Develop strategies to ensure active community participation
- Target both men and women in outreach activities

- Promote micro-enterprises among women to contribute to their empowerment
- Disseminate information throughout project implementation
- Ensure that the data gathered through biodiversity monitoring measures the most relevant management-related factors

Other Recommendations

- Recognize that true collaboration among PAMOs is difficult but can yield efficiencies
- Continue to work to institutionalize integrated landscape management at the policy-making and operational levels
- Continue to promote national policies to support the ILM approach
- Promote high-level synergies between protected areas management and the national development agenda
- In order for sustainable livelihoods activities to play a significant role in poverty reduction, there is a need for greater and longer-term support

Table 1: Ratings for Terminal Evaluation of the Golden Stream Watershed Project

Project element	**Rating**
Project formulation- conceptualization/design	Satisfactory
Project formulation- stakeholder participation	Moderately Satisfactory
Project implementation- implementation approach	Satisfactory
Project implementation- monitoring and evaluation	Satisfactory
Project implementation- stakeholder participation	Moderately Satisfactory
Project results	Moderately Satisfactory
Sustainability- Financial resources	Moderately Likely
Sustainability- Socio-political	Moderately Likely
Sustainability- Institutional/governance	Likely
Sustainability- Environmental	Likely

2 INTRODUCTION

2.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

1. The Terminal Evaluation (TE) is a requirement of UNDP and GEF and thus it is principally initiated by UNDP Belize Country Office. It was conducted according to guidance, rules and procedures for such evaluations established by UNDP and the Global Environment Facility.

2. The overall objective of the TE is to analyze the implementation of the project, review the achievements made by the project to deliver the specified objectives and outcomes. It establishes the relevance, performance and success of the project, including the sustainability of results. The evaluation also brings together and analyzes specific lessons, best practices and recommendations pertaining to the strategies employed and implementation arrangements, which may be of relevance to other projects in the country and elsewhere in the world.

3. The TE provides a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of a completed project by assessing its project design, process of implementation and results vis-à-vis project objectives including the agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation. TEs have three complementary purposes:

   - To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
   - To synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future UNDP-GEF activities;
   - To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues.

2.2 Key issues addressed

4. This evaluation will analyze the following five major criteria:

   - Relevance**.** The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
   - Effectiveness**.** The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
   - Efficiency**.** The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy.
   - Results**.** The positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects.
   - Sustainability**.** The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

5. The evaluation will provide general information about the evaluation; assess project results, based on the criteria of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, and provide a rating of project outcomes using

the scale from Highly Unsatisfactory to Highly Satisfactory; assess the sustainability of project outcomes; describe the catalytic role of the project; and assess the monitoring and evaluation systems.

6. As per the Terms of Reference for this consultancy, the following specific topics are also considered in this evaluation.

- Have there been changes in local stakeholder behavior that have contributed to improved conservation/ land management? If not, why not?
- Have the products of the project informed/ shaped national protected areas thinking/ planning processes?
- Is there distinct improvement in coordination efforts among GSW management agencies?
- Has awareness of the project outputs and subsequent public participation in GSW management increased as a result of the project?
- Is there adequate planning in place, or in progress, ensuring the delivery of project outcomes?

7. Given that almost one year has passed since the Project Management Unit completed its work, this evaluation is also serving as an ex-post evaluation, enabling some early analysis of the sustainability of project results.

2.3 Methodology of the evaluation:

8. The methodology for this Terminal Evaluation included the following components:

(i) Documentation review (desk study). The list of documents reviewed is provided in Annex 5.

(ii) Pre-Evaluation meeting. The consultant engaged in a pre-evaluation meeting and debriefing session with UNDP/Belize to review the scope of the Terminal Evaluation and to finalize the evaluation methodology, and itinerary of interviews.

(iii) Interviews. These were carried out with the following individuals/ organizations: the Government of Belize, Forest Department; GEF Operational Focal Point; Ya'axché Conservation Trust; Toledo Institute for Development and Environment; GSW Project Manager, Representative of the GSW Project Execution Group; the Belize Association of Private Protected Areas; the Association of Protected Areas Management Organizations; the Policy Unit of the MNRE; Fauna and Flora International; UNDP Belize; Toledo Maya Women's Council; and several community members. Please see Annex 3 for a list of the individuals interviewed. A semi-structured interview format was adopted to ensure that all critical topics were covered while maintaining a certain level of flexibility to explore additional relevant issues.

(iv) A one-day field trip. This took place in the Golden Stream Watershed (Toledo District), specifically the Port Honduras Marine Reserve and Golden Stream Corridor, and buffer communities of the watershed. [1]

(v) Report preparation. This involved a detailed analysis of data, follow-up phone calls to address information gaps, consolidation of the information, and preparation of the final report.

[1] Please note that the evaluator also prepared a presentation on the initial findings of the evaluation, but this was cancelled due to time constraints.

2.4 Structure of the Evaluation

9. The structure of this evaluation follows the Terms of Reference provided by UNDP Belize and approved by the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordinating Unit (see Annex 1). UNDP Guidelines for Evaluators as well as GEF evaluation policies were followed as well as the specific expectations of the Implementing agency (IA) and Executing Agency (EA).

3 THE PROJECT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

3.1 Project Start and its Duration

10. The project was approved by GEF on October 19, 2005. It commenced on June 23, 2006 and the first Project Manager began working on September 25, 2006. The main project activities ended in August, 2010 when the Project Manager left, and the Terminal Evaluation is being carried out from July 2011 to January 2012, with the project operational and financial closure planned for 2012.

3.2 Problems that the project seeks to address

11. A total of 36% of Belize's land mass is covered by terrestrial protected areas. Recent national initiatives, such as the development of the National Protected Areas Policy and System Plan (NPAPSP) , have highlighted certain deficiencies in the administration and management of protected areas. Specifically, the current system is faced with different legal, administrative and management regimes which are not sufficiently coordinated and which are inconsistent with the recent, more cohesive NPAPSP. Moreover, there are vague and incongruent policies on land use and insufficient financial and technical resources.

12. In addition, it should be mentioned that there is insufficient coordination among government departments and entities responsible for providing organizational, technical, legal and on-ground support to the different NGOs that co-manage a number of national and private protected areas in Belize.

13. The NPAPSP identified the importance of consolidated management of protected areas through a variety of management regimes to permit effective regional and site based management of the protected areas. In addition, the need to strengthen the legislative framework to support both co-management and private protected areas was identified in order to establish a "simpler, stronger, comprehensive and financially sustainable" protected areas system in Belize.

14. The project aims to address the following three main barriers, which are key to ensuring the sustainability of Belize's National Protected Areas System, including the specific protected areas included in the Golden Stream Watershed:

    i. A fragmented NPAS is not cost-effective or financially sustainable. The model project intends to demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of protected area management though collaborative efforts with management partners and the utilization of existing management tools that aim to harmonize protected areas management at the national level.
    ii. A fragmented landscape does not protect biodiversity or ensure the biological corridors critical to genetic exchange and the viability of populations of species are maintained. An integrated ecosystem management approach to ensure connectivity of the landscape matrix is needed. The project will support and promote a management strategy for the

Golden Stream Watershed focusing on maintaining the biodiversity and ecological values of the area while integrating stakeholders' needs.

iii. Private protected areas are not currently legally integrated as part of the NPAPSP and as such, there are few incentives or mechanisms for their establishment or effective management for conservation**.** The project intends to promote the development of fiscal incentives and legislative requirements for the incorporation of private protected areas into the National Protected Areas System.

3.3 Immediate and development objectives of the project

15. The overall or development objective of the project is to "function as a replicable example of how multiple protected areas working within an ecologically interconnected and interdependent area can jointly achieve conservation and sustainable use objectives, thereby catalyzing the sustainability of Belize's national protected area system".

16. The following four program support objectives (PSOS)/ immediate objectives/ Outcomes have been articulated in response to the overall project objective:

    1. Protected area management authorities are implementing a complementary set of management plans for the Golden Stream's Watershed four protected areas.

    2. Protected area management authorities, local government bodies, private sector landholders, and local communities are co-operating in the implementation of sustainable development strategies over the long-term.

    3. Fiscal and legislative environments affecting private protected areas enhanced by specific changes in the policy environment.

    4. Protected area management authorities and other stakeholders throughout Belize have benefited from, and are beginning to apply, lessons learned from the GSWP experience.

3.4 Main stakeholders

17. The GSWP involves a number of direct and indirect stakeholders distributed across various sectors. The primary stakeholders are those who are affected directly by the project's interventions. These include the protected area managers (FFI/YCT, TIDE, FD and Fisheries Department), landowners and local communities who are important stakeholders for the integrated landscape management model to be successful.

18. The Ya'axché Conservation Trust (YCT) is a community-oriented non-governmental organization established in 1998 with the following mission statement: "YCT is a community-based organization which advances integrated landscape management for equitable development in southern Belize through sustainable land use management, strategic advocacy and awareness and by supporting socially innovative and financially viable alternatives". The organization works on four programmatic areas, including Sustainable Land Use Management Programme, the Community Outreach and Livelihoods Programme, the Advocacy Programme, and the Institutional Governance and Management Programme. YCT co-manages the Golden Stream Corridor Preserve, which is located in the Golden Stream Watershed, and also undertakes sustainable livelihood activities in the project area. YCT was identified as the local NGO that would be in charge of on-the-ground

execution of the project, on behalf of the official Executing Agency for this project, Fauna and Flora International.

19. Fauna and Flora International is an international NGO whose mission is to act to conserve threatened species and ecosystems worldwide, choosing solutions that are sustainable, based on sound science and taking into account human needs. It is the Executing Agency for this project and delegated the day-to-day execution of the GSWP to its local partner, YCT.

20. The Toledo Institute for Development and the Environment (TIDE) is a non-governmental organization founded in 1997, whose mission is to: "foster community participation in resource management and sustainable use of ecosystems within the Maya Mountain Marine Corridor of southern Belize for the benefit of present and future generations". The organization works in four main programmatic areas, namely, the terrestrial management programme, marine programme, education and outreach programme, and TIDE tours. TIDE was awarded the UNDP Equator Prize for "outstanding community efforts in the area of poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation". TIDE co-manages a number of blocks of land in the project area, including Blocks 123, 127 and 130, as well as the Port Honduras Marine Reserve.

21. Belize's Forest Department (FD) under the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment (MNRE) is responsible for managing the forestry resources of Belize, which includes all national forests, protected areas, wildlife, and biological diversity of terrestrial zones. The Forest Department's Vision Statement is: "The Forest Department is a leading modern and committed government agency with a well trained, accountable and professional staff efficiently coordinating resources for the sustainable management of Belize' Natural Resources, while proactively contributing to the achievement of local, regional and global goals for present and future generations." FD officially endorsed the GSWP in 2005. FD manages the Colombia River Forest Reserve, located in the Golden Stream Watershed.

22. A number of communities buffer the protected areas of the Golden Stream Watershed, including Indian Creek, Medina Bank, Golden Stream, Indian Creek, Big Falls, Silver Creek, San Miguel, and San Pedro Columbia. A large proportion of inhabitants are of Mayan origin and practice subsistence agriculture. In addition, there are several private sector businesses in the area, most notably Belize Lodge & Excursions, an ecotourism company, and Golden Stream Plantations, a citrus plantation.

23. Secondary stakeholders include Government institutions, NPAC, and PACT that have direct incidence on policies and the administration of the legal instruments pertaining to protected areas and other organizations. The National Protected Areas Secretariat implements the decisions of the National Protected Areas Technical Committee, which provides guidance on the implementation of the NPAPSP and was established in 2010. Prior to the National Protected Areas Technical Committee, the National Protected Areas Commission was assigned this role, however, this Commission was relatively inactive during project implementation.

24. The Belize Association of Private Protected Areas (BAPPA) and the Association of Protected Area Management Organizations (APAMO) are also secondary stakeholders who are involved in protected areas management. Included also are the government institutions that coordinate productive sector initiatives, especially agriculture and tourism. Finally, UNDP-Belize is an important stakeholder as the Implementing Agency for the GSWP. UNDP-Belize has played a key role in the development of national resource legislation and in protected area issues in the country.

25. A third level of stakeholders includes the NGOs or Sectors which operate in the Toledo District and which provide support to the project activities.

26. The fourth and final level of stakeholders are those involved in other supporting and complementary initiatives being carried out within the Toledo district and at the National level such as the Toledo Healthy Forest Initiative (THFI), the Belize Rural Development Project (BRDP), and Forest Managers of private companies with long-term licenses which operate in Forest Reserves in the immediate vicinity of the project area.

3.5 Results expected

27. The Logical Framework presented in Annex 7 identifies the Project Objective and four Project Outcomes, as well as associated indicators, baselines, targets, sources of verification, risks and assumptions. Note that the project underwent several revisions of the Logical Framework, and the Annex presents the latest version after the Mid-Term Evaluation.

4 FINDINGS

4.1 Project Formulation

Conceptualization/Design (S)

28. The project conceptualization/design is considered satisfactory. The project proposal was well-formulated and stemmed from a sound analysis of existing threats and barriers. In addition, the proposal presented a detailed national baseline. It is felt that the project's selected intervention strategy, which included the participatory development and implementation of a watershed-level strategy, protected area (PA) management plans and a business plan, support for complementary sustainable development activities, legislative reform, and the promotion of replication, was appropriate to address the barriers identified for the project area.

29. It should be noted that this project was associated with an extensive and extended process of development, beginning in 1999 until its endorsement by GEF in 2005 and its start-up in 2006. During this process, the project evolved and included a greater emphasis on replication beyond the project site, on the delivery of outputs to support the National Protected Areas Policy and System Plan, and an increased focus on the landscape-level management approach.

30. A specific section of the project proposal provided a detailed account of how lessons learned from other relevant projects were incorporated into the project design. For example, the need for capacity building within FD, the importance of an adequate policy and legislative framework, and the importance of working at a landscape level were identified.

31. The Project Objective, four Project Outcomes and Outputs are considered to have followed a logical progression. The logical framework initially submitted with the project proposal in 2005 had certain deficiencies, including the fact that the results indicators were not always SMART (i.e., specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely), making it difficult to monitor project progress and impact. Furthermore, some of the indicators were no longer appropriate at the time of project start-up as a result of changes in the project environment since the time of initial development of the proposal.

Given that it was not serving as an effective management tool, the logframe was revised in May 2007, such that the indicators were easier to measure, and realistic project outcome targets were set. These timely modifications were considered to have been key to guiding implementation and ensuring project impact. This underscores the importance of ongoing monitoring to ensure that indicators remain relevant over time. Subsequent modifications to the logframe were made to incorporate the baseline information gathered in the first year of project implementation, and again in 2008 after the Mid-Term Evaluation, to provide more specificity, modify some wording, adjust the timing of achievement of some targets, and add an additional indicator related to riparian connectivity.

32. However, there was still a lack of specificity in some of the baselines and targets in the final logframe. For example, at the Objective Level, for the indicator pertaining to economic enterprises, the target was: "businesses, some certified, established and coordinated across each relevant sector…", but the number of businesses the project was meant to establish or support was not identified. For Output 3.1, the baseline information was missing (the percentage of the public interviewed that recognized the unique role that PPAs play in Belize's National Development). Outputs 3.1 and 4.1 include a target that refers to "widespread awareness", without defining "widespread", making it difficult to measure whether the targets have been achieved. In some cases, achievement of the target does not necessarily equate with achievement of the Outcome. For example, for Outcome 4, "Protected area management authorities and other stakeholders throughout Belize have benefited from, and are beginning to apply lessons learned from the GSW experience", the established target does not measure whether the protected areas management organizations are actually reaping benefits from the application of the lessons learned.

33. In addition, some of the stakeholders interviewed felt that the project outcomes and targets themselves may have been overambitious given the timelines of national processes. For example, it may have been unrealistic to assume that a number of different strategies and management plans would be developed *and* implemented in the course of a four-year project, and the proposed output of actually putting in place the first conservation easement in the country may not have been politically palatable given the national context at the time of project implementation.

Country-ownership/Driveness

34. This project was in line with Belize's commitments as a party to the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (ratified by Belize in 1993) and supports the National Biodiversity Strategy. The project forwarded the national protected areas agenda by serving as a demonstration site for the application of an integrated protected areas and landscape management approach as espoused in the National Protected Area Policy and System Plan (NPAPSP). The project also complemented the work of the Toledo Healthy Forest Initiative Taskforce and the Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT) in the region.

35. The project supported the implementation of Belize's sustainable development policies for Toledo and Southern Belize, such as the 1999 Economic and Social Technical Assistance Project Regional Development Plan for southern Belize, and the objectives of the Toledo Development Corporation.

The proposal included a table summarizing project support to national priorities (*see pages 5-6 of proposal*). The Government of Belize officially endorsed the GSWP in 2005.

Stakeholder participation (MS)

36. The level of stakeholder participation in project formulation is considered moderately satisfactory. The extensive period of preparation of the PDF-A for this project included significant contributions from a diverse array of stakeholders. A number of stakeholder consultation sessions were funded, including three stakeholder project design and planning workshops as well as smaller focus group sessions and meetings. Stakeholders provided input into the project components, objectives and activities, the composition of the GSWAC, the threat analysis, approaches to tackle the threats, and possible sustainable income-generating alternatives, among other elements.

37. Despite the thorough stakeholder consultation at the PDF-A stage, there was a significant period of time between these initial consultations and the approval of the final document, which meant that due to staff turnover and changes in community leaders, some of the new stakeholders did not provide input. Furthermore, the delays undermined the project's momentum and were associated with a certain degree of loss of support from stakeholder groups. In order to ensure that the project would meet GEF requirements, some revisions were made during the later stages of project development by the project design consultant, FFI and UNDP, without fully consulting with other stakeholders about these changes, resulting in a situation where the final document differed somewhat from the concept agreed upon by the community stakeholders. The approved project was focused more on the production of plans and strategies, and included less practical community engagement.

38. TIDE indicated that it did not participate to the extent possible in the design of the project, and the ILM approach to PA management espoused in the project did not fully fit with TIDE's previous work, which was oriented more toward ecosystem-based management. While TIDE does engage communities in resource management, the organization does not yet have a full livelihoods program, and indicated in interviews that it may not have been fully ready to embrace the ILM approach to PA management.

39. According to the minutes of the first Project Board meeting in February 2007, "concerns were raised that stakeholder input into project design was not current". It should be noted that once the project commenced, a re- inception workshop was carried out with stakeholder groups to present the project to new staff members of stakeholder organizations. This was felt to be a very useful undertaking.

Replication approach

40. A replication approach was explicitly considered in the design of this project, the main objective of which was to serve as a replicable model for how multiple protected areas can jointly achieve conservation and sustainable development objectives. In fact, an entire outcome was dedicated to promoting information dissemination, sharing lessons learned and encouraging replication, with corresponding budgetary allocations (Outcome 4). Slightly over 30% of the GEF grant was allocated to this outcome (20% of the total project budget including co-financing). Possible sites for replication were identified in the project proposal.

41. The proposal identified a number of different activities to promote replication, such as:

- Production of materials to document the GSW experience, such as pamphlets, project information and updates to be posted on the website, Powerpoint presentations delivered to relevant meetings, as well as an interactive CD-Rom at the end of the project;
- Meetings and field trips organized for stakeholders, such as APAMO, BAPPA, the Forest Department and Fisheries Department;
- Support to replication of the GSW example for interested agencies, for example through field visits;
- Capacity building/training of key stakeholders in the GSW in areas such as participatory planning, sustainable resource management and small business enterprise development, among others.

42. During project design, activities under Outcome 3 were also identified as "strengthening the enabling environment" for regional and national replication. The replication approach detailed in the project design is considered appropriate and adequate.

Other aspects

UNDP Comparative Advantage

43. UNDP-Belize has a strong comparative advantage as the Implementing Agency for this project. UNDP is the only GEF Implementing Agency with a physical office in Belize. As such, UNDP's Country Office and Environmental Programme Analyst could provide the Executing Agency with a greater level of support and with timely responses, particularly when adapting to changing circumstances. Furthermore, UNDP has an extensive network of contacts in the country to draw upon and knowledge of partner dynamics, especially important when interventions to remediate problematic situations are required. When the project was developed, Sustainable Management of Environmental Resources was the largest of UNDP Belize's three programs. Sustainable development in the broader sense is still a significant part of the work UNDP Belize undertakes.

44. UNDP has played an important role in the development of natural resource legislation in Belize and in protected areas issues specifically. UNDP was the Implementing Agency for the UNDP-GEF Community Co-Managed Park System Medium-Sized Project (2001-2003), which identified barriers to effective PA management, information that was useful in the conceptualization of this project. Lessons learned and recommendations from this project, including the need to strengthen PA governance, played an important role in the decision by the Belizean government to review the national protected areas management system. Subsequently, UNDP was involved in, and provided funding support for, the process of revising the protected areas management system, which led to the first National Protected Areas Policy and System Plan (NPAPSP). The GSWP project maintains a strong fit with this previous work, as it serves as a pilot or demonstration site to apply the NPAPSP on the ground.

45. It should also be noted that UNDP implemented the "Conservation and Sustainable Use of the Belize Barrier Reef" Full-Sized Project and that UNDP/GEF and YCT/FFI are involved with two Full-Sized

regional programmes that include Belize, namely the Mesoamerican Biological Corridor (MBC) and the Mesoamerican Barrier Reef System (MBRS).

Consideration of linkages between project and other interventions within the sector

46. The project proposal included an analysis of the linkages of the project with other GEF projects in Belize, as well as the consistency of the project with Belize's policies and progammes related to protected areas management and sustainable development. The project supported the implementation of the NPAPSP, which outlines the framework for protected areas management in Belize, including streamlining administration, coordination and consolidation of protected areas in Belize and legal reform. The timing of the project was opportune as it followed the date of endorsement of the NPAPSP. The protected areas that are the focus of this project are located in one of the three natural units identified in the NPAPSP as areas of exceptional importance that would benefit from consolidation, namely the Maya Mountain-Mountain Pine Ridge Massif. This southeastern corridor extending from the Maya Mountains to the ocean is also a vital corridor identified by the Mesoamerican Biological Corridors Project.

Definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage

47. The UNDP Project Document provided Terms of Reference and outlined the responsibilities of the project's managing entities, including UNDP as the Implementing Agency, Fauna and Flora International as the Executing Agency (with responsibility for the day-to-day supervision being undertaken by the local NGO YCT), the Project Steering Committee, Project Director, Project Management Unit, and consultants. An organogram was included to illustrate the project steering mechanism and Project Management Unit relationships. The project proposal also included a section describing the implementation/execution arrangements.

48. A Project Cooperation Agreement, endorsed by the Government of Belize, was entered into by UNDP and Fauna and Flora International, detailing the management arrangements for project execution (including issues such as financial records, reporting requirements, supplies, vehicles and procurement, personnel, and standard legal clauses). A Memorandum of Agreement governs the relationship between FFI and the Golden Stream Corridor Preserve (now YCT) in general, and a specific agreement for this project was also established between FFI and YCT.

49. Neither the project proposal nor the UNDP Project Document included much information to clarify the role of the Government of Belize (GoB) as "owner" of the project, which might have been useful, particularly given that this was the first Medium-Sized UNDP/GEF project executed by an NGO on behalf of the government of Belize. In the Extraordinary Meeting of the Tripartite Partners of February 2007, the fact that the project was a GoB project with the GoB having made the decision to partner with an NGO was clarified, and according to the minutes, the "need for the [UNDP] ProDoc to make the partnering [with the NGO], more explicit was highlighted". Furthermore, more detail on the division of responsibilities between FFI and YCT might have been helpful.

4.2 Project Implementation

Implementation Approach (S)

50. The overall project implementation approach is considered satisfactory. Details are provided in the next sections.

i) Use of the logframe as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this

51. The original logical framework submitted in 2005 was revised in May of 2007, as explained in Section 4.1 of this report, as it was not serving as a useful management tool, in particular since some of the indicators were not sufficiently measurable and some targets were somewhat unrealistic. The logframe was revised again with the addition of baseline information after the first year of project implementation. After the Mid-Term Evaluation in 2008, some further adjustments were made to the logframe. Specifically, the wording of some indicators or targets was modified to be more specific, additional assumptions were added to reflect new realities, an indicator related to riparian connectivity was added, some of the target dates were changed to allow the project more time to achieve them and the specific target identifying the number of businesses to be established was removed.

52. The logframe revisions played an important role in strengthening the ability to monitor and evaluate project results and were an example of the Project Management Unit's (PMU's) use of adaptive management. The final logframe employed by the PMU was a substantial improvement over the first version and was considered to have served as a useful management tool (though there remained a lack of specificity in a few of the baselines and targets as mentioned in Section 4.1).

ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management

53. Comprehensive and realistic work plans were developed that took into account issues that came up during project implementation. Both the IA and the EA felt that an adaptive management approach was applied throughout project implementation by project staff and consultants to deal with a number of different issues that arose on the ground. For example, when it became evident that the initial Project Manager was not meeting the project's implementation needs and insufficient progress was being made, a new Project Manager was hired, which had an important role in speeding up project implementation. Another example of adaptive management occurred early on in the project when lack of consensus among stakeholders contributed to poor delivery, which led to the decision to carry out a re-inception workshop. A third example took place when the project faced local political interference during the development of the management plan for the Colombia River Forest Reserve, which led the project consultants to take the decision to expand the number of communities involved in the stakeholder consultation and to clarify misunderstandings through repeated community visits. In many ways, adaptive management was perceived to have been critical to the project's success.

iii) Project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies

54. The project used electronic media to obtain broader visibility in terms of national actors and potential donors, posting project information on the YCT website, such as major project deliverables and updates on ongoing initiatives. It should be noted that such technologies were of limited relevance for

promoting the project at the local community level, given the limited internet access among community members.

iv) General operational relationships among the institutions involved

55. The operational relationship between FFI/YCT and UNDP evolved over time, with some tensions at the beginning of the project related to operational and financial management issues. Perhaps owing to the fact that this was the first NGO executed Medium-Sized UNDP/GEF project, there was some uncertainty as to the respective roles of the IA and EA and some unfamiliarity with this framework. The FFI/YCT team felt that UNDP was micro-managing the project to a certain extent, that UNDP needed to understand the distinct nature of an NGO executed project, and that some donor requirements were unrealistic on the ground. In addition, YCT felt that the project could not really be separated from the work of the organization as a whole. A meeting was held between FFI at UNDP Headquarters in New York to address the perceived adversarial climate, and the issues were also brought up in an Extraordinary Tripartite Review in February 2007. These interventions contributed significantly to clarifying misunderstandings and communication lines. It should also be noted that YCT went through a learning process to become more familiar with UNDP structures and GEF policies. The second Project Manager prepared a manual to summarize the most important UNDP/GEF policies for the PMU, which enabled reporting to proceed more smoothly from then on. At the same time, UNDP considered that it learned to adopt a more flexible approach given the realities faced by NGOs on the ground.

56. After the initial issues were addressed, the relationship was perceived to have progressed very well. Communication between UNDP and YCT was felt to be strong with significant and timely inputs provided by the UNDP. One stakeholder indicated that UNDP could perhaps have applied more pressure on the government with regard to their policy commitments under the project.

57. The relationship between YCT and the Forest Department went through highs and lows in terms of the level of communication that occurred. In general, YCT felt that the Forest Department provided valuable input and effectively chaired the Project Board. However, at times human resource constraints limited the amount of time and follow-up the Department was able to provide. The general tensions that are considered to exist in Belize between government and NGOs also affected the relationship, as well as the specific issue that arose when YCT opposed the construction of a hydroelectric dam in a protected area. On this particular issue, the UNDP intervened in a Tri-Partite Review and the decision was made to keep the Golden Stream Watershed Project (GSWP) and the advocacy issue separate.

58. The Project formed a Steering Committee, entitled Project Executing Group and later Project Board, consisting of six to eight members, including:

- UNDP Environmental Programme Analyst
- Chief Forest Officer of the Forest Department, MNRE
- Representative of YCT
- Representative of TIDE
- GEF Operational Focal Point from MNRE

- Community representative
- Private sector representative
- Representative of FFI- Project Director (the latter member was later dropped).

59. The first meeting of the Project Board did not take place until February 2007, owing to the fact that the initial Project Manager did not establish key supporting bodies for the project. The Board was seen as having played a useful role in providing guidance for project execution, particularly in terms of arriving at a common understanding of the deliverables.

60. However, there was some difficulty in maintaining consistent representation on the Board, which made it less effective than it otherwise could have been. This was the case for the community representatives; the President of the Toledo Maya Women's Council sat on the committee for two years, after which point, there was inconsistent community representation. Similarly, the project had limited success in getting a private sector representative on the Board. The project tried without success to convince Belize Lodge and Excursions (BLE) to join the Board, and for the final few meetings, a representative of the Cacao Growers Association attended. TIDE indicated that they could have participated to a greater extent on the Project Board, however, they felt that their input would make less of an impact since they were not directly executing the project. The GEF Operational Focal Point (also Chief Environment Officer from the Department of Environment under MNRE), who came in board in 2008, also had limited participation in Board meetings, and at times sent junior staff members in his place.

v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements

61. The Project Management Unit's work and the consultancy outputs were generally considered to be satisfactory and resulted in a well-implemented project and the delivery of strong outputs. When technical capacities did not live up to expectations, timely changes were made. Thus, for example, when the initial Project Manager was not performing to the standards expected, he was replaced. The new Project Manager was felt by all stakeholders interviewed to have managed the project very proficiently. In general, it was difficult to recruit consultants for the project, including project staff, owing to Toledo's perceived isolation, the difficult sociopolitical context, language barriers, and the political interference in the process from local area representatives. As a result of these difficulties, UNDP had to make some accommodations to its procurement systems to permit direct contracting when necessary.

Monitoring and evaluation (S)

i) Appropriateness of M&E system

62. The basic elements of the project's M&E system were outlined in the Project Proposal submitted to GEF. The project implemented the standard UNDP/GEF monitoring requirements, which include: 1) field monitoring visits by UNDP Country Office Representative twice a year (in fact a greater number of visits were carried out), 2) Tri-monthly narrative reports submitted by the Project Manager to the Project Director and UNDP, 3) Annual project reports prepared by the Project Manager, 4) Tripartite Reviews (TPR), including Terminal TPR, 5) Annual Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)

submitted by UNDP with project team to GEF, 6) Annual Financial Audit, in accordance with UNDP/GEF rules and procedures (note that for 2006, 2009 and 2010, the level of project expenditures did not meet the threshold requiring separate project audits). The management effectiveness of protected areas was measured at different points in project implementation using the WWF-WB management effectiveness tracking tool. Additional studies were commissioned during project implementation to measure project progress in relation to various indicators (*see next section*). The M&E system established for this project is considered appropriate.

ii) Appropriateness of M&E tools used, i.e. baselines, clear and practical indicators, data analysis, studies to evaluate the expected results for certain project stages

63. As mentioned in Section 4.1, there were some limitations in the original indicators, baselines and targets and these were subsequently revised in May 2007, later in 2007, and again in 2008 after the Mid-Term Evaluation. Because of the lack of baseline information at project outset, these data were gathered over the course of the first year of project implementation. To a certain extent, due to limited delivery during the first nine months of the project, the baseline information, though collected late, reflected the general situation before the main project interventions. The final logframe included baseline information and more clearly worded and realistic indicators and targets. In a few instances, the targets could still have been more specific, such as for example, for Outputs 3.1 and 4.1 which refer to widespread awareness, without specifying what this would mean in practice. In one instance, for Output 3.1, the baseline value is still missing. Finally, there are a few instances where the indicators do not fully correspond with the Outcome, that is, achievement of the target for the indicator does not necessarily imply achievement of the Outcome. For example, for Outcome 1, the Outcome specifies that the protected area management plans will be implemented, while the indicators refer to the production of the management plans and to joint monitoring (which does not cover all aspects of implementation). Outcome 2 indicates that local communities will be co-operating in the *implementation* of sustainable development activities, while the indicators refer to the production of the watershed strategy and plan and to joint planning of sustainable development activities in the watershed. Nevertheless, in general, the modified log frame served as a useful management tool, and included baselines, clear and practical indicators, and a comprehensive list of assumptions/project risks.

64. The project commissioned a number of relevant studies in order to review progress against the log frame targets. In order to measure project impact on land use change and forest cover, two studies were undertaken in 2008 and 2010, which included satellite image analysis. A study was carried out in 2010 to measure the impact of the project on the management effectiveness of the four PAs in the GSW and this was compared to the baseline data from 2007. An "End of Project" Biodiversity Synthesis Report was produced in 2010 to measure changes in biodiversity-related indicators between 2006/2007 and 2009/10, which included an analysis of abundance and diversity indices for mammal and bird transects, as well as an analysis of the level of change in threats to GSW's biodiversity. Additional reports were produced to summarize different capacity building initiatives with stakeholders, such as workshops and field trips. In addition, a project systematization exercise was carried out to document lessons learned at mid-point as part of the fulfilment of Outcome 4, and this

report was shared with stakeholders. These additional studies and reports served as effective monitoring tools.

65. A Mid-Term Evaluation report was produced in December, 2008 and the recommendations were validated with stakeholders. All actions specified in the Management Response were implemented with the exception of two: 1) GSWAC's role was not successfully transformed from an advisory one to a steering one. Stakeholders interviewed indicated that this was because the committee did not have the legal mandate to effectively steer development in the landscape, and because of weak participation on the committee; and 2) a no-cost extension to the project was not realized due to financial limitations within YCT. The project's Terminal Evaluation is being undertaken from July 2011 to January 2012.

66. While YCT went through a learning curve to become familiarized with the M&E tools and their application was considered somewhat time-consuming, the organization appreciated the value of the tools, which enabled the organization to more closely track progress in project implementation. The monitoring and evaluation work carried out by the project was satisfactory to track progress against project results, reporting was regular and UNDP/GEF guidelines were adhered to.

iii) Were there enough resources for M+E?

67. The total indicative budget for Monitoring and Evaluation in the project proposal was US $103,200, which excludes project and UNDP staff time, travel expenses, and the monitoring and evaluation associated with different project components. This was felt to be sufficient by the Executing Agency to effectively track project progress and evaluate lessons learned.

Stakeholder participation (MS)

i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project

68. The development of several significant outputs of this project, including the Golden Stream watershed-level strategy, Business Planning Strategy, and the protected area management plans, was undertaken with extensive consultation and participation of the communities in the area. For example, 11 communities participated in the planning sessions for the CRFR management plan. The Forest Department and communities participated in the preparation of the management plan for the private lands owned by YCT and TIDE, and for PHMR, the Fisheries Department, and communities worked with TIDE on the development of the management plan. The development of the legislative recommendations on private protected areas was undertaken with the active participation of BAPPA.

69. A wide variety of project products were disseminated to stakeholders, such as PAMOs, including the Ranger Manual, the project brochure, presentations, the report synthesizing lessons learned during the first half of project implementation, and a final publication depicting different elements of the GSWP with photos. For communities, the main dissemination vehicle used was presentations, rather than written reports as this was felt to be more effective.

70. Feedback from some interviewees indicates that it would have been desirable to have more regular information dissemination to stakeholders, particularly during the first half of project implementation.

ii) Local resource users and NGO's participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this area.

71. Local resource users participated in different capacity building sessions and implemented sustainable development activities in the area, such as agroforestry with cacao, production of food products, and beekeeping. According to interviews with community members, these activities were well-received and adopted. In order to ensure the continuity of these activities or even expand on them, greater financial and technical support are felt to be needed. As mentioned in Section 4.2, iv, it was difficult to maintain consistent community representation on the Project Board, and as a result, communities had less of a decision-making role in project implementation than would have been desired.

72. Apart from YCT, TIDE was the other NGO involved in project implementation, particularly in the production of the watershed-level management strategy, the joint management plan for the private lands owned by YCT and TIDE, and the Business Planning Strategy. TIDE participated in the development of these plans and carried out integrated landscape management activities, such as joint enforcement and biodiversity monitoring. TIDE was also a member of the Project Board. However, TIDE did not have the same level of project ownership and participation as YCT. The comment was made that it could perhaps have participated to a greater extent in project implementation and might have contributed greater resources to the project. TIDE felt that the project design was already established and that the main decisions on the Project Board would be made by YCT. In addition, TIDE felt that given the size of the project, it would have been beneficial to allocate more resources from project funds for activities such as joint enforcement.

73. The project established the Golden Stream Watershed Advisory Committee (GSWAC) as a mechanism to facilitate stakeholder input into the project and its deliverables. GSWAC did not end up meeting regularly or live up to its objective of being a sustainable body. According to interviewees, this may have been because communities were more interested in making decisions about a long-term program, rather than advising on a planning-focused project. In the February 2007 Board meeting, it was decided that GSWAC would be a "broad committee", but that "only selected GSWAC members [would] be called upon to address specific issues and the large group would only meet during large consultation events". For future initiatives, it might be more effective to form committees with a smaller membership from the outset, and to consider the possibility of providing participants with a small incentive to compensate for the opportunity cost associated with attendance.

iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation

74. The project established partnerships with World Wildlife Fund and with the Golden Stream Plantation to undertake collaboration on best practices in citrus plantations in the GSW. Specifically, this involved the planting of *Arachis pintoi* as a cover crop to reduce erosion, soil degradation and the use of pesticides. Since the end of the project, this activity has expanded to include additional farmers.

75. The project also developed a collaborative relationship with the Belize Association of Private Protected Areas (BAPPA), which led to the joint development of legislative recommendations for the incorporation of private protected areas in the national protected areas system.

iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project

76. The main government institution involved in project implementation was the Forest Department of the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment (MNRE) as the entity responsible for protected areas management in Belize. The input that the Department provided, including through its position as Chair of the Project Board, was considered useful by all stakeholders interviewed. YCT was considered to have had strong linkages with staff members of FD.

77. However, human resource and financial limitations were felt by some stakeholders to have led to somewhat inconsistent participation of the Forest Department in the project. In addition, due to personnel changes, some of those involved when the NPAPSP was completed in 2005 were no longer with the department during project implementation, and were therefore not as familiar with the NPAPSP. Furthermore, it should be noted that the project coincided with a chance in administration in Belize, with the new administration only re-endorsing the NPAPSP in 2010.

78. There were varying opinions among the stakeholders interviewed as to the level of ownership and prioritization of the project on the part of the government. Some interviewees considered that the integrated landscape management approach to protected areas management has not yet been fully institutionalized within the government and that the latter could have done more to socialize the concept. It should be noted that the NPAPSP has not been officially legislated. While the National Protected Area Commission (now replaced with the National Protected Area Technical Committee) was responsible for steering the NPAPSP, some interviewees felt that this body did not undertake the expected level of outreach or socialization. Various stakeholders also felt that there was still a lack of clarity as to the implications of an ILM approach to PA management and that the concept needed to be adapted to the Belizean context. In addition, there was a certain lack of understanding that this was still a GoB project, even though it was being implemented on the ground by an NGO. Some interviewees also commented that the GEF Operational Focal Point could have played a greater role in "helping the national counterpart stay at the table". Again, this was perhaps related to the fact that the project was being executed by an NGO, a modality to which the government was not accustomed.

79. The aforementioned issues may have contributed to some of the delays experienced by the project in interactions with the Forest Department. For example, the approval by the FD of the Colombia River Forest Reserve Management Plan was temporarily stalled, despite the FD having been apprised of the development of this plan throughout the consultancy. The Chief Forestry Officer has now signed off on it, but the plan is still awaiting approval from the CEO of the Department. In addition, the legislative recommendations made by the project under Outcome 3 have not yet been approved. The government decided that it would be more strategic to examine these as part of its overall review of the National Protected Areas Act, while some other stakeholders would have preferred the legislative recommendations to be approved ahead of this process as a sign of government commitment.

80. The Policy Coordination and Planning Unit of the MNRE, which was established in 2009 to act as a space for non-governmental actors to discuss issues with the government, was kept abreast of the project through regular presentations from the Project Manager. The Unit also reviewed different documents related to the project and, according to YCT, played a useful role in facilitating dialogue among stakeholders. However, as the Unit was created when the project was already at its mid-way point, it had little role in guiding the project.

81. The Fisheries Department under the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries participated in the development of the management plan for the Port Honduras Marine Reserve. In addition, YCT and the Fisheries Department began collaborating in 2010 on river monitoring, with the latter providing a captain and maintenance for the boat owned by YCT that continues to be used for river patrols. The Agriculture Department under the same Ministry was also involved in the project by co-financing elements related to agricultural training.

Financial planning

i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities

82. The final co-financing as well as final projects costs per outcome can be found in Annex 8. According to one of the interviews, there was only one consultancy that exceeded its budget.

ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements

83. The project complied with incremental cost criteria and worked to address the main barriers undermining the effective and efficient management of GSW's protected areas. GEF monies were used to fund elements that would not otherwise have had sufficient resources, such as the development of a watershed-level strategy, a Business Planning Strategy, and PA management plans, as well as to ensure the promotion of replication. Significant co-financing and leveraged resources were obtained by YCT (*see Section iv*). The project built on substantial baseline investments, such as those related to land acquisition in the project area, and on previous initiatives and national processes, in particular the NPAPSP.

84. The costs were in line with the original budget, with only one consultancy exceeding the original budget, according to one interviewee. The Implementing and Executing Agencies both consider the project to be cost-effective.

iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)

85. UNDP used the Direct Request for Payment modality for funds disbursement to ensure accountability and transparency. In addition, UNDP provided the EA with a petty cash account. The PMU was considered to have managed the project finances proficiently.

86. Project financial audits were undertaken for 2007 and 2008, while the amounts spent in 2006, 2009 and 2010 were insufficient to require financial audits. No major concerns were identified in the financial audits undertaken. The auditors indicated that "the accounting and financial operations and reporting system were adequate for effective budget control" and that the financial statements presented the financial position of the project fairly. The internal controls in place were considered adequate to ensure that project expenditures were in line with the project's annual workplan and

budget. One issue highlighted in the 2007 audit was the fact that an Execution Fee of $13,436.93 was allocated for FFI without "appropriate justification and support for classification.

iv) Co-financing analysis and co-financing and leveraged resources table

87. As a result of the long delay in project development and early implementation delays, some expected co-financing sources were no longer available to the project at start-up. However, the project obtained substantial co-financing and was also able to leverage significant additional funds, above and beyond what was included in the original project proposal. According to the 2010 PIR, the total amount of co-financing secured was 1,370,522 (this includes $20,000 USD secured by UNDP for project development) and the total amount of leveraged resources was 290,000. Leveraged resources included a grant from the Organization of American States for the implementation of the project: "Building Capacity of Sustainable Community Enterprise Development for Poverty Alleviation among Indigenous Communities in Southern Belize".

88. The co-financing and leveraged resources supported various different project components, but in particular, they were critical for the sustainable livelihood initiatives promoted by the project under Outcome 2. These were key elements for increasing the level of community support for this project and form an integral part of the Integrated Landscape Management (ILM) approach to PA management.

Execution and implementation modalities

89. This project represents the first time that a Medium-Sized UNDP/GEF project was implemented by an NGO on behalf of the government in Belize. The idea to delegate project execution to an NGO originated in the Forest Department, as the government felt that YCT's experience and presence in the area would increase the likelihood of project success and that government execution of the project would require a significant learning curve. In addition, FD was considered to have capacity limitations in terms of implementing pilot projects at a site level.

90. The NGO execution modality was felt to have brought certain benefits, in that YCT was able to bring continuity and sustainability to the project efforts as an NGO with local presence and networks. In addition, by their very nature, NGOs are able to carry out different activities than government.

91. The project faced delays in terms of several elements of the project that required government endorsement, and in some cases, approval was not given during the time period of the project. Some interviewees commented that it was difficult to keep the government engaged in the project under this execution modality, and it was effectively seen as a YCT project, rather than a Government of Belize (GoB) owned project. In addition, some of the interview results suggest that not all staff within the government approved of the NGO execution modality. One interviewee expressed concern that FD did not play enough of a role in influencing the Terms of Reference for the consultancies, particularly when it came to legislative revisions.[2]

[2] However, it should be noted that as Chair of the Project Board, the Forest Department would have had to sign off on all Terms of Reference for consultancies.

92. The issues surrounding the NGO execution modality were compounded by the general tensions that exist in the relationship between the Belizean government and NGOs, and by the fact that YCT opposed the government authorized incursions of a hydroelectric company in CRFR and Bladen Nature Reserve. It is recommended that in future projects using this execution modality, all attempts be made to establish strong lines of communication between executing NGOs and the government as owner of the project.

93. In terms of the relationship between the Implementing Agency, UNDP, and the Executing Agency, FFI-YCT, there was some confusion as to their respective roles and responsibilities during the early project implementation phase as explained in Section 4.2, iv. This may have been due to the lack of experience in Belize with the NGO execution modality. At one point the EA requested specific guidelines on the NEX-NGO modality. A Tripartite Review was held in February 2007 at which the NGO execution modality was explained and a presentation of the roles and responsibilities of the partners was made. The meeting clarified the NGO obligation to report to the Government and to UNDP and the oversight roles of the latter two. FFI was also in communication with UNDP-Headquarters as a result of the tensions between UNDP and FFI/YCT.

94. One of the issues that arose with the NGO execution modality was that the project became firmly embedded in the work of YCT, and as such, project staff members sometimes had to work on non project-related issues. It should be noted, however, that this issue could also arise with the traditional NEX modality of government execution.

95. As for the relationship between FFI and YCT, FFI's mode of operation is to act through local partnerships, and the organization has worked for a number of years with YCT. FFI laid some of the groundwork for this project through the land purchase of the Golden Stream Corridor Preserve and through its collaborative involvement in the design of the project. FFI applied as the Executing Agency as it was felt that YCT did not yet have the capacity to execute such a large project on its own. For the first years of the project, FFI participated on the Board and had an in-country representative. In addition, FFI maintained regular communication with YCT to monitor project progress and provide technical support when needed. As the project progressed, YCT's capacity developed substantially and FFI's role increasingly became one of technical backstopping.

Project duration

96. The effective time of operation of the project was shorter than anticipated, owing mainly to the initial delays in project implementation before the first Project Manager was replaced (approximately nine months). In addition, due to shortfalls in YCT's budget, more GEF funding was used for staff in the final year than the PMU had planned, which led to a situation in which the no-cost extension recommended in the MTE could not be implemented. The Project Manager left in August 2010, though YCT continues to work on activities related to the project outcomes, such as the joint implementation of management plans and sustainable development activities with communities of the area. However, it is felt that a greater level of implementation of plans and strategies as well as increased replication might have occurred if more time had been available during the project.

4.3 Results

97. This section describes the level of achievement of the Project Objective and Outcomes. In addition, Table 2 summarizes this information based on the specific indicators established for this project.

Achievement of Project Objective/ Attainment of Outcomes (MS)

98. Achievement of Project Objective: "For the Golden Stream Watershed (GSW) to function as a replicable model of how multiple protected areas working within an ecologically interconnected and interdependent area can jointly achieve conservation and sustainable use objectives, thereby catalyzing the sustainability of Belize's national protected area system."

99. Achievement of the Project Objective can be considered moderately satisfactory. The project served as a pilot in terms of implementing an integrated landscape management approach to protected areas management in Belize, and in so doing, achieved some conservation gains as well as uptake of sustainable development activities by buffer communities in the project area. In addition, valuable planning tools were produced that continue to guide activities in the Golden Stream Watershed. However, limited implementation of the plans occurred during the project and there remain funding constraints for further implementation of the watershed-level plan, the PA management plans and business plan activities, as well as policy issues that still need to be addressed to incorporate private protected areas in an integrated national protected areas system.

100. In terms of conservation, management effectiveness of the protected areas increased by almost 30% in the project PAs and there was a significant increase in key mammal and bird species, as well as some reduction in the level of threats. For example, based on some of the monitoring undertaken, the *number* of fires in the area decreased between project baseline and the end of the project, indicating some uptake of the messages of the project. It is felt that the project led to the increased use of prescribed burning, as people became more aware of the importance of controlling fires, not least to protect the trees some had planted in agroforestry systems. Note that the actual amount of area burned was larger in the end-of-project assessment than at project start-up, but this is likely due to an extremely unusual period of drier weather in 2010, which would have made it much more difficult to manage fires. Based on the satellite work undertaken as part of the project, there has been a reduction in deforestation in the project area. This may be due to the project impact and/or to the regeneration that is continuing to occur after Hurricane Iris. For a few of the indicators, insufficient data analysis was carried out, making it difficult to assess whether targets were met. For example, it is unclear from

It is believed that the increase in management effectiveness was due to 1) increased inter-agency coordination; 2) strengthened staff appraisal systems in YCT; 3) procurement of telephone systems for YCT and TIDE field stations; 4) biological and social research carried out in the GS watershed; 5) improved threat monitoring systems facilitated by YCT and TIDE; 5) implementation of equipment maintenance policy byYCT and TIDE; 6) improved management system in TIDE.

the final project report whether riparian connectivity and coverage remained the same as in 2006, improved or worsened, and while deforestation decreased over the time period of the project, there are no data on the size of the broadleaf forest specifically or on the percentage of agricultural lands that were rehabilitated through the project.

101. With regard to the sustainable development objectives, 80% of the farmers in the villages of the watershed were engaged in the project in terms of land use planning and best practices, and a total of 134 families became involved with, or expanded their cacao production, honey production and organic vegetable production. In addition, an agro-processing micro-enterprise was established by women in the community.

102. GSW management system evaluations undertaken annually indicate that the level of cooperation between TIDE and YCT has been increasing, as has the level of cooperation with communities. Human resource constraints somewhat limit ongoing cooperation with FD. At least two co-managing NGOs have begun to apply project lessons to the Corozal Bay Wildlife Sanctuary and Vaca Area of the Maya Mountain Massif, respectively and many other planning processes underway in Belize are adopting an ILM approach. Beyond the main objective, the project led to additional achievements, such as the substantial institutional strengthening of YCT.

103. While significant progress was made in demonstrating the viability of the operational aspects of the ILM approach to PA management, in terms of the project's policy objectives, the recommended legislation to incorporate private protected areas into the national protected area system and the Conservation Covenant Act have not yet been adopted by the government. The government is currently in the process of reviewing the entire National Protected Areas Act.

Outcome 1: Protected area management authorities, with the support and participation of buffer area stakeholders, have jointly developed and are collaborating to implement a standardized and complementary set of management plans for the GSW's four protected areas.

104. For the most part, Outcome 1 was achieved by the project, including the joint development of an overarching watershed-level strategy, standardized management plans for GSW's protected areas, as well as the joint implementation of two of the three standardized management plans[4]. The management plan for Colombia River Forest Reserve has not yet been approved and is not being implemented, due to political, social and funding issues that were generally outside of the control of the project. It should be mentioned that the development of the management plans was delayed and took longer than anticipated and as a result, less time remained for implementation than hoped. Nevertheless, some joint implementation of two of the management plans commenced even before the plans were formally approved, particularly joint enforcement and biodiversity monitoring. Self-financing of PAMOs increased though it is unclear whether the specific target established in the logframe is not believed to have been met. More details of achievements under this Outcome follow.

[4] Note that a joint management plan was developed for the private lands owned by YCT and TIDE, rather than two individual plans as had been specified in the project proposal. Thus, the total number of management plans produced under this Outcome was three, rather than four.

105. An agreed watershed-level strategy was developed to guide both conservation and sustainable development activities in the area. The strategy was developed with the participation of a number of stakeholders, including YCT, the Forest Department, TIDE as well as buffering communities such as Indian Creek and Golden Stream. The strategy drew significantly from the National Protected Areas Policy and System Plan (NPAPSP) and was one of the first watershed-level strategies developed in Belize. Elements of the strategy were incorporated into the work programs of YCT and TIDE. This watershed strategy served as the framework under which the management plans for the private protected areas owned by YCT and TIDE and for CRFR were developed. In addition, the project undertook a number of training sessions and produced various outputs to support joint PA management plan implementation and led to increased capacity in management plan development.

106. A joint five-year management plan for the private protected areas managed by YCT (Golden Stream Corridor Preserve) and TIDE (Blocks 123, 127 and 130) was developed for the period 2010-2015, in order to combine resources and manage the region as a whole, with different actions for each area.[5] By August 2010, the draft plan was still being reviewed and it has not yet been formally approved since then, though this is expected by late 2011. The management plan sets out the framework for a more collaborative approach between TIDE and YCT, outlines the overarching policies for the protected areas and includes management actions in five thematic areas as well as the identification of four management zones.

107. YCT and TIDE are currently collaborating to implement elements of the plan. For example, the two NGOs are involved in joint patrols, which enable more rangers to be involved, a wider area to be covered, increased security and greater team spirit [6]. They also share a joint communication network. According to some stakeholders, additional funding for joint enforcement activities would have been useful to address the ongoing threats of hunting and illegal timber extraction. As a result of the joint implementation of the plan, the level of partnering between the two NGOs is felt to have increased. However, on the ground collaboration was not always at desired levels, for example, TIDE rangers did not participate in monitoring patrols in the upper watershed areas and the Forest Department faced significant human resource constraints in terms of engaging in enforcement activities.

108. The management plan for the Port Honduras Marine Reserve was updated with the project through a process that included a number of community meetings and work with the Fisheries Department. The plan follows the framework provided by the NPAPSP. The development of this plan started late in 2009 due to delays in receiving co-financing for this component. The management plan outlines the basic concepts for managing the area, however, details such as fishing quotas will be provided once the Fisheries Department completes the process of revision of the Fisheries Act (expected for 2014). The biodiversity data collection and monitoring protocols were updated to bring them in line with the national methodologies used by the Fisheries Department. The management plan

[5] Note that the Block 127, PHMR and CRFR management plans already existed but these were updated through the project to make them consistent with the NPAPSP framework.
[6] In addition, YCT contributed to recommendations for a National Patrol Information system to standardize the information being collected; the recommendations are currently in government hands.
[7] PHRM already had a management plan, as all marine reserve co-managed by an NGO have to have a management plan in place.

is currently being polished and should be finalized shortly, with approval by the Fisheries Department expected in 2012. Nevertheless, the co-managing NGO TIDE has already begun implementing the management plan (2010-2015), in conjunction with the Fisheries Department. For example, the area is now being managed under a "managed access" regime, instead of open access, with permits required for fishing. Communities are also involved in tasks like data collection for fish stock assessment through the community stewards project.

109. The process to develop the management plan for CFRF worked to break new ground and build consensus among 11 Mayan communities in the area. The project was able to obtain significant buy-in and agreement among the communities on their involvement in the long-term management of the resources. However, the development of the plan commenced late, and significant political interference from the local area representative caused substantial delays in its development, leading to misunderstandings within the community, and the belief that the CRFR management plan would take away their rights to the area. YCT staff and consultants had to repeatedly go back into the communities to clarify misunderstandings, and the UNDP also intervened to permit activities to continue. In 2008, the Mayas also initiated a court process against the government over the right to natural resources and land in the area[8]. As a result of this situation, the consultants developing the plan were not always clear on how to proceed. In addition, the level of support on the ground within the Forest Department was not always consistent. As a result of this complex social and political context, the consultants adopted a flexible approach. The level of community consultations was extended to obtain broader input, and there was a great deal of work with communities to explain the objectives of the management plan and build consensus.

110. The final draft management plan permits access and sustainable activities by communities adjacent to the reserve. The plan is still awaiting approval by the Ministry of Natural Resources. There were differing opinions among interviewees as to the reasons for this delay, with some feeling that this signals insufficient political will and prioritization of the issue, while others indicated that this is a normal part of the review process. YCT continues to lobby government for the approval of the plan, and although it does not co-manage the reserve, does some patrolling in the area and has played a role in working to ensure more military presence in the area, especially critical given the level of illegal timber extraction being undertaken by Guatemalans.

111. Implementation of the plan has not commenced, and there are limited funds available to do so within the Forest Department or within the NGO community. One of the interviewees pointed to the need for a dynamic leader to take on the task of scoping out sources of funding for this plan. As part of the implementation of the NPAPSP, it is expected that some projects will take place in the area, however full funding for the implementation of the CRFR management plan has by no means been secured. Despite the fact that the management plan has not yet been approved, stakeholders feel that it was important to produce the plan. The comprehensive process that was undertaken with local communities significantly increased community members' level of public awareness and understanding of the ecological services that CRFR provides and the benefits of alternative, more

[8] Near the end of the project, the Supreme Court ruled in favour of the Maya Leader`s Alliance in June 2010 granting the Mayan villages rights to use the natural resources found in their lands (which coincide significantly with the area of the PAs). An appeal by the government is still pending

sustainable production systems, and contributed to their empowerment. However, it should be noted that the lack of follow-up with the communities buffering the CRFR since the project has ended could lead to some disillusionment and reduced support.

112. The project supported the refining of biodiversity monitoring techniques and in 2009 produced a standardized "Biodiversity Research, Inventory and Monitoring Strategy (BRIM)" for the GSW, including freshwater, bird and mammal monitoring. Joint biodiversity monitoring guided by the BRIM is being implemented across the GSW. YCT and TIDE are working together on the monitoring of water quality in the region, and community members are participating in freshwater monitoring activities as well. Monitoring in the area has also been facilitated by the refurbishment of the conservation post in CRFR. The database set up to store monitoring data is enabling YCT to analyze data over time and determine trends. The information and feedback from the monitoring system is permitting adaptive management to occur and is being used to guide YCT's activities, such as the areas of focus for patrols. YCT is now moving beyond the project deliverables and is working with the University of Belize to set up a National Biodiversity Monitoring Plan to standardize biodiversity monitoring throughout the country.

113. In terms of the level of self-financing of PAs, the overall amount of funding did not increase as a result of the project, but there was a diversification in funding sources, with TIDE securing funds from a number of sources and YCT establishing a program to collect a fee from the sustainable harvesting of forest resources as well as from a "Ranger for a Day" program (though the organization commented that the latter has not yet been sufficiently promoted). Ongoing work is being carried out by YCT in the field of carbon financing. Some stakeholders indicated that more work to raise funds for the implementation of the management plans and for project follow-up should have been undertaken.

Outcome 2: Protected area management authorities, local government bodies, private sector landholders and local communities have jointly developed a strategy for sustainable development of the GSW landscape that strengthens the financial sustainability of the protected area system and provides widespread benefits to the communities at large, and are co-operating to sustain its implementation over the long-term

114. This Outcome was partially achieved, with the joint development of a watershed strategy, including a Business Planning Strategy, and increased adoption by community members of biodiversity-friendly practices, such as agroforestry with cacao, agro-processing and beekeeping. YCT established a Community Outreach and Livelihoods Programme so that the promotion of sustainable development activities in the communities of the area is now an integral part of YCT's work, and as such, the implementation of the Business Planning Strategy is ongoing. However, the area's stakeholders were not able to establish a sustainable watershed management advisory body, thus limiting joint planning of sustainable development activities in the area, and funding uncertainties in terms of the long-term implementation of sustainable development activities remain. More effort in socializing the Business Planning Strategy among communities, more time and additional resources are needed to implement the strategy. Details of the achievements under this Outcome follow.

115. A ″Business Planning Strategy for the Golden Stream Watershed″[9] was developed after a process of extensive consultation with communities, which involved the joint planning of appropriate sustainable development activities. This strategy outlines the categories of possible business opportunities in the area, while highlighting critical issues that need to be considered in order for opportunities to come to fruition. YCT feels that the Business Planning Strategy is an important output of the project as it continues to orient the organization's activities. However, there are some limitations in terms of funding to implement the Business Planning Strategy at present. One of the main challenges communities face is a lack of seed capital to jump-start new micro-enterprises.

116. The project hoped to establish an advisory committee which would be involved in joint planning in the area and which would include a wide variety of stakeholders. The Golden Stream Watershed Advisory Committee (GSWAC)[10] did not meet in a consistent manner during the life of the project and was not sustainable after the main project activities were completed. The project found that it was difficult to gather people together, especially locals. Based on interviews with stakeholders, they postulated that perhaps this was because community members did not feel that they had the time to be on committees or that the project was dealing with issues of interest to them, as the project was primarily focused on planning. Furthermore, GSWAC committee members could only give advice, rather than actually make decisions, which may have been less attractive to some members. In addition, some community representatives wanted to be compensated for their attendance at meetings, when the project had not included this in its budget. It was felt by some that the committee may also have had too many members.

117. The number of community members adopting best practices increased as a result of the project intervention, and it believed that the target of at least 25% of enterprises using best practices was met. However, it should be noted that the project experienced some difficulties in evaluating social impact.[11]

118. A number of sustainable development activities were promoted in the communities of the project area, in line with the Business Planning Strategy. In Golden Stream and Indian Creek, investments were made in training and support of organic vegetable production, agroforestry with cacao, and the establishment of four small apiaries. The communities' capacity to become involved in such activities increased and there was good support for the concept of incorporating livelihood issues as part of a landscape-level approach to protected areas management, rather than focusing only on conservation. Beekeeping, for example, had a significant level of uptake. The level of income generation was

[9] The decision was made to develop a Business Planning Strategy rather than a Business Plan per se, as the latter is usually very detailed and focused on one particular business.

[10] GSWAC officially had 22 members, and included representatives from: 1) Department of Agriculture, 2) Forest Department, 3) Fisheries Department, 4) the Institute of Archaeology, 5) BMDC (Belize Marketing and Development Corporation), 6) YCT, 7) TIDE, 8) BLE (Belize Lodge and Excursions), 9) TEA (Toledo Ecotourism Association), 10) BITI (Belize Indigenous Training Institute), 11) Golden Stream Plantation, 12) Gomez Logging Concession, 13) TDC (Toledo Development Corporation), and the villages of 14) Medina Bank, 15) Golden Stream, 16) Indian Creek, 17) Big Falls, 18) Silver Creek, 19) San Miguel, 20) San Pedro Columbia, 21) DAVC (District Association of Village Council) and 22) TMWC (Toledo Maya Women's Council).

[11] YCT has indicated that it was difficult to obtain comprehensive and reliable information from community members using the traditional interview/survey method.

relatively small, however, there is potential for increased returns. In the community of Medina Bank, the project provided support for the re-establishment of a solar-powered water system and in so doing, educated the community on the importance of watershed protection. Farmers were also trained in biodiversity-friendly agricultural techniques and in organic vegetable production in this community. Some initial trials in non-timber forest products were carried out and the cover crop *Arachis pintoi* was planted in the Golden Stream plantation to reduce herbicide use and soil degradation, an activity which has expanded since project end to incorporate additional farmers. Overall, 80% of the farmers in the watershed were directly involved in the project. Based on interviews with YCT and the project's final report, farmers continue to adopt the practices promoted by the project and elements of land use planning, though for some activities at a lesser scale.

119. Women also became involved in activities such as agro-processing and marketing and showed substantial interest in participating in more income-generating activities. Based on one of the interviews, increased replication of the activities promoted among women would require greater socialization of the Business Planning Strategy.

120. The project was felt to have contributed to a greater understanding of the need to work together to preserve the area's natural resources for the future. During the life of the project, groups like the Tziminche of Medina Bank were formed to preserve the health of the river and its riparian buffer, with the support of YCT. In addition, a women's group in Oxoxpec was established and a beekeeper's group is considering becoming a cooperative. YCT set up an agreement with a vegetable production group in Medina, as well as agreements with Golden Stream Plantation and World Wildlife Fund for collaboration on best practices in citrus plantations.

Outcome 3: Fiscal and legislative environments affecting private protected areas have been clarified and improved as a result of collaborative NPAPSP /BAPPA / GSW efforts, providing mechanisms to effectively integrate private protected areas and private lands within landscape level management systems

121. This Outcome was only partially achieved, owing to factors largely outside of the control of the project's EA. The groundwork was laid in terms of the development of recommendations for the legislation to incorporate private protected areas into the national protected areas system. In addition, a proposed Conservation Covenant Act was prepared. YCT felt that it took the issue as far as it could and that it succeeded in putting the issue back on the agenda for discussion. However, the proposed legislative amendments have not yet been adopted by the government and incorporated into the legislative framework. As a result, the barrier identified during project development of the level of isolation of private protected areas from the broader NPAS was not removed during the life of the project. The proposals will be reviewed as part of the ongoing process to update Belize's Protected Areas Act. Details of the achievements under this Outcome follow.

122. While there was some initial duplication of efforts and insufficient coordination between the project team and BAPPA which led to lost time, BAPPA and YCT eventually collaborated to develop legislative recommendations to incorporate private protected areas into Belize's NPAS, and these were presented to stakeholders. YCT also prepared a draft Conservation Covenant Act. Given that

Belize is engaging in a larger process to review its entire National Protected Areas Act, a process that is expected to be completed in 2012, the decision was made by the Forest Department on behalf of the Government of Belize that it would be more strategic to consider incorporation of these recommendations into the new Act. It is hoped that the fact that this legal background work has already been completed will speed up the larger process of reviewing the National Protected Areas Act.

123. However, the Executing Agency felt that the adoption of these recommended changes before the full revision of the Protected Areas Act would have signalled greater government commitment to these initiatives. Some stakeholders also felt that there was insufficient government leadership to promote this issue and that the change of government contributed to delays. The Protected Areas Commission was largely inactive during the period of project implementation and was replaced by the Protected Areas Technical Committee, which was only established in 2010 and which could have helped push through the legislative recommendations. One interviewee felt that any type of legislative initiative should have been led by and chaired by government through a public consultation process. It remains unclear to what extent the recommendations will be implemented, as the Forest Department has signalled that it needs to carefully balance conservation objectives with the tax collection needs of the country. UNDP will, however, monitor the process of legislative approval in the context of the implementation of the GEF project "Strengthening national capacities for the operationalization, consolidation and sustainability of Belize`s protected area system".

124. Overall, the project increased the level of understanding among technical staff of the importance of private protected areas to the national protected areas system. Some stakeholders commented that more could have been done by technical staff to promote understanding of these issues among decision makers. In addition, interviewees noted that the concept of conservation easements may not be yet be fully understood; for example, there appears to be an erroneous perception that conservation easements are associated with fiscal incentives. Some stakeholders suggested that it might have been premature to include this element in the original project design.

Outcome 4: Protected area management authorities and other stakeholders throughout Belize have benefited from, and are beginning to apply, lessons learned from the GSW experience, thereby consolidating the NPAS

125. The project succeeded in disseminating a substantial amount of information on the GSW experience to relevant stakeholders across the country, several of which have expressed interest in the model developed. Some elements of the integrated landscape management approach modeled by the project are beginning to be applied in different parts of the country, particularly within the Vaca Forest Reserve and the Corozal Bay Wildlife Sanctuary, although even greater replication and application of lessons learned had been hoped for.

126. The project developed an outreach strategy, which provided guidance on project communications. A number of documents were produced to facilitate information dissemination, such as a project

brochure and a PowerPoint presentation. A document that synthesized lessons learned during the first half of the project was shared with a number of stakeholders, and served as an input into the review of YCT's strategic plan. In addition, a final document illustrating many of the project's achievements with photographs was distributed to GEF, among others. Lessons learned from the project experience were also carefully documented in the Mid-Term Evaluation undertaken in 2008 and are now being gathered as part of the project's Terminal Evaluation in order to identify factors that contributed to, or hindered, project success. Project information, including major project deliverables, updates on ongoing initiatives and opportunities within the project, were posted on the YCT/FFI website during the project. Project documents were disseminated through the Forest Department, APAMO and the Protected Areas Commission, among others, and print copies were also distributed directly to PAMO field sites to ensure receipt. Project information was distributed through meetings and presentations to the Policy and Planning Unit of the MNRE, FD personnel (including the staff of the UNDP/GEF Sustainable Land Management project), the PA Commission and later the PA Technical Committee and protected areas management organizations. For communities, information dissemination was focused on presentations as this was felt to be more effective than distributing print material.

127. The comment was made by stakeholders interviewed for the Final Evaluation, as well as in the Mid-Term Evaluation that the information dissemination component began relatively late and that more should have been done earlier in the project. The MTE also recommended that more funds be invested in information dissemination. However, as several project outputs were delayed, such as the development of the PA management plans, there was less to share and replicate in the earlier stages of project implementation.

128. In general, stakeholders felt that protected area management organizations (PAMOs) were receptive to the ILM concept given the limited resources at their disposal and the difficulties of continuing to work in isolation. Furthermore, PAMOs recognize the importance of involving local communities and providing them with alternative, sustainable livelihood options.

129. Replication of different elements of the project is occurring in different parts of the country. The GSWP worked closely to disseminate information to the UNDP/GEF Sustainable Land Management Project, entitled "Mainstreaming and capacity building for SLM in Belize", being implemented from 2008-2011. The project document specifies that the project "will include pilots in integrated landscape management" and one of these pilots is the Vaca Forest Reserve of the Maya Mountain Massif. Friends of Conservation and Development (FCD), which co-manages the area, is using some of the management tools coming out of the GSWP, and is currently developing a landscape management strategy for the Vaca Forest Reserve. FCD is incorporating some aspects of landscape management to the area and has expanded its work to include the promotion of sustainable livelihoods.

130. Information was shared with the Sarteneja Alliance for Conservation and Development (SACD), co-manager of the Corozal Bay Wildlife Sanctuary, and the organization is drawing on lessons learned from the GSWP. Project outreach was also carried out with personnel of the Shipstern Nature Reserve, the Aguacaliente Management Team, which co-manages the Aguacaliente Wildlife Sanctuary, the Rio Blanco Mayan Association, which co-manages the Rio Blanco National Park (the

latter two PAs are part of the Moho River watershed), as well as North Stann Creek, leading to some interest, but as of yet little, if any, concrete actions on the ground.

131. In terms of the two PAMOs directly involved in this project YCT and TIDE, the integrated landscape management approach continues to be applied in their work, even beyond the Golden Stream Watershed. For example, TIDE plans to replicate the approach used in this project in other areas that it manages, with possible examples including Big Falls and other blocks along the Rio Grande. TIDE is also interested in continuing to work with communities to promote sustainable tourism.

132. In addition, there are several processes underway that are striving towards integrated landscape management and that have benefitted from the lessons learned from the GSWP, including in the Maya Mountains Massif, the Maya Mountains Marine Corridor and the Southern Belize Reef Complex. The Maya Mountain Massif, for example, is being treated as a Protected Areas Unit, with economic valuation and strategic financial planning being undertaken for the massif as a whole. This is being developed by management entities that have been informed under this project. The Conservation Action Plan (CAP) currently being developed by the Fisheries Department for the Turneff Atoll Marine Reserve, with the support of the consultant who prepared the CRFR management plan, is also adopting an ILM approach.

133. Increasingly, other PAMOs are working together to pool limited resources and increase efficiencies using an ILM approach. It is difficult to say how much of this is attributable to the project. The Belize Audubon Society is carrying out some work with YCT and with TIDE for the Cockscombe Area and the Southern Area. Two PAMOs (TASTE-Toledo Association for Sustainable Tourism and Empowerment- and FoN- Friends of Nature) amalgamated to form the Southern Environmental Association (SEA), which will act as the "management authority for the three parks, Gladden Spit and Silk Cayes Marine Reserve, Laughing Bird Caye National Park, and Sapodilla Cayes Marine Reserve with better integration of system-level monitoring, enforcement and community involvement" to achieve greater efficiencies. TIDE and SEA have also begun collaboration in terms of their education and outreach, as well as their science programs.

134. However, a number of the stakeholders interviewed felt that coordinated PA management based on the ILM approach is not being applied to the extent wished for due to a number of factors. Among PAMOs, there is still a lack of clarity on how ILM planning would be carried out and how this would work on the ground. There may also be some resistance to adopting landscape-level management because most members of APAMO and of BAPPA still manage based on individual sites and may perceive the coordinated approach promoted by the project as a threat to their individual management. In addition, according to interviews, most NGOs in Belize (with the exception of a few such as YCT) continue to focus on conservation and enforcement, rather than adopting an approach that recognizes the importance of promoting sustainable development and working with communities alongside conservation work. It was pointed out that PAMOs perceive fundraising for sustainable development activities to be more difficult. It was also noted that some PAMOs are having difficulty managing PAs on a site basis due to financial and capacity constraints, and therefore are not yet in the position

to adopt a landscape approach; this is particularly true for the smaller Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) that co-manage PAs.

135. Some stakeholders indicated that the government could have played a greater role in sensitizing PAMOs and other stakeholders of the NPAPSP and of the ILM approach to protected areas management to promote greater replication. It should be noted, however, that the project coincided with a change in the Belizean administration and a time of revision of the national legislation governing protected areas.

136. The promotion of an ILM approach among PAMOs is perceived as a process that will take time to move towards greater adoption. Events such as the workshop on landscape management supported by FD in 2010 at the Protected Areas Managers Annual Meeting can play a useful role in increasing the level of familiarity of PAMOs with the ILM approach and with the National Protected Areas Policy and Systems Plan. Further discussion is needed to increase the level of understanding of the landscape-level approach and to communicate how this approach can improve conservation outcomes. PAMOs also require further education as to how collaboration among different PAMOs will result in sharing and mutual benefits, rather than stripping individual organizations of their roles and responsibilities.

Table 2: Level of achievement of Project Objective and Outcomes based on project indicators

Description	Indicators	Results
Project Objective: For the Golden Stream Watershed (GSW) to function as a replicable model of how multiple protected areas working within an ecologically interconnected and interdependent area can jointly achieve conservation and sustainable use objectives, thereby catalyzing the sustainability of Belize's national protected area system.		Overall progress at the Project Objective and Outcome levels can be considered Moderately Satisfactory. Based on the various Objective level indicators, there has been some achievement of conservation goals, including increased management effectiveness of protected areas, increases in species richness and diversity, reduced number of fires as established from surveys, and reduced number of some key species hunted. However, it is difficult to ascertain based on the data available whether all the conservation targets have been met, for example in relation to riparian connectivity and percentage of rehabilitation of agricultural lands. In terms of sustainable use objectives, there was an increase in the number of farmers in the buffering areas adopting sustainable use practices. There is evidence of increased collaboration among PAMOs and other entities in the GSW for the joint achievement of conservation and sustainable development objectives, which forms part of the Project Objective. Finally, in terms of whether the GSW is functioning as a replicable model, there is some evidence that replication on the ground is occurring, particularly in the Vaca Forest Reserve and Corozal Bay Wildlife Sanctuary. It should also be mentioned that at a country level, there are several initiatives underway that are adopting elements of a landscape level approach

		to PA management; these were informed by the project though they cannot necessarily be fully attributed to the project. Details on each of the Objective level indicators is provided below.
	Management effectiveness of protected areas.	Management effectiveness has increased by almost 30% for the protected areas within the GSW.
	Protected area encroachment, illegal hunting of wildlife, number of fires in the GSW & buffer areas reduced.	In terms of the threat of encroachment, the 25% target reduction in threats was achieved in terms of the number of white lipped peccaries and jaguars hunted and the number of camp sites remained at 0. However, the number of trails increased, though it is not certain whether these were hunting trails or trails established to harvest the *xate* plant. While the number of fires established from surveys went down by 15%, the number of figures tracked using Modis increased, and the acreage burned increased, however, the latter is likely due to the extreme dry weather conditions in the final project year (2010).
	Change in land use to more sustainable systems.	In terms of the level of change to more sustainable land use systems, 80% of the farmers of the project area were directly engaged in the project and it believed that the target of over 50% of land managers actually employing best use practices was met.
	Biodiversity monitoring system indicates improving ecosystem integrity and health. Biodiversity index:1) species richness (numbers of species), 2) Simpson's & 3) Shannon-Weiner biodiversity indices	Statistically significant increases in species richness and species diversity were found. The average number of species found on each transect increased from 2.83-3.68, while Simpson's index of diversity increased from 0.52 to 0.69 and Shannon's index increased from 0.63-0.98.
	Overall connectivity and coverage of riparian zone	The data in the final progress review report are not conclusive in terms of the overall change in level of connectivity and coverage of the riparian zone, indicating that there have been some areas of improvement, but other new areas opening up.
	Economic enterprises based on sustainable resource management practices are developed on the basis of GSW's sustainable management	The target was met and various enterprises based on sustainable resource management practices were developed or expanded upon in the GSW, including agroforesty, beekeeping and agro-processing. For example, 44 new farmers were engaged in agroforestry with cacao through the project.

	Other PAMOs in Belize have begun to apply GSW example.	Based on project interviews, the Vaca Forest Reserve in GSW has begun to apply the GSWP example, in terms of the production of an ILM strategy and the incorporation of sustainable development activities. In addition, the Sartajena Alliance for Conservation and Development, the co-manager of Corozal Bay Wildlife Sanctuary, has started drawing on lessons learned from the project. Thus, the target of two sites applying lessons learned was met, though detailed information on to what extent operational changes have resulted were not available. Several other areas have received information on the GSWP and some have started incorporating more sustainable development activities or more of a unit approach to PA management.
	Level of collaboration among PAMOs and other entities in the watershed	GSW management system evaluations undertaken annually indicate that the level of cooperation between TIDE and YCT has been increasing at the field level. Collaboration with communities and landowners was also seen to have substantially increased as a result of the project. Collaboration with FD was considered satisfactory but limited by human resource constraints.
	Numbers of hectares of forest protected through stabilization of land conversion rates	The target in terms of the level of change in the percentage of broadleaf forest and percentage of agricultural lands rehabilitated is not reported on. The final progress review report indicates that there has been a decrease in the level of deforestation between 2008 and 2010, implying a stabilization of land conversion rates.
Outcome 1: Protected area management authorities are implementing a complementary set of management plans for GSW's four protected areas	Complementary and cross-referenced management plans produced for each of the GSW's terrestrial PAs	The target for this indicator was met as complementary and standardized management plans for the private lands owned by YCT and TIDE (GSCP, Block 127 and others), PHMR and CRFR were produced, though they are still awaiting formal approval.
	Terrestrial and marine PA managers are coordinating monitoring in an integrated manner across the GSW	This target was partially met with joint biodiversity and freshwater monitoring utilizing monitoring protocols developed under the project, shared research and joint patrolling being carried out by YCT and TIDE for the GSCP and the Blocks owned by TIDE. FD is less involved in joint monitoring due to capacity constraints. Regular meetings are held through ongoing work among stakeholders on the Maya Mountains to Marine Corridor[13] Conservation Action Strategy (CAS) and PA Manager meetings.
	Self-financing of PAs in the GSW has increased by end of project	The specific target under this indicator of a 25-30% increase in self financing per PAMO was not achieved. However, YCT did establish two new programs for revenue generation, one to allow community members to some sustainable harvesting at a fee and the "Be a

[13] The GSW is part of the Maya Mountains to Marine Corridor. Stakeholders such as YCT, TIDE, FD and the Fisheries Department are all involved in the CAS which has established critical terrestrial and marine targets in the area.

		Ranger for a Day" program, and both organizations have secured some funding for project-related initiatives. YCT is laying the ground work for a possible future carbon financing scheme through carbon stock assessments. YCT and TIDE continue to fundraise in order to follow up on project work. TIDE is also continuing to promote TIDE Tours.
Outcome 2: Protected area management authorities, local government bodies, private sector landholders and local communities are co-operating in the implementation of sustainable development strategies over the long-term	The existence of a GSW management strategy, including business component, produced as a result of collective stakeholder input to guide decision-making with regards to management and development and conservation of the area. Joint planning of short term sustainable development activities among different actors in the watershed. New and existing enterprises incorporating biodiversity-friendly and sustainable development considerations	The first target for this indicator was met, with a landscape-level management strategy for the GSW produced through a participatory process. This served as a framework for the development of the PA management plans in the area. In addition, a Business Planning Strategy to guide business initiatives in the area was developed in a participator manner. Through the process of development of the Business Planning Strategy, joint planning of sustainable development activities occurred. In addition, there were some joint fundraising attempts for sustainable development activities in the watershed, for example between YCT and TIDE. It should be noted that the GSWAC, set up to facilitate joint planning among a variety of actors in the watershed, did not end of functioning as a sustainable body. YCT has established a Community Outreach and Livelihood Programme, which serves as a vehicle for the long-term promotion of sustainable livelihoods as recommended under the Business Development Strategy. The preliminary data indicated that the target of 25% of the businesses in the GSW adopting best practices has been met. It is clear that the new and existing enterprises promoted by the project were biodiversity-friendly. The community members who have become involved in beekeeping are ensuring maintenance of forest cover. In addition, those involved in agroforestry with cacao systems remain organically certified. Organic vegetable production is continuing after project end, though at a smaller scale.
Outcome 3: Fiscal and legislative environments affecting private protected areas enhanced by specific changes in the policy environment	PPAs are legally recognized by the GoB.	This Outcome was partially achieved as the draft legislative recommendations to incorporate PPAs in the national protected areas system were prepared as was a draft Conservation Covenant Act. However, these have yet to be approved by the government of Belize, so the actual policy environment has not yet changed. It is hoped by YCT, BAPPA and other stakeholders that the recommendations will be incorporated in the new Protected Areas Act currently under development.

Outcome 4: Protected area management authorities and other stakeholders throughout Belize have benefited from, and are beginning to apply lessons learned from the GSW experience	Techniques and methods related to landscape management approach are being adopted within at least two other landscape in Belize	Significant dissemination of lessons learned from the GSW experience has occurred with PAMOs and other stakeholders across the country. The Vaca Forest Reserve is applying these lessons learned in integrated landscape management planning and implementation, including through the adoption of sustainable development activities. Some lessons learned from the project are also being applied in Corozal Bay Wildlife Sanctuary. Several other areas that were informed by the project are also beginning to adopt an ILM approach, though it is difficult to attribute this solely to the GSWP.

Sustainability

137. The strategies and management plans developed through the GSWP continue to guide the work of the PAMOs in the GSW. Joint management activities between co-managing NGOs are ongoing, as well as work with local communities to promote sustainable activities in the buffer zones of the protected areas, in line with the integrated landscape management approach. Some initiatives started with the project are continuing, though at a smaller scale, such as organic vegetable production and the women's agro-processing micro-enterprise. Other activities have expanded, notably the planting of *Arachis pintoi* in citrus plantations to reduce soil degradation and pesticide use. Furthermore, the project succeeded in raising the level of awareness and building capacity in the field of ILM, both nationally and locally.

138. There appears to be sufficient momentum at the national level in terms of policy reform (with the current revision of the National Protected Areas Act and development of a national Land Use Policy) that it is likely that the integrated landscape management approach to protected areas management will continue to be promoted and increasing replication is likely over time. There is also ongoing work to operationalize the NPAPSP, for example through the current UNDP/GEF project: "Strengthening National Capacities for the Operationalization, Consolidation, and Sustainability of Belize's Protected Areas System". As such, lessons learned from this project will continue to be employed, not least because the same UNDP Environmental Programme Analyst and the former GSWP Coordinator are involved in this new project. Furthermore, the FD Chief Forest Officer who chaired the GSWP also chairs most other Project Boards dealing with natural resource management, which facilitates the exchange of information and dissemination of lessons learned from this project.

139. The extent of sustainability of project results will be dependent primarily on the amount of financial resources available, as well as on the level of political support to promote uptake of the concept and establish the necessary supportive national policy and legislative framework. The next section analyzes the financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, and environmental risks that could affect the sustainability of project achievements in greater detail.

Financial resources (Moderately Likely[14])

140. As the integrated landscape management approach to protected areas management and the objectives of the GSWP have been fully institutionalized within the work of YCT, the organization will continue to fundraise for project follow-up and sustainability of project initiatives. According to interviews, the organization has already secured some significant grants to continue with some of the project elements. In addition, some self-financing is available through programs such as the "Ranger for a Day" program and a program to obtain fees from communities members for a certain level of sustainable harvesting. YCT is increasingly looking at various options to increase its level of self-financing, such as through the use of the field centre and the establishment of small-scale enterprises. In addition, the organization is exploring other possibilities such as carbon financing. However, with the global economic crisis and funding limitations, YCT had to cut some staff in 2010, and the MTE-recommended no-cost extension of the project to December 2010 was not possible. The level of funding available for project-related initiatives is less than during the project and the global economic crisis has not facilitated the situation.

141. TIDE has some financial resources available for sustaining project outcomes, such as for joint enforcement. The organization receives some funding as well as interest from a debt-for-nature swap program and the profits of TIDE Tours, a for-profit organization it has established. However, the funding TIDE has received annually as part of the debt-for-nature swap program for Blocks 123, 127 and 130 will no longer be given after 2012, and the organization will depend more on the interest it receives on its endowment fund. The organization has identified this as an issue and is hoping to build on the endowment fund in order to increase the level of interest earnings.

142. The Forest Department is generally very limited in terms of financial resources to implement management plans, such as the CRFR management plan. There are, however, some national projects that may provide funding for related initiatives.

143. Some interviewees felt that additional effort should have been invested in fundraising during project implementation to obtain funds for the implementation of the plans produced through this project. While some joint fundraising was undertaken between TIDE and YCT, it was not always successful.

144. Overall, then, it appears that some funding for the implementation of the planning tools developed by the project and for sustainable livelihoods activities is available and fundraising for this work will continue to be a priority for the co-managing NGOs in the area. However, there is a moderate level of risk that the funds raised will not be sufficient to fully pursue a joint management approach to the PAs in the GSW and to fully implement the watershed-level strategy, Business Planning Strategy and PA management plans. In particular, there is a substantial risk of funding

[14] Each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes have been provided a rating based on the following scale: Likely (L): there are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability; Moderately Likely (ML): there are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability; Moderately Unlikely (MU): there are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability; Unlikely (U): there are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

deficits for the CRFR, which is managed by the Forest Department without a formal co-managing PAMO (though YCT does provide some support in the reserve).

Sociopolitical (Moderately Likely)

145. Based on the information received by the evaluator it appears moderately likely that socio-political support will exist to continue to promote the sustainability of project results. YCT remain fully committed to the integrated landscape management approach to protected areas management and continues to implement this approach in its activities. TIDE has indicated an appreciation for the benefits of working beyond the site-based management level and recognizes that significant opportunities to do so exist in the region.

146. The project was able to garner significant community support and there was substantial interest in continuing with the sustainable development activities promoted by the project. Even in the Colombia River Forest Reserve, with its complex socio-political context, the project was able to broker agreement among the great majority of communities around the principles of the management plan.

147. There are varying opinions among the stakeholders interviewed as to the level of government ownership and support of the objectives of this project in terms of the promotion of the ILM approach to PA management. The NPAPSP has been endorsed by the current government and the ILM approach is enshrined within NPAPSP. In addition, the government has committed to the operationalization of the NPAPSP and is currently implementing a UNDP/GEF project focused on this objective.

148. Some stakeholders, however, were concerned about the level of political will in Belize to incorporate the environmental dimension in the national development agenda and institutionalize and promote genuine uptake of the ILM approach. Of course, the level of political support may also change in relation to Belize's electoral cycle and the agenda of whichever administration is in power. In addition, some stakeholders felt that there was a certain level of tension between the government and NGOs in general at present, which could potentially have an impact on the activities of co-managing NGOs.

149. At the level of local government, the project faced strong opposition and even what was considered political interference from the local governor in the development of the CRFR management plan, which undermined and delayed achievement of the project's objectives. The comment was made that this type of opposition is not unusual as local governors sometimes perceive these types of projects as taking away some of their power over the communities. This issue must be continuously monitored and addressed by PAMOs in the area to ensure support for the concepts promoted by the project among local governments.

150. The impact of the Maya Land claim is still unclear but it does create an environment of uncertainty, which could jeopardize the perception of the Forest Department's authority over the Colombia River Forest Reserve. On the other hand, the management planning exercise that was undertaken in the CRFR directly involved the Maya communities and clarified the plan's recognition

of their management rights over the natural resources they use (though not over the land *per se*), keeping in mind that sustainable resource use and maintenance of forest cover are the end goals of the management plan. There was substantial buy-in from the community to these concepts.

151. The entry of Guatemalans to extract timber from the CRFR is also a threat to the integrity of this forest reserve. Due to sensitive political border issues between Guatemala and Belize, this issue may not be receiving the attention it deserves.

Institutional framework and governance (Likely)

152. In light of the ongoing legislative revisions and projects underway in Belize, it seems likely that a supportive institutional framework and governance regime will be established/ consolidated to support the project's objectives.

153. There remain a number of policies and legislative issues whose adoption would strengthen the framework for implementing the Golden Stream Watershed Management Strategy and these were highlighted in the report of the consultancy entitled "Framework for Implementation of the Golden Stream Watershed Management Strategy". However, it is important to point out that the new administration has endorsed the NPAPSP, which is based on an ILM or systems approach to PA management. Furthermore, the country is currently implementing a project that will develop a revised Protected Areas Act to bring the management of protected areas under one framework (instead of the current situation, which involves different management structures under the Forest Department, Archaeology Department and Fisheries Department), and which will also consider incorporation of the legislative recommendations produced under this project vis-à-vis the inclusion of private protected areas in the national PA system and the issue of conservation covenants.

154. In terms of the level of technical know-how in place to continue to work on project-related objectives, the majority of key staff members from YCT who were involved in the GSWP remain with the organization, and project learning is thus being retained. While there was a reduction in staff members after the project closed, the team is being built up again. Furthermore, it should be noted that YCT established a Community Outreach and Livelihood Programme as part of its structure, and as such, continues to promote sustainable livelihoods in line with the Business Development Strategy. In a broader sense, the project contributed to increasing the level of understanding among decision makers, technicians and PAMOs of the integrated landscape management approach to protected areas management. However, project PIRs identified that there was still insufficient understanding among PA managers and FD staff about landscape management and there is also a "general lack of support/ lack of capacity to support NPAPSP". There is therefore still a need for ongoing awareness raising and capacity building among these stakeholders in terms of how to translate the ILM approach into concrete activities on the ground in order to increase the level of replication. In addition, it is important to ensure that there are a variety of champions to push for the adoption of the ILM approach, as there is a certain level of risk associated with a situation where only a few individuals take on this championing role.

Environmental (Likely)

155. It seems likely that environmental risks will not undermine the sustainability of project results. Hurricanes and uncontrolled fires, which could increase as a result of climate change, could lead to more forest degradation and loss in the area, thus undermining some of the conservation achievements of the project. Furthermore, the risk of natural disasters always exists. However, the project's promotion of the integrated landscape management approach and involvement of buffering communities in sustainable activities, as well as the possible eventual incorporation of private protected areas in the national protected areas system, would likely increase ecosystem health and resilience to environmental stressors. It should be noted, though, that changes in weather patterns associated with climate change are affecting farmers' livelihood activities in the area, with families losing part of their crops in some years, which could place additional pressures on the resources of the area, an issue that should be continuously monitored.

Contribution to upgrading skills of national staff

156. Many of the people interviewed as part of this evaluation agreed that the institutional strengthening and capacity building of YCT represents one of the project's most significant achievements. The organization gained substantial experience in project management, technical and narrative reporting, and monitoring and evaluation in general. YCT also became more familiarized with the specific Monitoring and Evaluation System associated with UNDP/GEF projects. In addition, the project served to increase the institutional profile of the organization, as shown, for example, by its membership on a number of national committees. YCT's participation in the project led to a comprehensive strategic review of the organization, which led to a refining of the organization's vision, mission, and program areas, which are now fully in line with the objectives of the GSWP.

157. As a result of the project, both YCT and TIDE staff gained greater experience in the participatory development of plans and strategies, as well as in joint monitoring and enforcement activities, in line with an ILM approach to PA management. Through FD's participation in this project, its technical staff became more experienced at reviewing technical documents and reports and more familiarized with the ILM approach to PA management.

158. A number of documents synthesizing the project experience and lessons learned were produced and shared with stakeholders. In addition, materials developed through this project, such as the Ranger's Manual, are available to PAMOs throughout the country. Tools such as the Biodiversity Research, Inventory and Monitoring Strategy (BRIM) also continue to be employed in the GSW.

5 Conclusions

159. The GSWP played an important role in piloting a coordinated ILM approach to PA management in a site of particularly high conservation value. While ILM is not a new concept in Belize and is already being applied in some parts of the country, the project elevated the level of awareness among stakeholders of the validity of this approach and the efficiencies that can be gained, particularly given

the very real financial and human resource limitations that exist. The project remains highly relevant in the Belizean context, with an administration currently undertaking a process to operationalize the National Protected Areas Policy and System Plan, which involves the consolidation of the system and the continued adoption of an ILM approach to protected areas management. The country is also currently revising the National Protected Areas Act to support the NPAPSP objectives.

160. The main planning tools to jointly manage the GSW PAs as well as promote appropriate sustainable development activities were successfully developed, and will continue to guide work in the area, in line with the project's objectives. Ongoing fundraising is occurring to continue to build on the project's work. The results of the GSW project have been shared with relevant national stakeholders, and will be used as an input into ongoing projects, such as the current UNDP/GEF project focused on the operationalization of Belize's protected areas system[15], as well as the process of reviewing the National Protected Areas Act.

161. The project succeeded in significantly increasing the level of coordination efforts between YCT and TIDE in the management of the GSW, including in terms of the development of joint management tools, biodiversity monitoring and enforcement. The impact of the project on the level of coordination with the Forest Department was also positive though less pronounced due to human resource constraints within the department.

162. The project reaffirmed the importance of engaging local communities to provide them with sustainable livelihood alternatives and to garner their support for protected area management objectives. Based on project interviews and the end-of-project monitoring, the project resulted in changes in local stakeholder behaviour, contributing to improved conservation and land management. There has been some reduction in threats, as well as increased awareness of the importance of conserving the resources in the GSW and implementing more sustainable activities in the communities buffering the PAs. Local community stakeholders have also benefitted from capacity building in activities such as agroforestry with cacao, organic vegetable production and beekeeping. In terms of the level of slash and burn agriculture, it is difficult to gauge whether this has decreased as a result of the project; some stakeholders felt that at the very least, community members are increasingly using prescribed burning due to a greater recognition of the danger of uncontrolled fires to the resources in the area, including to their own agroforestry systems.

163. While the project increased the level of community understanding of the role of PAs in the GSW and while the management plans and strategies were developed with extensive community participation, public participation in the actual management of the GSW has not significantly increased as a result of the project. This may have been partly because of the inability to establish a sustainable Golden Stream Watershed Advisory Committee.

164. In terms of the efficiency of project implementation, the project is considered to have been cost-effective, and to have employed a satisfactory implementation approach. With regard to the effectiveness of the project in achieving its intended results, for the most part, the project succeeded in achieving the four project Outcomes. The GSW PAMOs are implementing a complementary set of

[15] "Strengthening National Capacities for the Operationalization, Consolidation, and Sustainability of Belize's Protected Areas System"

PA management plans (with the exception of the plan for CRFR), various stakeholders in the area are promoting and implementing sustainable development activities, background work was completed to improve the fiscal and legislative environments affecting private protected areas, and various PAMOs are learning from and beginning to apply lessons learned from the GSWP. However, the project fell somewhat short in accomplishing its policy objectives in that the legislative amendments to permit the incorporation of private protected areas in the national protected areas system and to establish conservation covenants were not adopted by the government during the lifetime of the project. In addition, it should be noted that due to delays in project implementation, particularly during the first months of the project, the project was focused more on developing, rather than implementing, protected area management tools and strategies. Overall, it can be said that the Project Objective was achieved for the most part; the GSWP is serving as a replicable model for how multiple PAMOs can jointly achieve conservation and sustainable development objectives, with the caveat that certain aspects of the model were not fully implemented, most notably the supporting policy and legislative framework.

165. The project results are considered to be relatively sustainable given the ongoing work of the PAMOs in the area, the capacity building that was achieved, and the national legislative revisions and projects that are underway. However, greater mobilization of financial resources as well as political will are necessary to ensure the full institutionalization of the ILM approach to PA management.

166. The project generated important lessons, which are documented in detail in the last section of this report and which can guide future similar initiatives. These include various issues to consider when designing a project, including the need to: develop a strong logical framework with achievable targets given the national context and project duration, engage stakeholders throughout the design process to ensure support and buy-in, make the government's role in a project with an NGO execution modality explicit, and ensure sufficient funds are available for work with communities. In terms of project implementation, the project pioneered the NGO Execution modality for a Medium-Sized UNDP/GEF project in Belize, and as such, provided valuable lessons, including the critical importance of promoting government ownership and support to ensure project success and maintaining strong communication lines among all stakeholders, as well as the need for flexibility on the part of the UNDP when the NGO execution modality is being adopted. In addition, the project highlighted the importance of resocializing projects with new staff in the event of a change in government administration, maintaining realistic community expectations, and adopting innovative strategies to elicit active community participation throughout project implementation. The project demonstrated that adaptive management is critical to success and that proactive changes when required (for example, in terms of human resources or the project logframe) are key to projects' ability to deliver.

167. The project demonstrated the complexities involved in a collaborative, landscape-level approach to PA management, especially in terms of ensuring the support and full participation of all relevant stakeholders, i.e., government, PAMOs, community members and the private sector. The project experience showed that true collaboration among PAMOs is not always easy, but can yield importance efficiencies and conservation benefits. In addition, the integrated landscape management approach requires both on-the-ground coordination, as well as supportive national policies. This will

require, among other elements, high-level synergies between protected areas management and the national development agenda.

168. Given the complexities in implementing collaborative PA management at a landscape level, the project demonstrated that a longer time frame is needed to fully implement this overarching strategy. Any change takes time, and the adoption of a new approach to protected areas management is no exception. In order to maximize replication and reinforce the initial benefits of the project, ongoing education and information dissemination are needed. The project demonstrated that the ILM approach can contribute to poverty reduction and the empowerment of women, but again, greater and longer-term support is required to consolidate achievements in these areas. In addition, it is critical for GSW stakeholders to invest time in obtaining resources to follow up on project activities. Additional financial resources are needed to permit greater implementation of the watershed-level strategy, Business Planning Strategy and protected area management plans, particularly for CRFR, and for ongoing work with the communities in the PA buffer zones. Finally, continuing efforts to promote the adoption of the legislative recommendations made by the project are required.

169. The following section describes the specific lessons learned and recommendations in greater detail. The Management Response Table included in Annex 9 also provides a detailed list of recommendations and the units responsible for implementing them.

6 Recommendations based on lessons learned

170. This project generated a number of valuable lessons learned, in particular because it was the first NGO executed Medium Sized UNDP/GEF project in Belize and because it piloted a new coordinated, landscape-level approach to protected areas management.

Project design

- **Develop strong logframe with baselines, SMART indicators and realistic targets to avoid need for later revisions and loss of time**

To avoid delays at project start-up which can significantly reduce the amount of time available for project implementation, the logical framework should be carefully developed during the project design stage with measurable indicators and targets. If possible, baseline data should be gathered during the design stage rather than at project start-up to maximize the time available for project implementation and facilitate accurate measurement of project impact.

- **Hire project designer(s) who are familiar with GEF requirements to speed up the process of project development and approval**

This is critical to designing projects that are consistent with the GEF Biodiversity Strategy, Objectives and general GEF priorities.

- **Establish project outputs and outcomes that are achievable in the national context**

Stakeholder consultations during the project design stage can enable project formulators to obtain a realistic assessment of what changes a particular country is ready to bring about. In the case of this project, some stakeholders suggested that the Belizean government may not have been ready to legislate and implement conservation easements yet and that including this in the project design was setting the project up for disappointment.

- **Do not underestimate the length of time it can take to bring about significant changes, including those related to policies and legislation**

  The adoption of new policies or legislation is a process that can take some time, particularly when a project spans different administrations. For this reason, it is important not to be overambitious in terms of targets related to policy and legislation and ensure sufficient time is set aside in the project timeline. In hindsight, a four-year project may not have provided sufficient time to both develop and implement the number of plans and strategies involved in this project.

- **Design projects with short planning periods and ensure sufficient time dedicated for implementation.** This is critical to maintain the interest of the project stakeholders, avoid so-called planning fatigue and, as will be mentioned in the next recommendation, ensure the support of local communities. Also this enables results to be demonstrated earlier rather than later, thus increasing the possibility of replication and scaling up of project initiatives.

- **Make project attractive at local community level**
  In particular for a project that is being executed by an NGO at the grassroots level and one that espouses an ILM approach, elements to elicit local community support should be included. In this respect, it is important to ensure that communities are engaged throughout the process of project design. For this project, the final project design was heavily focused on the production of plans and strategies and may not have included enough of a focus on activities that would interest and benefit communities. However, YCT worked to address this situation by obtaining substantial co-financing for sustainable livelihoods work.

- **Ensure sufficient time and funds allocated to obtain community buy-in and to work closely with communities**

  Any project attempting to bring about changes in the way communities have traditionally managed their natural resources will need to allocate sufficient time in the project workplans, as well as resources in the project budget. Cultural adaptation to novel approaches takes time. Furthermore, each community differs in terms of its production patterns, level of development, readiness to embrace new production or business ideas, needs, and level of awareness of issues, and as such, project EAs may need to work with each community individually, in essence, launching and implementing the project distinctly in each community. Continuity in outreach and training activities, and technical support are critical to promote uptake. This can entail high fuel costs, which must be budgeted. In addition in order to elicit greater community support, it is important for projects to actually demonstrate the economic benefits of conservation and sustainable use to communities, which can take time.

- **Ensure that PAMOs participate in project design from the outset so project is consistent with organizational goals**

  When promoting an ILM approach to protected areas management, protected areas are managed as a unit within a landscape, rather than individually, often requiring different co-managing PAMOs (NGOs or CBOs) to collaborate and implement joint activities, such as enforcement and biodiversity monitoring. In order to maximize the success of such collaborative efforts, all PAMOs must participate in project design to ensure that they are in full agreement with project

elements, that these are consistent with organizational goals, priorities, workplans and the resources available, and that they feel that the deliverables are achievable.

- **Consider gender issues in design and budget of project**

  As women and men often play different roles in natural resource management and in families in general, tailored strategies to work with each gender may be required. As such, funds should be included in the project budget to ensure that women's differing needs are met and that appropriate potential opportunities are identified and promoted.

- **Ensure that the government's role in an NGO Executed project is made explicit in the UNDP Project Document**

  It is important to define the nature of the partnering arrangements between the government and any executing NGO within the ProDoc and highlight the government's role as "owner" of all UNDP-GEF projects. This will reduce the likelihood of misunderstandings from the outset and help to promote national ownership.

Project implementation- Issues Related to NGO Execution Modality

- **Establish strong communication lines with government to promote national ownership of GEF projects**
  Even when a project is being executed by an NGO, it is critical to ensure strong communication is maintained with the government and promote national ownership of the project. Government ownership of projects and political support for project objectives are critical to any project, especially when it aims to influence policies.

- **Attempt to keep non-project related issues from affecting relationship between NGO/EA and Government**
  Given that one of the roles of NGOs can be to act as a government watchdog, NGOs and government may come into conflict. It is critical to keep such issues separate from project-related issues to maintain an effective working relationship, keep the lines of communication open, and achieve project deliverables.

- **Flexibility on the part of UNDP is required**
  As the Implementing Agency, UNDP may need to adopt a more flexible approach when overseeing an NGO executed project compared to the typical government executed project. This could entail providing support to NGOs to enable them to understand UNDP/GEF policies and procedures and helping NGOs manoeuvre through the system in light of on-the-ground realities.

Project implementation- general lessons learned

- **Clarify roles and responsibilities of key partners early on**
  In order to avoid project implementation delays and misunderstandings, the roles and responsibilities of all key partners, including the Implementing Agency, Executing Agency and government (in the case of an NGO executed project) should be clarified at project start-up. This information may need to be presented again if a change in national administration occurs during the lifetime of the project. For projects whose development takes an extensive period of time, a

reinception process with all relevant stakeholders should be undertaken to ensure that a collective understanding of project objectives exists and to ensure buy-in and support.

- **Make sure ToRs of staff and consultants are tight and make timely changes if required**

  One of the key roles of the PMU, UNDP and Project Board (including government representatives) is to prepare, review and approve the Terms of Reference for project staff and consultants to ensure that they are clear and comprehensive. In the event that staff or consultants fail to deliver, changes should be made proactively and promptly to avoid undue delays in project implementation. It should be noted that such staffing changes, including in the Project Manager if necessary, can stimulate project implementation.

- **Hire staff and consultants with the necessary experience**

  Although fairly obvious, it is always important to ensure that staff and consultants have the relevant experience to reduce the amount of time required for training as well as the likelihood of having to make human resource changes. For example, for projects promoting an integrated landscape management approach to protected areas management, the project manager should have experience working with communities, as was the case with the manager ultimately hired for the GSWP. As another example, it is helpful to select a Project Director who is already familiar with UNDP/GEF procedures, as was done with this project, as this will facilitate his/her work.

- **Verify that the logframe is adequate to track progress**

  During project implementation, if the logical framework is not permitting the PMU to adequately track progress on deliverables, timely revisions should be made to ensure that it functions as an effective management tool. This involves ensuring the inclusion of accurate baselines, appropriate indicators, realistic targets and sources of verification, as well as updated project assumptions and risks.

- **In order to effectively monitor social impact, consider methods other than the traditional survey method**

  In attempting to evaluate the social impact of the GSWP, YCT found that it was difficult to obtain detailed and accurate information from community members using the traditional interview/survey approach. This issue should be further explored to identify other possible ways to gather social data to effectively monitor and evaluate social impact.

- **For projects spanning a change in the national administration, carry out a resocialization process**

  For projects that are implemented during a time of change in administrations, resocialization must be carried out to ensure ownership, buy-in and continued support, which are critical to project success. This process of resocialization may also have financial implications which need to be considered in the budget.

- **Ensure that government ownership resides in the institution itself, rather than only in particular individuals**

In order to ensure continued government support given the possibility of staffing changes, it is important that government ownership be embedded in the relevant institution itself, as opposed to in particular individuals.

- **Promote the GEF Operational Focal Point's role in consolidating government support**

  Part of the role of GEF Operational Focal Points is to "[facilitate] GEF coordination, integration and consultation at country level". As such, it follows that the Focal Point can play a useful role in ensuring that the government fully understands and is on board with ongoing GEF projects. The performance of this role should be encouraged as much as possible.

- **Socialize the project with local politicians from the outset to solicit their support**
  Project staff should dedicate sufficient time to implement a campaign to socialize projects with local politicians, including area representatives and their aides, in order to increase the likelihood of obtaining political and popular support. Local politicians can seriously undermine the achievement of project deliverables if they are not brought on board. As such, local politicians should be fully consulted at the design stage, and involved from the outset, rather than being presented with a completed project design. Any objections they may have should be considered. This process would need to be repeated in the event of changes in the local representatives due to elections.

- **Dedicate sufficient time to raise funds for project follow-up**
  It is critical to ensure that planning documents and strategies produced by projects actually have funds available for their continued implementation after project closure and that there are funds for follow-up work with communities. As such, projects may need to budget in staff time for fundraising. Funds for follow-up work or subsequent project phases would enable greater implementation, information dissemination and replication to occur. Without such continuity, there is a risk that some project results will not be sustained over time.

- **Be careful not to raise communities' expectations**
  It is important to be open from the outset when communicating with communities about what particular projects can and cannot provide. Raising false expectations can lead to disappointment and a reduced level of support for future projects. In this respect, it is also critical to be careful when presenting the total amount of project funding, as this may lead to heightened expectations.

- **Develop strategies to ensure active community participation**
  Projects sometimes have difficulty maintaining strong and consistent community participation on advisory boards or steering committees, as did the GSWP. It is therefore important to adopt strategies to facilitate such participation, for example, by bringing meetings to community sites. In addition, the project design should include sufficient elements of interest to local communities. It may also be useful to consider the possibility of enabling community members to have a decision-making role on committees, for example, by giving them authority as a local land use committee for a particular region. Finally, project budgets may need to include honoraria for community members to participate on committees, to compensate them for the opportunity cost of attendance.

  In terms of the choice of individuals with which to work when promoting sustainable development activities, project experience attests to the importance of a careful selection process to ensure farmer commitment; this may include the identification of farmers who have already demonstrated interest in the initiatives being promoted and/or those who have already begun similar work that could be built on. It is also important to recognize that communities will prioritize economic survival over sustainable use and that projects should promote

complementary sustainable activities without expecting an immediate abandonment of the traditional practices communities employ to meet their subsistence needs.

- **Target both men and women in outreach activities**

  The GSWP initially focused much of its outreach on male farmers and attempted to promote a significant change in natural resource management, substituting one practice with another. It was found that when problems arose, these farmers quickly resorted to their traditional way of farming. By involving women in the promotion of additional sustainable activities, it was more likely that male farmers would switch to more sustainable ways of farming over time once the alternative activities were found to be viable (that is, tested and proven by farmers themselves).

- **Promote micro-enterprises among women to contribute to their empowerment**

  The work undertaken by the project to promote micro-enterprises such as agro-processing among women can be an effective way to promote the empowerment of women in their communities by providing them with increased capacity and a source of income.

- **Disseminate information throughout project implementation**
  Continual dissemination of information from project start-up is important as stakeholders need to receive information over a period of time to reinforce the messages. It is also important to ensure that information is not only sent to national coordinating bodies, but also directly to stakeholders working on the ground to ensure receipt. A well-thought out communication strategy can help the project identify relevant target audiences, messages and the most appropriate vehicles through which to spread information. Ensuring adequate information dissemination and communication is critical to uptake and replication of project achievements.

- **Ensure that the data gathered through biodiversity monitoring measures the most relevant management-related factors.** The data should be consistent with conservation plans and the results should help steer management actions.

Other Recommendations

- **Recognize that true collaboration among PAMOs is difficult but can yield efficiencies**
  Effective collaboration among PAMOs can be difficult and requires a give-and-take on the part of each organization. However, the benefits of PAMOs working together to jointly manage PAs using an ILM approach are recognized in terms of the achievement of conservation and sustainable development objectives in a more cost-effective manner.

- **Continue to work to institutionalize integrated landscape management at the policy making and operational levels**

  While there is general support for the concept of coordinating PA management at the landscape level, it has not been fully institutionalized, either at the policy level (NPAPSP is not legislated and the National Protected Area Act is currently being revised) or at the operational level (for example, many PAMOs still operate at the site level). Furthermore, there is a lack of sufficient understanding among PAMOs and government of what landscape-level management entails. The shift from site- level PA management to a more integrated landscape approach is not easy and

will take time and increased awareness, capacity building, political support and the establishment of a supportive policy framework.

- **Continue to promote national policies that support the ILM approach**
  The ILM approach requires both on-the-ground-coordination and supportive national policies. As documented in "A Framework for the Implementation of the Golden Stream Watershed Management Strategy", produced under the GSWP, a strong framework at the policy-making level is necessary to ensure intersectoral collaboration and full implementation of the ILM approach. The current disconnect between the operational and policy levels is undermining realization of the full benefits of the work being piloted in the GSW.

- **Promote high-level synergies between protected areas management and the national development agenda**

  Given the number of actors involved when implementing an ILM approach, protected area management needs to be integrated into the country's development agenda. Government support is critical to the success of this approach, as PAMOs do not usually have the funds to address the sustainable development needs of communities on their own. At the national level, protected area issues should be better integrated into other fields such as rural development by the national government and into the strategies of the National Association of Village Councils. At the local level, PA issues should be more closely integrated into the livelihood strategies of communities, and the personnel with the skills to analyze livelihood strategies need to be available.

- **In order for sustainable livelihoods activities to play a significant role in poverty reduction, there is a need for greater and longer-term support**

  Some of the activities promoted by the project, such as beekeeping and agroforestry with cacao, were well-received among the communities involved and generated some additional income for families. However, for these activities to have a greater impact on poverty reduction, longer-term support is required, beyond the lifetime of a four-year project, for example, in terms of technical assistance, supplies and access to credit. This support would need to come not only from co-managing PAMOs in the area, but also relevant government departments.

Annexes for Golden Stream Watershed Project Terminal Evaluation Report

Table of Contents

1 Evaluation TORs

"Integrating Protected Areas and Landscape Management in the Golden Stream Watershed"

PIMS 1740

Belize

Terms of reference for conducting the Terminal Evaluation

November 22 2010

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 UNDP/GEF Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) policy at the project level in UNDP/GEF has four objectives:

i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts;
ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements;
iii) to promote accountability for resource use;
iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These might be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators -, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and final evaluations.

In accordance with UNDP/GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized projects supported by the GEF should undergo a final evaluation upon completion of implementation. A final evaluation of a GEF-funded project (or previous phase) is required before a concept proposal for additional funding (or subsequent phases of the same project) can be considered for inclusion in a GEF work program. However, a final evaluation is not an appraisal of the follow-up phase.

Final evaluations are intended to assess the relevance, performance and success of the project. It looks at early signs of potential impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental goals. It will also identify/document lessons learned and make recommendations that might improve design and implementation of other UNDP/GEF projects.

1.2 The project objectives and its context

Despite Belize's small size (22,960 km^2), the country's global biodiversity significance is disproportionately high, due to the extent and relative intactness of its estimated 85 terrestrial and 2 marine ecosystems. The Government of Belize (GoB) has combined a willingness to assign protected area (PA) status to an unusually large percentage of its national territory , with persistent difficulties in finding ways to finance active management of these same areas. In light of this situation, NGOs have played a particularly constructive role in co-management of Belize's biodiversity and Protected Areas.

The GSW project plays a critical and complementary role to ongoing national process, by providing a replicable demonstration model where several of the key priorities of the reform process will be implemented and showcased. The project's overall objective is to "function as a replicable example of how multiple protected areas working within an ecologically interconnected and interdependent area can jointly achieve conservation and sustainable use objectives, thereby catalyzing the sustainability of Belize's National Protected Area System". Four program support objectives (PSOS) or immediate objectives have been articulated as a response to the overall project objective:

1. **Outcome 1:** Protected area management authorities have jointly developed and are implementing a standardized and complementary set of management plans for GSW's four protected areas.
2. **Outcome 2:** Protected area management authorities, local government bodies, private sector landholders, and local communities have jointly developed a strategy for sustainable development of the GSW landscape and are co-operating to sustain its implementation over the long-term.

3. **Outcome 3:** Fiscal and legislative environments affecting private protected areas have been clarified and improved as a result of collaborative NPAPSP/BAPPA/GSW efforts.
4. **Outcome 4:** Protected area management authorities and other stakeholders throughout Belize have benefited from, and are beginning to apply, lessons learned from the GSW experience.

The initiative, developed in line with GEF strategic priority BD-1, is closely linked to a number of priorities elaborated in Belize's National protected Areas Policy and System's Plan (NPAPSP). It has been the intent of the executing agency and its national partners demonstrate a model approach to PA management in situations involving several protected areas with varying protected area designation types, working in a coordinated manner within an interrelated landscape area – in this case, a watershed and its receiving water body. ***It is expected that the lessons arising from this project will inform approaches and interventions being developed under the newly GEF approved national project titled, "Strengthening National Capacities for the Operationalization, Consolidation, and Sustainability of Belize's Protected Areas System" (PIMS 4207).***

Special Considerations:
The project underwent an extensive process of evolution and refinement starting in 1999 until endorsement by GEF in 2005. The project experienced a further nine-month delay after project inception in October 2006. This extended development process and delayed project implementation resulted in loss of momentum and some loss in support by stakeholder groups. An extensive re-acquainting and inception program was required to introduce the project to relatively new staff of stakeholder organizations.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) is a requirement of UNDP and GEF and thus it is principally initiated by UNDP Belize Country Office. It will be conducted according to guidance, rules and procedures for such evaluations established by UNDP and the Global Environment Facility.

The overall objective of the TE is to analyze the implementation of the project, review the achievements made by the project to deliver the specified objectives and outcomes. It will establish the relevance, performance and success of the project, including the sustainability of results. The evaluation will also collate and analyze specific lessons and best practices pertaining to the strategies employed, and implementation arrangements, which may be of relevance to other projects in the country and elsewhere in the world.

The main stakeholders of this TE are the Government of Belize, Forest Department; Ya'axche Conservation Trust; Toledo Institute for Development and Environment; the National Protected Areas Technical Committee; the Belize Association of Private Protected Areas; the Association of Protected Areas Management Organizations; and UNDP Belize

The TE must provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of a completed project by assessing its project design, process of implementation and results vis-à-vis project objectives including the agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation. TEs have four complementary purposes:

- To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
- To synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future UNDP-GEF activities;

- To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues, for example in the mid term evaluation.

Please refer to section 7 for further details on the scope of this evaluation.

3. PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following products:

Oral presentation of main findings of the evaluation: This should be presented to UNDP CO before the mission is concluded in order to allow for clarification and validation of evaluation findings.

Evaluation written report: This report will be submitted to the UNDP Country Office, the UNDP-GEF regional Coordination Unit (RCU) and project team electronically within 2 weeks after the evaluation mission has been concluded. These parties will review the document and provide feedback to the evaluation team within 1 month after the evaluation report draft has been submitted. The evaluator will address these comments and provide a final report within a period of 1 week. In case of discrepancy between parties and the evaluation team an annex should be included at the end of the document explaining the discrepancies. The RCU and CO will sign a formal clearance form to be submitted with the final evaluation report (see Annex 5). The evaluation report outline should be structured using the report outline provided in section 7.

General considerations of the report:

- Formatting: Times New Roman – Font 11; single spacing; paragraph numbering and table of content (automatic); page numbers (centered bottom); graphs and tables and photographs (where relevant) are encouraged.
- Length: Maximum 50 pages in total excluding annexes
- Timeframe of submission*:* first draft within 2 weeks of completion of the country mission

4. METHODOLOGY OR EVALUATION APPROACH

An outline of the evaluation approach is provided below. However, it should be made clear that the evaluation team is responsible for revising the approach as necessary. Any changes should be in line with international criteria and professional norms and standards as adopted by the UN Evaluation Group[2] . Any change must be cleared by UNDP before being applied by the evaluation team.

(i) **Documentation review** (desk study): the list of documentation is included in Annex 2. All the documents will be provided in advance by the Project Team and by the UNDP Country Office. The Project Team and UNDP Country office will provide an annotated cover note for each document describing the relative importance of each document, key sections and issues to be brought to the evaluator's attention. The evaluator should consult all relevant sources of information, including but not limited to the following list of documentation: UNDP and GEF evaluation policy, the project document, project reports, Project Steering Committee minutes and decisions, project budgets, project work plans, progress reports, PIRs, project files, UNDP guidance documents, national legislation relevant to the project and any other material that they may consider useful. The Project Manager will also provide a report of the project's accomplishments and lessons.

[2.] www.uneval.org

(ii) **Interviews** will be held with the following organizations and persons as a minimum: the Government of Belize, Forest Department; Ya'axche Conservation Trust; Toledo Institute for Development and Environment; GSW Project Manager, GSW Project execution Group, the National Protected Areas Technical Committee; the Belize Association of Private Protected Areas; the Association of Protected Areas Management Organizations; and UNDP Belize

(iii) **Field Visits** should be made to the Golden Stream Watershed (Toledo District) and buffer communities of the watershed.

(iv) **Semi-structured interviews** – the team should develop a process for semi-structured interviews to ensure that different aspects are covered. Focus group discussions with project beneficiaries will be held as deemed necessary by the evaluation team.

(v) **Questionnaires**

(vi) **Participatory Techniques and other approaches for the gather and analysis of data**

5. EVALUATION TEAM

Qualifications
•Masters Degree in Natural Resources Management or related field
•Relevant field-based experience in monitoring and evaluation of projects
•Familiarity with a participatory approach in project monitoring and evaluation
•Excellent writing and analytical skills
•Excellent facilitation and interpersonal skills

The evaluator must be independent from both the policy-making process and the delivery and management of assistance. Therefore applications will not be considered from evaluators who have had any direct involvement with the design or implementation of the project. This may apply equally to evaluators who are associated with organizations, universities or entities that are, or have been, involved in the INRM policy-making process and/or delivery of the project. Any previous association with the project, the MNRE Administration, the FD Administration, UNDP Belize or other partners/stakeholders must be disclosed in the application. This applies equally to firms submitting proposals as it does to individual evaluators. If selected, failure to make the above disclosures will be considered just grounds for immediate contract termination, without recompense. In such circumstances, all notes, reports and other documentation produced by the evaluator will be retained by UNDP.

If individual evaluators are selected, UNDP will appoint one Team Leader. The Team Leader will have overall responsibility for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products. Team roles and responsibilities will be reflected in the individual contracts. If a proposal is accepted from a consulting firm, the firm will be held responsible for the delivery and quality of the evaluation products and therefore has responsibility for team management arrangements.

6. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

6.1 Management Arrangements

The evaluation is being solicited by UNDP, led by the UNDP Belize CO as project Implementing Agency. The UNDP-CO has overall responsibility for the coordination and logistical arrangements of the

evaluation as well as day-to-day support to the evaluation team (travel, accommodation, office space, communications, etc) and timely provision of per diems and contractual payments. The UNDP-CO will also organize the site missions (travel arrangements, meetings with key stakeholders and beneficiaries, interviews, field trips). The evaluation team will be briefed by the UNDP Country Office and the RCU upon the commencement of the assignment, and will also provide a terminal briefing. Other briefing sessions may be scheduled, if deemed necessary.

Payment modalities and specifications: The evaluators will be contracted directly from the project budget. Payment will be 50% at the submission of the first draft to the UNDP-CO, UNDP-GEF RCU and PT, and the other 50% once the final report has been completed and cleared by both the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF RCU. The quality of the evaluator's work will be assessed by the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF-RCU. If the quality does not meet standard UNDP expectations or UNDP-GEF requirements, the evaluators will be required to re-do or revise (as appropriate) the work before being paid final installments.

These Terms of Reference follow the UNDP-GEF policies and procedures, and together with the final agenda will be agreed upon by the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordination Unit, UNDP Country Office and the Project Team. The final report must be cleared and accepted by UNDP before being made public, therefore, the UNDP-CO and UNDP-GEF-RCU will have to formally clear the report (please see Annex 5).

6.2 Timeframe, resources, logistical support and deadlines

The total duration of the evaluation will be **30** days according to the following plan:

Preparation before field work: (5 days including travel time)

- Acquaintance with the project document and other relevant materials with information about the project (PIRs, TPR reports, Mid term Evaluation report and other evaluation report, etc);
- Familiarization with overall development situation of country (based on reading of UNDP- Common Country Assessment and other reports on the country).
- Detailed mission programme preparation, including methodology, in cooperation with the UNDP Country office and the Project team.
- Initial telephone discussion with UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor

Mission: (**10** days)

- Meeting with UNDP Country office team;
- Meetings with key stakeholders in country
- Joint review of all available materials with focused attention to project outcomes and outputs
- Visit to Project site
  - Observation and review of completed and ongoing field activities,(capacity development, awareness /education, sustainable use demonstration activities, community development, etc)
  - Interviews with key beneficiaries and stakeholders, including representatives of local authorities, local environmental protection authorities, local community stakeholders, etc.

Draft report (10 days): To be provided within two weeks of mission completion

- Final interviews / cross checking with UNDP CO, UNDP RCU and Project team.
- Drafting of report in proposed format
- Telephone review of major findings with UNDP CO and UNDP-GEF RTA

- Completing of the draft report and presentation of draft report for comments and suggestions within 1 month

Final Report (**5** days)
- Presentation of final evaluation report

7. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION AND SPECIFIC ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

The scope of a TE will depend upon project type, size, focal area, and country context. In all cases, the TE should properly examine and assess the perspectives of the various stakeholders. In most cases, the TE will include field visits to ascertain project accomplishments and interviews of the key stakeholders at national and, where appropriate, local levels. It also analyses the use of GEF and co-financing resources in the broader context of the country.

In general it is expected that evaluations in the GEF explore the following five major criteria：

- **Relevance.** The extent to which the activity is suited to local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including changes over time.
- **Effectiveness.** The extent to which an objective has been achieved or how likely it is to be achieved.
- **Efficiency.** The extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible; also called cost effectiveness or efficacy.
- **Results.** The positive and negative, and foreseen and unforeseen, changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects.
- **Sustainability.** The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion. Projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

The following should be covered in the TE report:

General information about the evaluation.
The TE report will provide information on when the evaluation took place; places visited; who was involved; the key questions; and, the methodology. More details are provided in the template of Terms of Reference **(ToR)** in Annex 2.

Assessment of Project Results
TEs will at the minimum assess achievement of outputs and outcomes and will provide ratings for outcomes. This assessment seeks to determine the extent to which the project outcomes were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any other positive or negative consequences. While assessing a project's outcomes, the TE will seek to determine the extent of achievement and shortcomings in reaching the project's objective as stated in the project document, and also indicate if there were any changes and whether those changes were approved and achieved. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluator- together with the Project Team-

should seek to estimate the baseline condition so that achievements and results can be properly established. Since most GEF projects can be expected to achieve the anticipated outcomes by project closing, assessment of project outcomes should be a priority. Outcomes are the likely or achieved short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Examples of outcomes could include but are not restricted to stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes in behavior), and transformed policy frameworks or markets. **For GEF 4 projects it is required**, and for GEF 3 projects it is encouraged, that the evaluators assess the project results using indicators and relevant Tracking Tools.

To determine the level of achievement of project results and objectives following three criteria will be assessed in the TE:

- **Relevance**: Were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities? The evaluators should also assess the extent outcomes specified in the project appraisal documents are actually outcomes and not outputs or inputs.
- **Effectiveness**: Are the project outcomes commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)? In case in the original or modified expected outcomes are merely outputs/inputs then the evaluators should assess if there were any real outcomes of the project and if yes then whether these are commensurate with the realistic expectations from such projects.
- **Efficiency**: Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Wherever possible the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

The evaluation of relevancy, effectiveness and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of project's effectiveness and efficiency. Since projects have different objectives assessed results are not comparable and cannot be aggregated. To track the health of the portfolio, project outcomes will be rated as follows:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

The evaluators will also assess positive and negative actual (or anticipated) impacts or emerging long term effects of a project. Given the long term nature of impacts, it might not be possible for the evaluators to identify or fully assess impacts. Evaluators will nonetheless indicate the steps taken to assess project

impacts, especially impacts on local populations, local environment (e.g. increase in the number of individuals of an endangered species, improved water quality, increase in fish stocks, reduced greenhouse gas emissions) and wherever possible indicate how the findings on impacts will be reported to the GEF in future.

Assessment of Sustainability of project outcomes

The TE will assess, at a minimum, the "likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this." The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. More details on the sustainability assessment are provided in the Template for ToR provided in Annex 2.

Catalytic role

The terminal evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out.

Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems

The TE will assess whether the project met the requirements for project design of M&E and the application of the Project M&E plan. GEF projects must budget adequately for execution of the M&E plan, and provide adequate resources for the implementation of the M&E plan. Project managers are also expected to use the information generated by the M&E system during project implementation to improve and adapt the project. Given the long duration of many GEF projects, projects are also encouraged to include long-term monitoring plans to measure results (such as environmental results) after project completion. The TE reports will include separate assessments of the achievements and shortcomings of these two types of M&E systems.

7.2 Specific Topics to Consider

- Have there been changes in local stakeholder behavior that have contributed to improved conservation/ land management? If not, why not?
- Have the products of the project inform/ shape national protected areas thinking/ planning processes?
- Is there distinct improvement in coordination efforts among GSW management agencies?
- Has awareness on the project outputs and subsequent public participation in GSW management increased as a result of the project?
- Is there adequate planning in place, or in progress, ensuring the delivery of project outcomes?

7.3 Final report Outline

1. Executive summary

- Brief description of project
- Context and purpose of the evaluation
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned
- Table summarizing main ratings received

2. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation
- Key issues addressed

- Methodology of the evaluation
- Structure of the evaluation

3. The project(s) and its development context

- Project start and its duration
- Problems that the project seek to address
- Immediate and development objectives of the project
- Main stakeholders
- Results expected

4. Findings

In addition to the Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency assessment described above, a descriptive assessment must be provided. All criteria marked with **(R)** should be rated using the following divisions: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU). Please see Annex 2 for an explanation on the GEF terminology.

4.1. Project Formulation

This section should describe the context of the problem the project seeks to address. It should describe how useful the project conceptualization and design has been for addressing the problem, placing emphasis on the logical consistency of the project and its Logical Framework. This section should seek to answer the following questions: *Was the project well-formulated? Were any modifications made to the Project's LogFrame during implementation, and if so, have these modifications resulted or are expected to result in better and bigger impacts?*

- Conceptualization/Design **(R):** This should assess the approach used in design and an appreciation of the appropriateness of problem conceptualization and whether the selected intervention strategy was the best option to address the barriers in the project area. It should also include an assessment of the logical framework and whether the different project components and activities proposed to achieve the objective were appropriate, viable and responded to contextual institutional, legal and regulatory settings of the project. It should also assess the indicators defined for guiding implementation and measurement of achievement and whether lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) were incorporated into project design.

- Country-ownership/Driveness: Assess the extent to which the project idea/conceptualization had its origin within national, sectoral and development plans and focuses on national environment and development interests.

- Stakeholder participation **(R):** Assess information dissemination, consultation, and "stakeholder" participation in design stages.

- Replication approach: Determine the ways in which lessons and experiences coming out of the project were/are to be replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects (this also relates to actual practices undertaken during implementation).

- Other aspects: to assess in the review of Project formulation approaches, the comparative advantage of UNDP as IA for this project; the consideration of linkages between projects and

other interventions within the sector and the definition of clear and appropriate management arrangements at the design stage.

4.2. Project Implementation

- Implementation Approach **(R):** Independent from the issue of whether the project was well designed or not, the next question should be *how well has the project been implemented?* This section should include an assessment of the following aspects:

  (i) The use of the logical framework as a management tool during implementation and any changes made to this as a response to changing conditions and/or feedback from M & E activities if required.

  (ii) Other elements that indicate adaptive management such as comprehensive and realistic work plans routinely developed that reflect adaptive management; and/or changes in management arrangements to enhance implementation.

  (iii) The project's use/establishment of electronic information technologies to support implementation, participation and monitoring, as well as other project activities.

  (iv) The general operational relationships between the institutions involved and others and how these relationships have contributed to effective implementation and achievement of project objectives.

  (v) Technical capacities associated with the project and their role in project development, management and achievements.

- Monitoring and evaluation **(R):** Including an assessment as to whether there has been adequate periodic oversight of activities during implementation to establish the extent to which inputs, work schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan; whether formal evaluations have been held and whether action has been taken on the results of this monitoring oversight and evaluation reports. For evaluating this, it is proposed that evaluators use the following criteria: i) to evaluate if the project has an appropriate M&E system to follow up the progress towards achieving the project result and objectives ii) to evaluate if appropriate M&E tools have been used, i.e baselines, clear and practical indicators, data analysis, studies to evaluate the expected results for certain project stages (results and progress indicators). iii) to evaluate if resources and capacities to conduct an adequate monitoring are in place and also if the M&E system has been utilized for adaptive management

- Stakeholder participation **(R):** This should include assessments of the mechanisms for information dissemination in project implementation and the extent of stakeholder participation in management, emphasizing the following:

  (i) The production and dissemination of information generated by the project.

  (ii) Local resource users and NGOs participation in project implementation and decision making and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach adopted by the project in this area.

(iii) The establishment of partnerships and collaborative relationships developed by the project with local, national and international entities and the effects they have had on project implementation.

(iv) Involvement of governmental institutions in project implementation, the extent of governmental support of the project.

- Financial Planning: includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE. See more details and explanation of concepts in Annex 3 This section should include:

  (i) The actual project cost by objectives, outputs, activities
  (ii) The cost-effectiveness of achievements (has the project been the cost effective?)
  (iii) Financial management (including disbursement issues)
  (iv) Co-financing Apart from co-financing analysis the evaluators should complete the co financing and leverages resources table provided in Annex 3.

- Execution and implementation modalities. This should consider the effectiveness of the UNDP counterpart and Project Co-ordination Unit participation in selection, recruitment, assignment of experts, consultants and national counterpart staff members and in the definition of tasks and responsibilities; quantity, quality and timeliness of inputs for the project with respect to execution responsibilities, enactment of necessary legislation and budgetary provisions and extent to which these may have affected implementation and sustainability of the Project; quality and timeliness of inputs by UNDP and the Government and other parties responsible for providing inputs to the project, and the extent to which this may have affected the smooth implementation of the project. This section should seek to answer questions such as: *Was the project's implementation done in an efficient and effective manner? Was there effective communication between critical actors in response to the needs of implementation? Were the administrative costs of the Project reasonable and cost efficient?*

4.3. Results

Attainment of Outcomes/ Achievement of project objective **(R):** This TE seeks to determine the extent to which the project's outcomes and project objective were achieved and if there has been any positive or negative impact. For this it is important to determine achievements and shortfalls of the project in achieving outcomes and objectives. If the project did not establish a baseline (initial conditions), the evaluators, with the Project Team, should seek to determine it through the use of special methodologies so that achievements, results and impacts can be properly established. This analysis should be conducted based on specific project indicators.

This section should also include reviews of the following:

- Sustainability*:* Including an appreciation of the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain after GEF assistance/external assistance in this phase has come to an end. The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. Following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability will be addressed. Each of

the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as shown in footnote below :

- *Financial resources:* Are there any financial risks involved in sustaining the project outcomes? What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?
- *Sociopolitical:* Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- *Institutional framework and governance:* Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits? While assessing on this parameter also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how is in place.
- *Environmental:* Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.

- Contribution to upgrading skills of the national staff

5. Conclusions and recommendations

This section must provide the concluding points to this evaluation and specific recommendations. Recommendations should be as specific as possible indicating to whom this are addresses. Please complete the relevant columns of the management response Table provided in Annex 4 with main recommendations made. This section should include:

- Final remarks or synthesis on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results and sustainability of the project;
- Final remarks on the achievement of project outcomes and objective;
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project;
- Actions to follow up on to reinforce initial benefits from the project;
- Proposals for future directions that reinforce the main objectives.

6. Lessons learned

Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.
Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.
Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability
Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

The evaluators will present lessons and recommendations on all aspects of the project that they consider relevant in the TE report. The evaluators will be expected to give special attention to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed or hindered: attainment of project objectives and results, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, and project monitoring and evaluation. Some questions to consider are:

- Is there anything noteworthy/special/critical that was learned during project implementation this year that is important to share with other projects so they can avoid this mistake/make use of this opportunity?
- What would you do differently if you were to begin the project again?
- How does this project contribute to technology transfer?
- To what extent have UNDP GEF projects been relevant to national / local efforts to reduce poverty / enhance democratic governance / strengthen crisis prevention and recovery capacity / promote gender equality and empowerment of women? Please explain.
- Has this project been able to generate global environmental benefits while also contributing to the achievement of national environmental management and sustainable development priorities? If yes, please elaborate.

7. Evaluation report Annexes

- Evaluation TORs
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)
- Clearance and revision form from RCU and CO

VIII. ANNEXES

Annex 1: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators
Annex 2. Explanation on GEF Terminology
Annex 3: Financial Planning – Co-financing
Annex 4: Management response Table
Annex 4. Clearance form

2 Itinerary

Sunday, July 17
Arrival in Belize

Monday, July 18
Debriefing session and interview with Ms. Diane Wade-Moore
Additional background reading and interview preparation

Tuesday, July 19
Interview with Ansel Dubon, former Project Manager, Golden Stream Watershed Project
Interview with Financial Administrator, Golden Stream Watershed Project
Additional background reading and interview preparation

Wednesday, July 20
Meeting with Wilber Sabido, Chief Forest Officer, Forest Department
Travel to Punta Gorda, Toledo District
Interview with Celia Mahung, Executive Director, TIDE
Interview with Lisel Alamilla, Excutive Director, YCT

Thursday, July 21
Guided tour of project area by boat, including the Port Honduras Marine Reserve and Golden Stream Corridor Preserve
Meetings with three members of buffering communities

Friday, July 22
Meeting with YCT staff members
Interview with Pulcheria Teul of Toledo Maya Women's Council

Monday, July 25
Interview with Martin Alegria, GEF Operational Focal Point

Tuesday, July 26
Interview with Tanya Marsden, Policy Unit, Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment

Wednesday, July 27

Interview with APAMO representative, Yvette Alonzo

Interview with BAPPA representative, Paul Walker
Scheduled final presentation to UNDP, Forest Department and YCT and discussion of initial evaluation findings (presentation cancelled due to time constraints)

3 List of persons interviewed

1. Acal, Santiago, current alcalde of Indian Creek
2. Ack, Marchilio, Forest Ranger, YCT
3. Alamilla, Lisel, Executive Director, YCT
4. Alegria, Martin, Chief Environmental Officer, GEF Operational Focal Point, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
5. Alonzo, Yvette, Coordinator of APAMO.
6. Cal, Alfonso, current alcalde of Golden Stream, YCT Board member, chairman of Toledo Alcalde's Association
7. Chub, Julio, YCT Outreach and Outreach Officer
8. Dubon, Ansel, Former Project Manager, Golden StreamWatershed Project
9. Gunn, Alison. Fauna and Flora International's Americas Regional Programme Manager
10. Mahung, Celia, Executive Director, Toledo Institute for Environment and Development (TIDE)
11. Marsden, Tanja, Policy Unit, Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment
12. Mcloughlin, Lee, Protected Areas Manager, YCT
13. Mortis, Aretha, Financial administrator of GSWP
14. Sabido, Wilbur, Chief Forest Officer, Forest Department
15. Teul, Bartholomew, Community Outreach and Livelihoods, Advocacy Programme Manager, YCT
16. Teul, Pulcheria, Former Executive Director, Toledo Maya Women's Council
17. Wade Moore, Diane. Environmental Programme Analyst, UNDP Belize
18. Paul Walker, consultant who worked on CRFR management plan. Also member of BAPPA.
19. Third community member, Punta Gorda district.

4 Summary of field visits

The evaluator carried out a two-week information gathering trip to Belize, including two days of travel time from Canada. Her time was spent in the UNDP Belize office, where she interviewed the UNDP Environmental Programme Analyst and carried out further background reading, interview preparation and preparation for the final presentation. Additional interviews were held with stakeholders from the MNRE and with former GSWP staff in Belmopan.

A three-day field trip to Punta Gorda in the Toledo District was undertaken to interview key stakeholders, including from YCT, TIDE and the Toledo Maya Women's Council. In addition, three community members were interviewed to assess their level of awareness of the project and their perception of the project's impacts. The evaluator also benefitted from a half-day guided tour of the project area, including the Port Honduras Marine Reserve and the Golden Stream Corridor Preserve.

Finally, interviews with representatives of APAMO and BAPPA were carried out in Belize City.

5 List of documents reviewed

1. Belize Environmental Technologies. Mid-Term Evaluation Report. December 2008.
2. Catzim-Sanchez, Adele, Diane Carla Haylock, Belize ISIS Enterprises Ltd. Final Progress Report. Capacity Building Consultancy. December, 2007.
3. Development Solutions Ltd. A Framework for the Implementation of the Golden Stream Watershed Management Strategy. January 2008 or 2009 (conflicting dates in report).
4. Dubon, Ansel. Integrating Protected Areas and Landscape Management in the Golden Stream Watershed Project: Final Project Review Report.
5. Dubon, Ansel. Final report on workshop to discuss landscape management in the Moho River watershed. Punta Gorda. 24 June 2009.
6. Forest Department, Ya'axché, UNDP, GEF, Fauna and Flora International. Strategic Management Plan- Columbia River Forest Reserve 2011-2015. Draft.
7. Global Environment Facility. Global Environment Facility website: Focal Point. Accessed August 3, 2011. Online: http://www.thegef.org/gef/focal_points
8. Meerman, Jan. Land Use Change Detection in the Golden Stream Watershed using Satellite Imagery 2003-2010. September 2010.
9. Meerman, Jan. Land Use Change Detection in the Golden Stream Watershed using Satellite Imagery 2006-2008. December 31, 2008.
10. Meerman, Jen. Promoting Sustainable Development in the Golden Stream Watershed: a Strategy for Landscape-Level Coordination.
11. National Protected Areas Secretariat, Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment. Ongoing Consultancies.
12. Project Management Unit. Project Implementation Report 2007
13. Project Management Unit. Project Implementation Report 2008
14. Project Management Unit. Project Implementation Report 2009
15. Project Management Unit. Annual Performance Review. February 2010.
16. Project Management Unit. Highlights of 2009. 2010 APR April 2010- *internal document?*
17. Project Management Unit. Major successes 2008-2009. August 2009. - *internal document?*
18. Project Management Unit. Project Implementation Report 2010
19. Project Management Unit. Undated. PowerPoint presentation on project: Integrating Protected Areas and Landscape Management in the Golden Stream Watershed.
20. Project Management Unit. Brochure: Integrating Protected Areas and Landscape Management in the Golden Stream Watershed.
21. Project Management Unit. Undated. GSW Revised Logframe.
22. Project Management Unit. Golden Stream Watershed Initiative (in pictures): 2006-2010. 2010
23. Project Management Unit. Report of field trip to Sarteneja. Aug. 6 and 7 2010.
24. Project Management Unit. Final report on workshop to discuss landscape management in the Moho River watershed.
25. Project Management Unit. Minutes of February 2007 Board meeting
26. Project Management Unit. PowerPoint presentation: Integrating Protected Areas and Landscape Management in the Golden Stream Watershed Initiative.
27. Strategic Management Plan – Colombia River Forest Reserve 2011-2015 Draft.
28. TASTE (Toledo Association for Sustainable Tourism and Empowerment), Friends of Nature and The Nature Conservancy. Undated. The Southern Belize Reef Complex Conservation Action Planning in Belize.
29. TIDE, YCT, UNDP, GEF. A Management Plan for the Golden Stream Private Protected Lands owned by TIDE and Ya'axché including Blocks 123/127/130 and the Golden Stream Corridor Preserve. August 2010.

30. UNDP. UNDP Common Country Assessment for Belize. 2006.
31. UNDP Belize. Integrating Protected Areas and Landscape Management in the Golden Stream Watershed: PIMS 1740 – PRODOC
32. UNDP Belize. Medium-Sized Project Proposal Request for GEF Funding. Integrating Protected Area and Landscape Management in the Golden Stream Watershed. August 2005.
33. Vernon, Dylan. "From Proposal Concept to Mid-Point of Project Implementation" A Systematization of the Golden Stream Watershed Project. December 2008.
34. Wicks, Nick and Chris Hamley. Management Effectiveness Review of the GSWs Protected Areas 2010.
35. Wicks, Nicholas and Chris Hamley. End of Project Biodiversity Synthesis Report. August 2010.
36. Wicks, Nicholas. Port Honduras Management Plan Progress Report. 14 Dec. 2009
37. Woods, Valerie, Terry Wright, and Osmany Salas, Business Planning Strategy for the Golden Stream Watershed. June 2009.
38. YCT (with support from Fauna and Flora International). Undated. Integrated Strategy for the Sustainable Development of the Maya Golden Landscape.

6 Questionnaire used and summary of results

It should be noted that the evaluator prepared detailed questions for each of the individuals interviewed based on their particular area of expertise and involvement in the project, rather than a single standardized questionnaire. The interview questions covered a wide gamut of questions, and looked at project design, implementation and results. Interview questions also explored the level of sustainability of project results, and analyzed possible financial, institutional/ governance, socio-political and environmental risks that could undermine the sustainability of project impacts. Finally, the evaluator asked all interviewees about lessons learned and recommendations for future projects of this nature.

The summary of the results is provided in the Executive Summary of the main report. In general, interviewees felt that the project was well-designed and that the deficiencies in the logical framework were by and large addressed during project implementation. Stakeholder involvement in the last stages of project design was felt to have been insufficient. In terms of project implementation, all interviewees agreed that the Project Management Unit proficiently implemented the project, and carried out sound monitoring and evaluation, reporting and financial management. The operational relationships between the Implementing Agency and Executing Agency improved after the initial misunderstandings surrounding each organization's role were clarified. The NGO Execution Modality was felt to have been associated with a certain level of difficulty in maintaining government engagement with the project. Finally, with reference to the level of achievement of project results, the main outputs in terms of the production of planning tools, the implementation of sustainable development activities, preparation of draft legislation and dissemination of project information were accomplished. Outcomes were partially achieved, but less implementation of the planning tools was achieved than hoped for due to time constraints and the legislative recommendations made by the project have not yet been adopted by the government. Overall, the project results were felt by interviewees to be sustainable due to the fact that the project objectives have been institutionalized within the work of YCT, due to ongoing national legislative processes and projects that support the project's objectives and due to the capacities that have been strengthened through the project. Insufficient financial resources and political will for project follow-up are potential risks that will need to be carefully monitored in particular.

Interviews with community members revealed that they did not generally distinguish between the project and the overall work of YCT. There was a general perception of the importance of the ideas being promoted and of safeguarding the resources on which people depend. Interviewees appreciated the work undertaken to promote initiatives such as women's food preparation, agroforestry with cacao, and honey production and were interested in continuing to work in areas such as ecotourism. However, with respect to the latter, concern was expressed that there are still insufficient tourists coming to the area. One interviewee encouraged YCT to do more work to spread the message to school children, churchgoers, and other audiences. Interviewees commented that the process of changing people's mindsets takes time but is starting to occur, with a concomitant easing of pressures on the protected area resources. Interviewees appreciated the fact that YCT granted them permission for selective cutting of trees for the construction of their thatched homes and indicated that if certain restrictions are imposed as a result of the legal protection of protected areas, then it makes sense for benefits to be provided to communities as well.

7 Logical Framework (Final Version)

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Goal: Belize's protected area management system to function as an integrated, coordinated and cost-effective tool for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use					

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Project Objective For the Golden Stream Watershed (GSW) to function as a replicable model of how multiple protected areas working within an ecologically interconnected and interdependent area can jointly achieve conservation and sustainable use objectives, thereby catalyzing the sustainability of Belize's national protected area system.	a. Management effectiveness of protected areas. b. Protected area encroachment, illegal hunting of wildlife, number of fires in the GSW & buffer areas reduced. c. Change in land use to more sustainable systems.	a. Management Effectiveness exercise conducted for 2006 as follows (Tracked using WWF RAPPAM methodology): Golden Stream Corridor Preserve = 50.8%; Colombia River Forest Reserve = 35.6%; Block 127 = 42.1%. Port Honduras Marine Reserve (= 60.6%. b. Fires Major Fires (Tracked using Modis) = 0, Est. No. from surveys = 42, Acres = 115.5, No. of fires escaped from anthropogenic activities = 0 Encroachment Hunting Trails = 2 White lipped peccary hunted = 22 Jaguars hunted (July 2006- June 2007= 1 Camp sites = 0 c. No farmers/land managers incorporating land use strategies based on the landscape approach.	a. By project midpoint management effectiveness has increased by 10% and by 25% by the end of the project of 2006 levels. b. Threats to the protected areas from fire, illegal incursions, etc. have reduced by 25% by the end of the project of 2006 levels. c. Trend for unsustainable land use reversed and >50% of land managers incorporating best use practices.	a. Management effectiveness reports b. GSW biodiversity monitoring system data, synthesizing reports c. Social surveys aerial surveys / satellite imagery	That the GoB will fully implement the NPAPSP process Have support of relevant line ministries with jurisdiction for issues /areas of project activity and focus That protected area managers and GSW stakeholders understand the benefits and are receptive to a collaborative approach and maintain support for the initiative until these benefits are realized

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Biodiversity monitoring system indicates improving ecosystem integrity and health Biodiversity index:1) species richness (numbers of species), 2) Simpson's & 3) Shannon-Weiner biodiversity indices, both of the latter are commonly utilized measure of species diversity	For species of selected threatened or socio-economically important mammals being monitored = 2.83 species per 1 km transect walked. Average indices for April2006 – March 2007 were: Simpson's index: 0.32125 and the average Shannon's index: 1.0075.	By the end of the project abundance of key mammal and bird species have significantly increased statistically.	GSW biodiversity monitoring system (data, synthesizing reports)	-Capacity to measure exists -Natural and man-made disasters-and impacts can be mitigated -Security and criminal encroachment can be mitigated
	Overall connectivity and coverage of riparian zone	Riparian coverage mapping (will be determined for 2009 and work back based on age of wamil/forest)	Overall connectivity and coverage of riparian zone remains same as 20069 levels.	Field Reports and pictures	

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Economic enterprises based on sustainable resource management practices are developed on the basis of GSW's sustainable management	53% of surveyed farmers are cultivating only 'traditional crops' (rice, beans, corn and chicken) rather than diversified systems with another 31% and 19% only cultivating one or two other crops respectively. 27 % practicing permaculture.	Businesses, some certified, established and coordinated across each relevant sector – Agroforestry, ecotourism, forestry (timber / NTFPs),	Business surveys, reports	That private entities enterprises are encouraged by the opportunities for investing in the GSW, Certification is a viable business improvement strategy Belize remains relatively unaffected by the global economic crisis. Ability for local investors is not severely impacted by the global economic crisis.

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Other PAMOs in Belize have begun to apply GSW example.	No examples of PAMOs working collectively to generate socioeconomic benefits and strengthen the sustainability of the National Protected Areas System (NPAS)	By the end of the project replication of the lessons learned at the operational level of the GSW experience will be underway within at least 2 sites elsewhere in Toledo and/or Belize	Documentary evidence, references to GSW model in other PA's work	Commitment of the government and other Protected Area Managers / donors to replicate lessons elsewhere in Belize exists GSW PAMOs are able to secure adequate co-financing to ensure that conservation and sustainable development activities are balanced thereby ensuring that the model is worthy of being replicated. PAMOs in other landscape have the resources to replicate elements of the GSW experience Socio-economic environment in other areas are conducive to replication

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Level of collaboration among PAMO's and other entities in the watershed.	No evidence of deliberate collaboration.	All three of the PAMOs will be actively collaborating in preparation of plans and implementation of activities. As the lead entity, Ya'axche will be collaborating with at least two other entities in applying other aspects of landscape management.	Annual work-plans, strategic plans, reports of joint planning, etc. Evidence of activities on the ground. Reports and photos.	Staff turnover of PAMOs and other entities remain fairly stable
	Numbers of hectares of forest protected through stabilization of land conversion rates	27,650 ha or 79% of the GSW are covered by forest whilst human impacted lands account for 7,276 ha or 21%	By 2010, increase the size of broadleaf forest within the GSW by 5% By 2010, 5% of existing agricultural lands have been rehabilitated through sustainable forestry and agroforestry practices in Medina Bank, Golden Stream, and Indian Creek	Forest cover assessment (Annex 2)	Socio-economic, political environment and normal weather patterns remain stable. The FD and other stakeholders can mobilize adequate resources to reduce illegal incursions into the CRFR.

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 1: Protected area management authorities are implementing a complementary set of management plans for GSW's four protected areas	Complementary and cross-referenced management plans produced for each of the GSW's terrestrial PAs	None of GSW's terrestrial PAs have cross-referenced management plans, and minimal standardization of management practices exists.	All 3 implicated terrestrial PAs within the GSW will have management plans, designed to be complementary (e.g., through shared BD system and data) and mutually reinforcing, while reflecting specific realities of the PA in question	Management plans for GSCP, Block 127 and CFRF	Protected area managers maintain commitment to sustaining collaborative activities
	Terrestrial and marine PA managers are coordinating monitoring in an integrated manner across the GSW	No systematic coordination among PA managers exists	All PAs will be working jointly to secure systematic monitoring of the GSW's biodiversity	Documents (meeting minutes, reports), equipment inventories PHMR management plan and activities reflect coordination with terrestrial PAs Ranger field reports and biodiversity monitoring data base	
	Self financing of PAs in the GSW has increased by the end of the project	PAs are not self-financed, and APAMO agencies are not capitalizing on opportunities to do so collectively	Protected Areas Management Organizations (PAMOs) will be capitalizing on sustainable enterprise opportunities to ensure the system's long-term financial sustainability, with self-financing increased by 25-30% per implicated PAMO.	Implicated PAMO agencies' annual audits/ financial reports, detailing distribution of institutional funds	Both TIDE and Ya'axché have been able to secure funds in addition to what was planned under the project. Ya'axché has instituted two programs aimed at revenue generation: a) first, community members are allowed to sustainably harvest

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
					some forest resources at a fee, and b) a program on 'Be a ranger for a day' whereby individuals pay a small fee to spend the day working alongside a ranger. Ya'axché and ? [error in logframe as mentions Ya'axché twice here) have also begun discussions on the way forward on carbon financing. TIDE continues to strengthen TIDE Tours so that one day it will become the main source of earned income for TIDE. We also plan to research the feasibility of engaging in agroforestry (cacao) if permitted, and becoming a membership organization. The latter two are not near realization so it's hard to say when they may

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
					come on stream.
Output 1.1 - An agreed watershed-level strategy for PAs and timetable among PA management authorities concerning individual PA management plan development, together with co-ordination of implementation of latter	A collective timetable and strategy for coordinating GSW-level management. Meetings of the key PAMO agencies Coordinated field patrols are being conducted by the 3 implicated PAMO agencies	No watershed level strategy exists to secure coordination between the GSW's respective PAs.	Model, replicable system of integrated watershed-level management endorsed by 3 PA managers, enabling incipient GSW conservation corridor to be consolidated and sustained	Timetable, strategy, meeting reports, patrol reports (documents)	PAMOs are able to agree upon and sustain a collective strategy throughout project period and beyond
Output 1.2 Capacity of local PAMO institutions and staff to plan, implement and sustain PA plans strengthened.	Continuous training and planning sessions provided to PAMO staff on an ongoing basis throughout project, based on skills gaps and needs assessment Field management reports and surveys showing PAMO staff assuming responsibility for management	Capacity of PAMOs to manage PAs limited due to lack of management plans, training, and infrastructure (equipment, facilities)	PAMO staff have assumed and are sustaining management of PA plans independent of GEF-funded staff / consultants' support	Mid-term and final project evaluations Training sessions and field reports (documents)	PAMO organizations do not suffer from high level of staff turnover undermining capacity building efforts enabled by the GEF mechanism FD is able to mobilize adequate resources for the CRFR.
Output 1.3 - GSCP management plan has been updated and is being implemented	GSCP management plan updated in accordance with the agreed GSW PA management framework and priorities	Management plan has been produced but does not cross-references to other PA and is not in line with the management strategy	Management plan for GSCP finalized and being implemented in conjunction with other PAs in GSW by the end of the project	GSCP management plan (document) Mid-term and final project evaluations	YCT is able to secure permanent exemption of PPA from national land taxes, ensuring the sustainability of the PPA

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Output 1.4 - Block 127 management plan has been developed and its implementation has been initiated.	Block 127 management plan produced, in accordance to the agreed GSW PA management framework and priorities	No management plan for Block 127 exists	Management plan for Block 127 finalized and being implemented in conjunction with other PAs in GSW by the end of Year 2 of the project	Block 127 management plan (document) Mid-term and final project evaluations.	TIDE secures the means to sustain permanent field personnel in Block 127.
Output 1.5 - CRFR (ex-MMFR) management plan has been developed and is being implemented.	CRFR management plan produced in the context of the GSW Landscape Framework	No management plan for CRFR block exists	Management plan for CRFR finalized and being implemented in conjunction with other PAs in GSW by the end of Year 2 of the project	CRFR management plan (document) Mid-term and final project evaluations	GOB / FD continues to collaborate in the design and implementation of a new management regime for the CRFR
Output 1.6 - PHMR management plan has been revised and it is under implementation	Revised PHMR plan reflects conscious interdependency with GSW management system, and is reflected by new collaborative activities on the ground	No terrestrial interdependency or coordination of management reflected in plan or daily management of the PHMR	Revised PHMR plan reflects integration with GSW management system	PHMR plan Reports of the PSC (documents)	TIDE staff ensure that linkages between terrestrial and marine PAs in the GSW are created and maintained TIDE's interest in project remains same.
Output 1.7 – Coordinated management – e.g. with GSW Biodiversity Monitoring system – established and sustained.	Inter-PA BD monitoring system has been established and is being maintained across the GSW PA landscape	No inter-PA BD monitoring system exists in GSW or elsewhere in Belize	The GSW's PA managers are maintaining a systematic, model collaborative management system in the GSW, providing an example for national replication	GSW biodiversity database (monitoring reports)	All PAMOs equally prioritize the need to create relevant and up-to-date database of biodiversity information in the GSW and share findings with one another.

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 2: Protected area management authorities, local government bodies, private sector landholders and local communities are co-operating in the implementation of sustainable development strategies over the long-term	a. The existence of a GSW management strategy, including business component, produced as a result of collective stakeholder input to guide decision-making with regards to management and development and conservation of the area. b. Joint planning of short term sustainable development activities among different actors in the watershed.	No joint strategy exists at a landscape level within the GSW or any comparative watershed within Belize as a model for collective action towards sustainable development	a. Strategy and business plan completed by the end of year ~~2~~ 3. b. PAMOs have met at least once in year three and year four to jointly plan short term sustainable development activities aimed at organizational and community development.	a. Copies of documents at offices of different PAMOs and with community leaders. b. Planning reports and hard/digital copies of plans	Socioeconomic conditions remain stable Resources available for organizations to continuously participate Land management (use/titling) remain the same Institutional environments remain the same Despite changing environs, organizational/community motivation to engage in project activities remains
	New and existing enterprises incorporating biodiversity-friendly and sustainable development considerations	No coordinated effort exists to actively encourage or solicit biodiversity-friendly investments in the GSW	By the end of the project a minimum of 25% of the enterprises in the GSW are utilizing "best practices", techniques and approaches learned from project	Private sector investments surveys	Private investors prove responsive to the GSW stakeholders' business strategies, and invest in sectors identified by the GSWAC
Output 2.1 - Golden Stream Watershed Advisory Committee has been established and is guiding	GSWAC meeting minutes reflect strategic decisions towards the implementation of the	No systematic and sustained coordination between the GSW's stakeholders exists to guide management and development of the area based on shared interests and priorities	By the end of the third year the GSWAC is fully functional	PEG and GSWAC meeting minutes and reports	Project can offer locally relevant benefits to address stakeholders' interests

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
implementation of the management strategy	management strategy.				
Output 2.2 - A landscape management strategy ~~plan~~ to direct and enhance conservation and sustainable management of the GSW over the long-term has been produced	GSW management strategy including conservation and development strategies for the area produced PAs management plans and organizational strategic plans reflect landscape level strategies as per the GSW management strategy.	No management plan or business strategy exists for the GSW or other watersheds in Toledo or in Belize as a whole to provide an example for national replication	By the end of the third year at least two entities would have incorporated elements of the landscape level plan and business strategy into their individual organizational, PA and community development plans	Organizational strategic and/or business plans and PA management plans	The GSW stakeholders can agree upon preferred strategies to focus upon in the development of the area
Output 2.3 Local stakeholders' capacity for sustainable and integrated resource use and management increased	a. GSW farmers have been trained and are adopting biodiversity-friendly agricultural techniques. b. Commercial operators in GSW are pursuing biodiversity-friendly ventures because of direct collaboration with the GSWP.	Minimal biodiversity-friendly industry underway in the GSW, largely limited to cultivation of organic cacao and limited ecotourism, benefiting private sector and only to a limited extent, the local communities (100% of farmers interviewed practicing slash and burn)	a. By the end of the project 75% of farmers in watershed have been trained and are adopting some elements of the training. b. By the end of year three of the project all commercial operators are cognizant of the management strategy and a minimum of 50% are incorporating elements of the management strategy	a. Stakeholder surveys b. Survey of commercial operators in the GSW c. End-of-project business survey of economic activities of GSW	The growth of traditional development or extractive industries (logging, large-scale plantation agriculture) do not expand into the GSW and undermine the resource base upon which the sustainable business alternatives depend.
Outcome 3: Fiscal and legislative environments affecting private protected areas	PPAs are legally recognized by the GoB.	PPAs are not recognized by national legislation, or incorporated within the NPAS	Legal recognition by GoB obtained by end of project	New or reformed legislation pertaining to the NPAS / PPAs	Relevant policy decision-makers appreciate critical role played by

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
enhanced by specific changes in the policy environment				Policy analysis reports PPA legislation	PPAs and private lands in consolidating national conservation efforts, and are willing to modify laws and fiscal constraints to enhance an enabling environment for PPA management National political context and commitments to NPASP remain constant Budget and revenue expenditures of Private Protected Areas Management Organizations (PPAMOs) remain constant
Output 3.1 Key policy makers and general public's awareness of PPAs' critical role within the NPAS increased	Knowledge of the difference between national PAs and PPAs and benefits of each.	Little national awareness of importance of PPAs in Belize; BAPPA's level of advocacy and profile minimal (% of the public interviewed recognized the unique role that PPAs play in Belize's National Development which is to fill key gaps in Belize's NPAS)	By the end of the third year of the project there is widespread national awareness of the importance of PPAs in sustaining the NPASP; The mechanism ~~need~~ to regulate	-Pre- and post-project surveys of public / policy makers -PPA criteria document	BAPPA becomes more organized, proactive and effective in its lobbying efforts, as a result of additional support from the GSW project

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
			establishment and management of PPAs formally integrated into the national system third year of the project.		
Output 3.2 PPAs officially recognized by and incorporated within revised legislative framework governing Belize's NPAS	Private Protected Areas appear in the lands registry and are reflected on the official PA's map of Belize.	PPAs not recognized within national legislation pertaining to PAs (the National Protected Area Act and System Plan)	PPAS recognized within national legislative system by the end of the project	NPAS reformed legislation (document). Official PA's map of Belize. PPA Bill/Act	Policymakers prove responsive to the need to incorporate PPAs within the NPAS
Output 3.3 Mechanism for PPAs to benefit from Conservation Covenants has been established.	Conservation Covenant Bill has been prepared.	No conservation easements exist in Belize	By the end of the project all PPA Management Organizations are demonstrating increase knowledge of conservation easements and stewardship mechanisms. Conservation Covenant Bill has been prepared and is endorsed by the regulatory bodies.	Pre- and Post project surveys	PPAMOs are able to maintain their technical staff.

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Outcome 4: Protected area management authorities and other stakeholders throughout Belize have benefited from, and are beginning to apply lessons learned from the GSW experience	Techniques and methods related to landscape management approach are being adopted within at least two other landscape in Belize	No concrete example of multiple, adjacent protected areas coordinating management across boundaries towards common conservation goals	At least 2 interconnected PA areas in Belize (preferably within a landscape / PPA context), consisting of at least 2 PA managing entities are applying lessons learnt from GSW by the end of the project	PA areas' reports References to GSW experience in planning and project documents related to PAM.	Government continues to support the project Acceptance of landscape management approach is widespread among protected areas authorities and resource management agencies PAs management entities are cognizant of and support the NPAPSP.
Output 4.1 Best practices and lessons learned have been disseminated to other PA's entities and other stakeholders in Belize.	a. Communication tools (publications, reports and recommendations) specifically targeting park managers, policy decision makers and the communities have been produced throughout the course of the project b. PA's entities and other stakeholders from throughout Belize are demonstrating awareness of the GSW Project, in particular lessons learned and	Minimal awareness of the GSW's potential to provide model of corridor and watershed level conservation (Only 2 out of 10 members of APAMO stated that they had any awareness of the GSWP, one of which was Bartolo Teul and the other was Alejandro Martinez from TNC who was involved in the GSWP through the MMMC CAP).	By the completion of the project there is widespread awareness of and interest in learning more from the GSW model demonstrated amongst Belize's PAMO community	a. Communication materials on the GSW experience, and records of dissemination strategies used to distribute them. b. Pre- and post-project survey reports	Other PAMO agencies and other stakeholders in Belize are interested in learning from the GSW experience.

Project Strategy	Indicators	Baseline	Target	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
	best practices.				
Output 4.2 Case study of project experiences based on monitoring & evaluation processes and mechanism have been developed	Consultant/s for mid and final evaluation are able to clearly identify specific documented process and mechanisms that contributed to or hindered the project success	No GSW-wide management, development or monitoring programme or strategy exists, nor are current, incipient efforts at collaborative work being evaluated	Project benefits from robust monitoring and evaluation throughout its implementation phase	Project evaluation reports (mid-term, final)	No unforeseen disaster prevents the normal functioning of the project, and requisite evaluation of its achievements at the stipulated stages laid out in the proposal

8 Financial Tables

Project Financial Summary by Outcome and Year

Output	Annual						Total Budget
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	
Outcome 1: **Protected area management authorities are implementing a complementary set of management plans for GSW's four protected areas**							
Total Project Budget as in PRODOC	119,790.00	37,730.00	35,530.00	32,780.00	0.00	0	225,830.00
Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	4,000.00	77,875.00	112,054.50	101,453.00	33,037.50	4,000	328,420.00
Disbursed	4,000.00	62,351.70	85,115.57	103,812.24	28,818.24	0	284,097.75
Delivery Rate	100%	80%	76%	102%	87%	0%	126%
Outcome 2: **Protected area management authorities, local government bodies, private sector landholders and local communities are co-operating in the implementation of sustainable development strategies over the long-term**							
Total Project Budget as in PRODOC	35,420.00	84,820.00	36,530.00	32,570.00	0.00	0	189,340.00

Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	3,150.00	69,945.00	89,695.00	43,970.00	13,760.00	0		220,520.00
Disbursed	3,150.00	67,643.16	78,616.08	38,799.22	18,180.54	0		206,389.00
Delivery Rate	100%	97%	88%	88%	132%	0%		109%
Outcome 3: **Fiscal and legislative environments affecting private protected areas enhanced by specific changes in the policy environment**								
Total Project Budget as in PRODOC	8,063.00	6,380.00	6,380.00	13,860.00	0.00	0		34,683
Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	0.00	10,260.00	18,867.50	6,460.00	330.00	0		35917.5
Disbursed	0.00	8,893.59	15,688.51	3882.08	12.54	0		28476.72
Delivery Rate	0%	87%	83%	60%	4%	0%		82%
Outcome 4: **Protected area management authorities and other stakeholders throughout Belize have benefited from, and are beginning to apply, lessons learned from the GSW experience**								
Total Project Budget as in PRODOC	9,900.00	26,950.00	9,306.00	45,965.00	0.00	0		92121
Annual Work Plan (as in	0.00	0	7,400.00	8,455.00	3,730.00	0		19585

Atlas)								
Disbursed	0.00	0	5,795.26	2453.17	2024.72	0		10273.15
Delivery Rate	0%	0%	78%	29%	54%	0%		11%
Outcome 5: **Institutional Capacity of EA and local collaborating NGO's strengthened and supported**								
Total Project Budget as in PRODOC	140,811.00	98,505.00	95,205.00	98,505.00	0.00	0		433026
Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	61,550.45	97,450.00	129,942.64	120,290.00	90,150.00	30,705.32		534088.41
Disbursed	61,550.45	86,797.29	112,919.86	92,434.68	57355.78	0.00		411058.06
Delivery Rate	100%	89%	87%	77%	64%	0%		95%
Grand Total								
Total Project Budget as in PRODOC	313,984.00	254,385.00	182,951.00	223,680.00	0	0		975,000.00
Total Annual Work Plan (as in Atlas)	68,700.45	255,530.00	357,959.64	280,628.00	141,007.50	34705.32		
Total Disbursed	68,700.45	225,685.74	298,135.28	241,381.39	106,391.82	0		940,294.68

Total Delivery Rate	100%	88%	83%	86%	75%	0%		96%

Co-financing Table:

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (US$ in thousands)		Government (US$ in thousands)		Other* (US$ in thousands)		Total (US$ in thousands)		Total Disbursement (US$ in thousands)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
Grants		20,000			625,668	1,080,312	645,668	1,080,312	645,668	1,054,822

Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate)										
Credits										
Equity investments										
In-kind support		30,000	80,000	66,000	473,900	295,400	494,500	361,400	494,500	361,400
Other (*)										
Totals		**50,000**	**80,000**	**66,000**	**1,099,568**	**1,375,712**	**1,140,568**	**1,441,712**	**1,140,568**	**1,416,222**

9 Management Response Table and Tracking Template

Evaluation Title: Evaluation of "PIMS 1740- Integrating Protected Areas Landscape Management in the Golden Stream Watershed" Proiect
Evaluation Completion Date: September 2011

Key issues and Recommendations	Management Response*				Tracking**	
	Response	Key Actions	Timeframe	Responsible unit(s)	Status***	Comments
Continue to fundraise for the implementation of the management plans for the private lands owned by YCT and TIDE, PHMR and CRFR (if and when approved). CRFR is a particular priority as this is the PA in the GSW with the least resources secured for its management.				YCT, TIDE and FD		
Promote formal approval of the management plans produced under this project.				YCT and FD		
Continue to implement the Biodiversity Research, Inventory and Monitoring Strategy in the GSW to provide continual, long-term data				YCT and TIDE		

Continue to work with communities engaged in sustainable livelihood activities during the project to provide ongoing technical and marketing support to promote the sustainability of these activities (e.g. for beekeeping, organic vegetable production, production of food products by women's groups, agroforestry with cacao, sustainable tourism)				YCT and TIDE		
Refine social survey techniques to measure true impact of project and post-project promotion of sustainable livelihood alternatives in communities of the Golden Stream Watershed.				YCT		
Continue to advocate for the inclusion of the legislative recommendations regarding private protected areas and conservation covenants in the National Protected Areas Act that is currently being revised				YCT, BAPPA, UNDP		
Continue to disseminate project documents and lessons learned throughout Belize to promote replication of the integrated landscape				YCT, UNDP Belize, FD, TIDE, APAMO		

management approach to PA management piloted in the GSW, with a focus on sites that are being prioritized by the main stakeholders.						
Continue to carry out education and raise awareness among PAMOs, APAMO, BAPPA and government decision makers about the integrated landscape management approach to PA management to promote increased understanding and further institutionalization of the concept at the policy and operational levels				YCT, technical staff of FD		
Ensure lessons learned from the GSWP are taken into consideration during implementation of the project: "Strengthening National Capacities for Operationalization, Consolidation and Sustainability of Belize's Protected Area System"				Former GSWP Manager, Ansel Dubon, who is now Coordinator of this new project, UNDP Belize, FD		
Disseminate the Terminal Evaluation of the GSWP to all relevant stakeholders and consider holding a meeting/workshop to discuss lessons learned and recommendations among all stakeholders, particularly				UNDP Belize, YCT		

with regard to the NGO Execution Modality						

10 Protected Areas Tracking Tools

Objective 1: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

SECTION I

I. General Data	Please indicate your answer here	Notes
Project Title	1740 - Integrating Protected Area and Landscape Management in the Golden Stream Watershed	
GEF Project ID	PIMS 1740	
Agency Project ID	47831	
Implementing Agency	UNDP	
Project Type	MSP	FSP or MSP
Country	Single Country	
Region		
Date of submission of the tracking tool	40,436	Month DD, YYYY (e.g., May 12, 2010)
Name of reviewers completing tracking tool and completion date		Completion Date
Planned project duration	5	years
Actual project duration	5	years
Lead Project Executing Agency (ies)		
Date of Council/CEO Approval	October 18, 2005	Month DD, YYYY (e.g., May 12, 2010)
GEF Grant (US$)	1,000,000	
Cofinancing expected (US$)	November 14, 4967	
II. Total Extent in hectares of protected areas targeted by the project by biome type	**Please indicate your answer here**	
Please use the following biomes provided below and place the coverage data within these biomes		
Terrestrial (insert total hectares for terrestrial coverage and then provide coverage for each of the terrestrial biomes below)		

Total hectares	32,434	ha
Tropical and subtropical moist broadleaf forests (tropical and subtropical, humid)	29,154	ha
Tropical and subtropical dry broadleaf forests (tropical and subtropical, semi-humid)		ha
Tropical and subtropical coniferous forests (tropical and subtropical, semi-humid)		ha
Temperate broadleaf and mixed forests (temperate, humid)		ha
Temperate coniferous forests (temperate, humid to semi-humid)		ha
Boreal forests/taiga (subarctic, humid)		ha
Tropical and subtropical grasslands, savannas, and shrublands (tropical and subtropical, semi-arid)	2615	ha
Temperate grasslands, savannas, and shrublands (temperate, semi-arid)		ha
Flooded grasslands and savannas (temperate to tropical, fresh or brackish water inundated)		ha
Mangroves		ha
Montane grasslands and shrublands (alpine or montane climate)		ha
Tundra (Arctic)		ha
Mediterranean forests, woodlands, and scrub or Sclerophyll forests (temperate warm, semi-humid to semi-arid with winter rainfall)		ha
Deserts and xeric shrublands (temperate to tropical, arid)		ha
Mangrove (subtropical and tropical, salt water inundated)	665	ha
Freshwater (insert total hectares for freshwater coverage and then provide coverage for each of the freshwater biomes below)		
Total hectares	216	ha
Large lakes		ha
Large river deltas		ha
Polar freshwaters		ha
Montane freshwaters		ha

Temperate coastal rivers		ha
Temperate floodplain rivers and wetlands		ha
Temperate upland rivers		ha
Tropical and subtropical coastal rivers		ha
Tropical and subtropical floodplain rivers and wetlands	216	ha
Tropical and subtropical upland rivers		ha
Xeric freshwaters and endorheic basins		ha
Oceanic islands		ha
Total hectares	41,440	ha
Coral reefs		ha
Estuaries		ha
Ocean (beyond EEZ)		ha
III. Please complete the table below for the protected areas that are the target of the GEF intervention. Use NA for not applicable.		
1. Protected Area		
Name of Protected Area	Columbia River Forest Reserve	
Is this a new protected area?	0	Yes = 1, No = 0
Area in Hectares	60020	ha, Please specify biome type
Global designation or priority lists	no	(E.g., Biosphere Reserve, World Heritage site, Ramsar site, WWF Global 2000, etc.)
Local Designation of Protected Area	Forest Reserve	(E.g, indigenous reserve, private reserve, etc.)
IUCN Category	6	**1:** Strict Nature Reserve/Wilderness Area: managed mainly for science or wilderness protection **2:** National Park: managed mainly for ecosystem protection and recreation **3:** Natural Monument: managed mainly for conservation of specific natural features **4:** Ha
2.Protected Area		
Name of Protected Area	Golden Stream Corridor Preserve	

Is this a new protected area?	0	Yes = 1, No = 0
Area in Hectares	6048	ha, Please specify biome type
Global designation or priority lists	no	(E.g., Biosphere Reserve, World Heritage site, Ramsar site, WWF Global 2000, etc.)
Local Designation of Protected Area	Private Reserve	(E.g, indigenous reserve, private reserve, etc.)
IUCN Category	1	**1:** Strict Nature Reserve/Wilderness Area: managed mainly for science or wilderness protection **2:** National Park: managed mainly for ecosystem protection and recreation **3:** Natural Monument: managed mainly for conservation of specific natural features **4:** Ha
3.Protected Area		
Name of Protected Area	Block 127	
Is this a new protected area?	0	Yes = 1, No = 0
Area in Hectares	10926	ha, Please specify biome type
Global designation or priority lists	no	(E.g., Biosphere Reserve, World Heritage site, Ramsar site, WWF Global 2000, etc.)
Local Designation of Protected Area	Private Reserve	(E.g, indigenous reserve, private reserve, etc.)
IUCN Category	1	**1:** Strict Nature Reserve/Wilderness Area: managed mainly for science or wilderness protection **2:** National Park: managed mainly for ecosystem protection and recreation **3:** Natural Monument: managed mainly for conservation of specific natural features **4:** Ha
4.Protected Area		
Name of Protected Area	Port Honduras Marine Reserve	
Is this a new protected area?	0	Yes = 1, No = 0
Area in Hectares	41440	ha, Please specify biome type
Global designation or priority lists	no	(E.g., Biosphere Reserve, World Heritage site, Ramsar site, WWF Global 2000, etc.)
Local Designation of Protected Area	Marine Reserve	(E.g, indigenous reserve, private reserve, etc.)

IUCN Category	6	**1:** Strict Nature Reserve/Wilderness Area: managed mainly for science or wilderness protection **2:** National Park: managed mainly for ecosystem protection and recreation **3:** Natural Monument: managed mainly for conservation of specific natural features **4:** Ha
5.Protected Area		
Name of Protected Area	Bladen Nature Reserve	
Is this a new protected area?	0	Yes = 1, No = 0
Area in Hectares	39255	ha, Please specify biome type
Global designation or priority lists	no	(E.g., Biosphere Reserve, World Heritage site, Ramsar site, WWF Global 2000, etc.)
Local Designation of Protected Area	Nature Reserve	(E.g, indigenous reserve, private reserve, etc.)
IUCN Category	1	**1:** Strict Nature Reserve/Wilderness Area: managed mainly for science or wilderness protection **2:** National Park: managed mainly for ecosystem protection and recreation **3:** Natural Monument: managed mainly for conservation of specific natural features **4:** Ha

Objective 1: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

SECTION II: Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for Protected Areas (1)

Data Sheet 1: Reporting Progress at Protected Area Sites	Please indicate your answer here	Notes
Name, affiliation and contact details for person responsible for completing the METT (email etc.)	Diane Wade-Moore (UNDP)	
Date assessment carried out	40,632	Month DD, YYYY (
Name of protected area	Columbia River Forest Reserve	
WDPA site code (these codes can be found on www.unep-wcmc.org/wdpa/)		

Designations(please choose 1-3)	1	1: National 2: IUCN Category 3: International (p 35-69 as necessar
Country	Belize	
Location of protected area (province and if possible map reference)	89°13'14"N & 88°45'47"N latitude and 16°28'28"E & 16°15'15"E Longitude	
Date of establishment	1,997	
Ownership details (please choose 1-4)	1	1: State 2: Private 3: Community 4: Other
Management Authority	Forest Department	
Size of protected area (ha)	60,020	
Number of Permanent staff	4	
Number of Temporary staff	-	
Annual budget (US$) for recurrent (operational) funds - excluding staff salary costs	20,000	
Annual budget (US$) for project or other supplementary funds - excluding staff salary costs	-	
What are the main values for which the area is designated	Forest resource management (Forestry products)	
List the two primary protected area management objectives in below:		
Management objective 1	Sustainable forest management and harvesting	
Management objective 2	Protect Belize's national natural heritage (eg Maya Mountain range)	
No. of people involved in completing assessment	3	
Including: (please choose 1-8)	1	1: PA manager 2: PA staff 3: Other PA agen 4: Donors 5: NGOs

Information on International Designations	**Please indicate your answer here**	
UNESCO World Heritage site (see: whc.unesco.org/en/list)	NO	
Date Listed		
Site name		
Site area		
Geographical co-ordinates		

Criteria for designation		(i.e. criteria i to x)
Statement of Outstanding Universal Value		
Ramsar site (see: www.wetlands.org/RSDB/)	NO	
Date Listed		
Site name		
Site area		
Geographical number		
Reason for Designation (see Ramsar Information Sheet)		
UNESCO Man and Biosphere Reserves (see: www.unesco.org/mab/wnbrs.shtml)	NO	
Date Listed		
Site name		
Site area		Total, Core, Buffe,
Geographical co-ordinates		
Criteria for designation		
Fulfilment of three functions of MAB		conservation, deve support
Please list other designations (i.e. ASEAN Heritage, Natura 2000) and any supporting information below	NO	
		Name
		Detail
		Name
		Detail
		Name
		Detail

Data Sheet 2: Protected Areas Threats		
1. Residential and commercial development within a protected area		
Threats from human settlements or other non-agricultural land uses with a substantial footprint		
1.1 Housing and settlement	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
1.2 Commercial and industrial areas		0: N/A

	1	1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
1.3 Tourism and recreation infrastructure	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2. Agriculture and aquaculture within a protected area		
Threats from farming and grazing as a result of agricultural expansion and intensification, including silviculture, mariculture and aquaculture		
2.1 Annual and perennial non-timber crop cultivation	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.1a Drug cultivation	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.2 Wood and pulp plantations	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.3 Livestock farming and grazing	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.4 Marine and freshwater aquaculture	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
3. Energy production and mining within a protected area		
Threats from production of non-biological resources		
3.1 Oil and gas drilling	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
3.2 Mining and quarrying	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
3.3 Energy generation, including from hydropower dams	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4. Transportation and service corridors within a protected area		

Threats from long narrow transport corridors and the vehicles that use them including associated wildlife mortality		
4.1 Roads and railroads (include road-killed animals)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4.2 Utility and service lines (e.g. electricity cables, telephone lines,)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4.3 Shipping lanes and canals	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4.4 Flight paths	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5. Biological resource use and harm within a protected area		
Threats from consumptive use of "wild" biological resources including both deliberate and unintentional harvesting effects; also persecution or control of specific species (note this includes hunting and killing of animals)		
5.1 Hunting, killing and collecting terrestrial animals (including killing of animals as a result of human/wildlife conflict)	3	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.2 Gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber)	3	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.3 Logging and wood harvesting	3	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.4 Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6. Human intrusions and disturbance within a protected area		
Threats from human activities that alter, destroy or disturb habitats and species associated with non-consumptive uses of biological resources		
6.1 Recreational activities and tourism	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.2 War, civil unrest and military exercises	1	0: N/A 1: Low

		2: Medium 3: High
6.3 Research, education and other work-related activities in protected areas	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.4 Activities of protected area managers (e.g. construction or vehicle use, artificial watering points and dams)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.5 Deliberate vandalism, destructive activities or threats to protected area staff and visitors	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7. Natural system modifications		
Threats from other actions that convert or degrade habitat or change the way the ecosystem functions		
7.1 Fire and fire suppression (including arson)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.2 Dams, hydrological modification and water management/use	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3a Increased fragmentation within protected area	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3b Isolation from other natural habitat (e.g. deforestation, dams without effective aquatic wildlife passages)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3c Other 'edge effects' on park values	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3d Loss of keystone species (e.g. top predators, pollinators etc)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8. Invasive and other problematic species and genes		
Threats from terrestrial and aquatic non-native and native plants, animals, pathogens/microbes or genetic materials that have or are predicted to have harmful effects on biodiversity following introduction, spread and/or increase		
8.1 Invasive non-native/alien plants (weeds)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.1a Invasive non-native/alien animals	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.1b Pathogens (non-native or		0: N/A

native but creating new/increased problems)	1	1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.2 Introduced genetic material (e.g. genetically modified organisms)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9. Pollution entering or generated within protected area		
Threats from introduction of exotic and/or excess materials or energy from point and non-point sources		
9.1 Household sewage and urban waste water	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.1a Sewage and waste water from protected area facilities (e.g. toilets, hotels etc)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.2 Industrial, mining and military effluents and discharges (e.g. poor water quality discharge from dams, e.g. unnatural temperatures, de-oxygenated, other pollution)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.3 Agricultural and forestry effluents (e.g. excess fertilizers or pesticides)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.4 Garbage and solid waste	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.5 Air-borne pollutants	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.6 Excess energy (e.g. heat pollution, lights etc)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10. Geological events		
10.1 Volcanoes	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10.2 Earthquakes/Tsunamis	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10.3 Avalanches/ Landslides	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10.4 Erosion and siltation/ deposition (e.g. shoreline or riverbed	-	0: N/A 1: Low

changes)		2: Medium 3: High
11. Climate change and severe weather		
Threats from long-term climatic changes which may be linked to global warming and other severe climatic/weather events outside of the natural range of variation		
11.1 Habitat shifting and alteration	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11.2 Droughts	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11.3 Temperature extremes	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11.4 Storms and flooding	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12. Specific cultural and social threats		
12.1 Loss of cultural links, traditional knowledge and/or management practices	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12.2 Natural deterioration of important cultural site values	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12.3 Destruction of cultural heritage buildings, gardens, sites etc	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
ASSESSMENT FORM		
1. Legal status: Does the protected area have legal status (or in the case of private reserves is covered by a covenant or similar)?	3	0: The protected area is not gazetted/covenanted 1: There is agreement that the protected area should be gazetted/covenanted but the process has not yet begun 2: The protected area is
Comments and Next Steps		
2. Protected area regulations: Are appropriate regulations in place to control land use and activities (e.g. hunting)?	2	0: There are no regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area 1: Some regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but these are major weaknesses 2: Regulations for controlling land use and a

Comments and Next Steps		
3. Law Enforcement: Can staff (i.e. those with responsibility for managing the site) enforce protected area rules well enough?	1	0: The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations 1: There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budg
Comments and Next Steps		
4. Protected area objectives: Is management undertaken according to agreed objectives?	1	0: No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area 1: The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives 2: The protected area has agreed objectives, but is only partially managed according to these obje
Comments and Next Steps		
5. Protected area design: Is the protected area the right size and shape to protect species, habitats, ecological processes and water catchments of key conservation concern?	2	0: Inadequacies in protected area design mean achieving the major objectives of the protected area is very difficult 1: Inadequacies in protected area design mean that achievement of major objectives is difficult but some mitigating actions are being take
Comments and Next Steps		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation: Is the boundary known and demarcated?	2	0: The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users 1: The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land user
Comments and Next Steps		
7. Management plan: Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?	2	0: There is no management plan for the protected area 1: A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented 2: A management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other p
Comments and Next Steps		
7.a Planning process: The planning process allows adequate opportunity	1	0: No 1: Yes

for key stakeholders to influence the management plan		
Comments and Next Steps		
7.b Planning process: There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	-	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
7.c Planning process: The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	-	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
8. Regular work plan: Is there a regular work plan and is it being implemented	1	0: No regular work plan exists 1: A regular work plan exists but few of the activities are implemented 2: A regular work plan exists and many activities are implemented 3: A regular work plan exists and all activities are implemented
Comments and Next Steps		
9. Resource inventory: Do you have enough information to manage the area?	2	0: There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area 1: Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient
Comments and Next Steps		
10. Protection systems: Are systems in place to control access/resource use in the protected area?	1	0: Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) do not exist or are not effective in controlling access/resource use 1: Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access/resource use 2: Protection systems are moderately effective in contr
Comments and Next Steps		
11. Research: Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	1	0: There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area 1: There is a small amount of survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management 2: There is considerable survey and research work but it
Comments and Next Steps		

12. Resource management: Is active resource management being undertaken?	1	0: Active resource management is not being undertaken 1: Very few of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values are being implemented 2: Many of the requirements for active management o
Comments and Next Steps		
13. Staff numbers: Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	1	0: There are no staff 1: Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities 2: Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities 3: Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the protected area
14. Staff training: Are staff adequately trained to fulfill management objectives?	2	0: Staff lack the skills needed for protected area management 1: Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area 2: Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of mana
Comments and Next Steps		
15. Current budget: Is the current budget sufficient?	1	0: There is no budget for management of the protected area 1: The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage 2: The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to
Comments and Next Steps		
16. Security of budget: Is the budget secure?	1	0: There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or highly variable funding 1: There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding 2: There is a
Comments and Next Steps		
17. Management of budget: Is the		0: Budget management is very poor

budget managed to meet critical management needs?	1	and significantly undermines effectiveness (e.g. late release of budget in financial year) 1: Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness 2: Budget management is adequate but could be improved 3: Budget managem
Comments and Next Steps		
18. Equipment: Is equipment sufficient for management needs?	1	0: There are little or no equipment and facilities for management needs 1: There are some equipment and facilities but these are inadequate for most management needs 2: There are equipment and facilities, but still some gaps that constrain management 3: T
Comments and Next Steps		
19. Maintenance of equipment: Is equipment adequately maintained?	1	0: There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities 1: There is some ad hoc maintenance of equipment and facilities 2: There is basic maintenance of equipment and facilities 3: Equipment and facilities are well maintained
Comments and Next Steps		
20. Education and awareness: Is there a planned education programme linked to the objectives and needs?	-	0: There is no education and awareness programme 1: There is a limited and ad hoc education and awareness programme 2: There is an education and awareness programme but it only partly meets needs and could be improved 3: There is an appropriate and fully
Comments and Next Steps		
21. Planning for land and water use: Does land and water use planning recognise the protected area and aid the achievement of objectives?	1	0: Adjacent land and water use planning does not take into account the needs of the protected area and activities/policies are detrimental to the survival of the area 1: Adjacent land and water use planning does not takes into account the long term need
Comments and Next Steps		
21a. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: Planning and	1	0: No 1: Yes

management in the catchment or landscape containing the protected area incorporates provision for adequate environmental conditions (e.g. volume, quality and timing of water flow, air pol		
Comments and Next Steps		
21b. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: Management of corridors linking the protected area provides for wildlife passage to key habitats outside the protected area (e.g. to allow migratory fish to travel between freshwater spawning sites an	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
21c. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: "Planning adresses ecosystem-specific needs and/or the needs of particular species of concern at an ecosystem scale (e.g. volume, quality and timing of freshwater flow to sustain particular species,	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
22. State and commercial neighbours:Is there co-operation with adjacent land and water users?	1	0: There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users 1: There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users but little or no cooperation 2: There is contact between m
Comments and Next Steps		
23. Indigenous people: Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the protected area have input to management decisions?	2	0: Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area 1: Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management 2: Indigenou
Comments and Next Steps		
24. Local communities: Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions?	1	0: Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area 1: Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management

		2: Local communities directly contribute to so
Comments and Next Steps		
24 a. Impact on communities: There is open communication and trust between local and/or indigenous people, stakeholders and protected area managers	-	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
24 b. Impact on communities: Programmes to enhance community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	-	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
24 c. Impact on communities: Local and/or indigenous people actively support the protected area	-	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
25. Economic benefit: Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities, e.g. income, employment, payment for environmental services?	1	0: The protected area does not deliver any economic benefits to local communities 1: Potential economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed 2: There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities 3: There is a
Comments and Next Steps		
26. Monitoring and evaluation: Are management activities monitored against performance?	1	0: There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area 1: There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results 2: There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but re
Comments and Next Steps		
27. Visitor facilities: Are visitor facilities adequate?	-	0: There are no visitor facilities and services despite an identified need 1: Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation 2: Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be
Comments and Next Steps		
28. Commercial tourism operators:		0: There is little or no contact

Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?	-	between managers and tourism operators using the protected area 1: There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters 2: There is limited co-operati
Comments and Next Steps		
29. Fees: If fees (i.e. entry fees or fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?	1	0: Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected 1: Fees are collected, but make no contribution to the protected area or its environs 2: Fees are collected, and make some contribution to the protected area and its environs 3: Fees are c
Comments and Next Steps		
30. Condition of values: What is the condition of the important values of the protected area as compared to when it was first designated?	2	0: Many important biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded 1: Some biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded 2: Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded b
Comments and Next Steps		
30a: Condition of values: The assessment of the condition of values is based on research and/or monitoring	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
30b: Condition of values Specific management programmes are being implemented to address threats to biodiversity, ecological and cultural values	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
30c: Condition of values: Activities to maintain key biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are a routine part of park management	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
TOTAL SCORE	43	

Objective 1: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

SECTION II: Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for Protected Areas (2)

Name, affiliation and contact details for person responsible for completing the METT (email etc.)	Diane Wade-Moore (UNDP)	
Date assessment carried out	40,632	Month DD, YYYY (e.g., May 12, 2010)
Name of protected area	Golden Stream Corridor Preserve	
WDPA site code (these codes can be found on www.unep-wcmc.org/wdpa/)	301941	
Designations(please choose 1-3)	1	1: National 2: IUCN Category 3: International (please complete lines 35-69 as necessary)
Country	Belize	
Location of protected area (province and if possible map reference)	89°13'14"N & 88°45'47"N latitude and 16°28'28"E & 16°15'15"E Longitude	
Date of establishment	2,002	
Ownership details (please choose 1-4)	1	1: State 2: Private 3: Community 4: Other
Management Authority	Ya axche Conservation Trust	
Size of protected area (ha)	6,058	
Number of Permanent staff	24	
Number of Temporary staff	8	
Annual budget (US$) for recurrent (operational) funds - excluding staff salary costs	30,750	
Annual budget (US$) for project or other supplementary funds - excluding staff salary costs	86,000	
What are the main values for which the area is designated	Maintenance of biological connectivity & watershed protection	

List the two primary protected area management objectives in below:		
Management objective 1	Protect biodiversity within the PA and across its interrelated ecosystems, thereby sustaining a biological corridor from the Maya Mountains to the forests of Belize's Southern coastal plain	
Management objective 2	Ensure that the GSCP provides recognised benefits to its buffering communities	
No. of people involved in completing assessment	3	
Including: (please choose 1-8)	1	1: PA manager 2: PA staff 3: Other PA agency staff 4: Donors 5: NGOs

Information on International Designations	Please indicate your answer here	
UNESCO World Heritage site (see: whc.unesco.org/en/list)	NO	
Date Listed		
Site name		
Site area		
Geographical co-ordinates		
Criteria for designation		(i.e. criteria i to x)
Statement of Outstanding Universal Value		
Ramsar site (see: www.wetlands.org/RSDB/)	NO	
Date Listed		
Site name		
Site area		
Geographical number		
Reason for Designation (see Ramsar Information Sheet)		
UNESCO Man and Biosphere Reserves (see: www.unesco.org/mab/wnbrs.shtml)	NO	
Date Listed		
Site name		
Site area		Total, Core, Buffe,
Geographical co-ordinates		
Criteria for designation		
Fulfilment of three functions of MAB		conservation, deve support
Please list other designations (i.e. ASEAN Heritage, Natura 2000) and any supporting information below	NO	
		Name
		Detail
		Name
		Detail
		Name
		Detail

Data Sheet 2: Protected Areas Threats		
1. Residential and commercial development within a protected area		
Threats from human settlements or other non-agricultural land uses with a substantial footprint		
1.1 Housing and settlement	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
1.2 Commercial and industrial areas	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
1.3 Tourism and recreation infrastructure	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2. Agriculture and aquaculture within a protected area		
Threats from farming and grazing as a result of agricultural expansion and intensification, including silviculture, mariculture and aquaculture		
2.1 Annual and perennial non-timber crop cultivation	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.1a Drug cultivation	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.2 Wood and pulp plantations	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.3 Livestock farming and grazing	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.4 Marine and freshwater aquaculture	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
3. Energy production and mining within a protected area		
Threats from production of non-biological resources		

3.1 Oil and gas drilling	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
3.2 Mining and quarrying	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
3.3 Energy generation, including from hydropower dams	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4. Transportation and service corridors within a protected area		
Threats from long narrow transport corridors and the vehicles that use them including associated wildlife mortality		
4.1 Roads and railroads (include road-killed animals)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4.2 Utility and service lines (e.g. electricity cables, telephone lines,)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4.3 Shipping lanes and canals	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4.4 Flight paths	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5. Biological resource use and harm within a protected area		
Threats from consumptive use of "wild" biological resources including both deliberate and unintentional harvesting effects; also persecution or control of specific species (note this includes hunting and killing of animals)		
5.1 Hunting, killing and collecting terrestrial animals (including killing of animals as a result of human/wildlife conflict)	3	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.2 Gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.3 Logging and wood harvesting	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.4 Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources	2	0: N/A 1: Low

		2: Medium 3: High
6. Human intrusions and disturbance within a protected area		
Threats from human activities that alter, destroy or disturb habitats and species associated with non-consumptive uses of biological resources		
6.1 Recreational activities and tourism	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.2 War, civil unrest and military exercises	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.3 Research, education and other work-related activities in protected areas	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.4 Activities of protected area managers (e.g. construction or vehicle use, artificial watering points and dams)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.5 Deliberate vandalism, destructive activities or threats to protected area staff and visitors	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7. Natural system modifications		
Threats from other actions that convert or degrade habitat or change the way the ecosystem functions		
7.1 Fire and fire suppression (including arson)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.2 Dams, hydrological modification and water management/use	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3a Increased fragmentation within protected area	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3b Isolation from other natural habitat (e.g. deforestation, dams without effective aquatic wildlife passages)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3c Other 'edge effects' on park values	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3d Loss of keystone species (e.g. top predators, pollinators etc)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium

		3: High
8. Invasive and other problematic species and genes		
Threats from terrestrial and aquatic non-native and native plants, animals, pathogens/microbes or genetic materials that have or are predicted to have harmful effects on biodiversity following introduction, spread and/or increase		
8.1 Invasive non-native/alien plants (weeds)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.1a Invasive non-native/alien animals	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.1b Pathogens (non-native or native but creating new/increased problems)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.2 Introduced genetic material (e.g. genetically modified organisms)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9. Pollution entering or generated within protected area		
Threats from introduction of exotic and/or excess materials or energy from point and non-point sources		
9.1 Household sewage and urban waste water	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.1a Sewage and waste water from protected area facilities (e.g. toilets, hotels etc)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.2 Industrial, mining and military effluents and discharges (e.g. poor water quality discharge from dams, e.g. unnatural temperatures, de-oxygenated, other pollution)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.3 Agricultural and forestry effluents (e.g. excess fertilizers or pesticides)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.4 Garbage and solid waste	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.5 Air-borne pollutants	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.6 Excess energy (e.g. heat pollution, lights etc)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10. Geological events		

10.1 Volcanoes	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10.2 Earthquakes/Tsunamis	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10.3 Avalanches/ Landslides	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10.4 Erosion and siltation/ deposition (e.g. shoreline or riverbed changes)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11. Climate change and severe weather		
Threats from long-term climatic changes which may be linked to global warming and other severe climatic/weather events outside of the natural range of variation		
11.1 Habitat shifting and alteration	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11.2 Droughts	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11.3 Temperature extremes	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11.4 Storms and flooding	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12. Specific cultural and social threats		
12.1 Loss of cultural links, traditional knowledge and/or management practices	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12.2 Natural deterioration of important cultural site values	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12.3 Destruction of cultural heritage buildings, gardens, sites etc	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
ASSESSMENT FORM		
1. Legal status: Does the protected area have legal status (or in the case of private reserves is covered by a covenant or similar)?	1	0: The protected area is not gazetted/covenanted 1: There is agreement that the protected area should be

		gazetted/covenanted but the process has not yet begun 2: The protected area is
Comments and Next Steps		
2. Protected area regulations: Are appropriate regulations in place to control land use and activities (e.g. hunting)?	3	0: There are no regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area 1: Some regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but these are major weaknesses 2: Regulations for controlling land use and a
Comments and Next Steps		
3. Law Enforcement: Can staff (i.e. those with responsibility for managing the site) enforce protected area rules well enough?	3	0: The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations 1: There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budg
Comments and Next Steps		
4. Protected area objectives: Is management undertaken according to agreed objectives?	3	0: No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area 1: The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives 2: The protected area has agreed objectives, but is only partially managed according to these obje
Comments and Next Steps		
5. Protected area design: Is the protected area the right size and shape to protect species, habitats, ecological processes and water catchments of key conservation concern?	2	0: Inadequacies in protected area design mean achieving the major objectives of the protected area is very difficult 1: Inadequacies in protected area design mean that achievement of major objectives is difficult but some mitigating actions are being take
Comments and Next Steps		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation: Is the boundary known and demarcated?	3	0: The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users 1: The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land user
Comments and Next Steps		

7. Management plan: Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?	3	0: There is no management plan for the protected area 1: A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented 2: A management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other p
Comments and Next Steps		
7.a Planning process: The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
7.b Planning process: There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
7.c Planning process: The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
8. Regular work plan: Is there a regular work plan and is it being implemented	2	0: No regular work plan exists 1: A regular work plan exists but few of the activities are implemented 2: A regular work plan exists and many activities are implemented 3: A regular work plan exists and all activities are implemented
Comments and Next Steps		
9. Resource inventory: Do you have enough information to manage the area?	3	0: There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area 1: Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient
Comments and Next Steps		
10. Protection systems: Are systems in place to control access/resource use in the protected area?	2	0: Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) do not exist or are not effective in controlling access/resource use 1: Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access/resource use

		2: Protection systems are moderately effective in contr
Comments and Next Steps		
11. Research: Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	3	0: There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area 1: There is a small amount of survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management 2: There is considerable survey and research work but it
Comments and Next Steps		
12. Resource management: Is active resource management being undertaken?	2	0: Active resource management is not being undertaken 1: Very few of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values are being implemented 2: Many of the requirements for active management o
Comments and Next Steps		
13. Staff numbers: Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	3	0: There are no staff 1: Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities 2: Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities 3: Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the protected area
14. Staff training: Are staff adequately trained to fulfill management objectives?	3	0: Staff lack the skills needed for protected area management 1: Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area 2: Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of mana
Comments and Next Steps		
15. Current budget: Is the current budget sufficient?	2	0: There is no budget for management of the protected area 1: The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage 2: The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to

Comments and Next Steps		
16. Security of budget: Is the budget secure?	2	0: There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or highly variable funding 1: There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding 2: There is a
Comments and Next Steps		
17. Management of budget: Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	3	0: Budget management is very poor and significantly undermines effectiveness (e.g. late release of budget in financial year) 1: Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness 2: Budget management is adequate but could be improved 3: Budget managem
Comments and Next Steps		
18. Equipment: Is equipment sufficient for management needs?	2	0: There are little or no equipment and facilities for management needs 1: There are some equipment and facilities but these are inadequate for most management needs 2: There are equipment and facilities, but still some gaps that constrain management 3: T
Comments and Next Steps		
19. Maintenance of equipment: Is equipment adequately maintained?	3	0: There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities 1: There is some ad hoc maintenance of equipment and facilities 2: There is basic maintenance of equipment and facilities 3: Equipment and facilities are well maintained
Comments and Next Steps		
20. Education and awareness: Is there a planned education programme linked to the objectives and needs?	3	0: There is no education and awareness programme 1: There is a limited and ad hoc education and awareness programme 2: There is an education and awareness programme but it only partly meets needs and could be improved 3: There is an appropriate and fully

Comments and Next Steps		
21. Planning for land and water use: Does land and water use planning recognise the protected area and aid the achievement of objectives?	2	0: Adjacent land and water use planning does not take into account the needs of the protected area and activities/policies are detrimental to the survival of the area 1: Adjacent land and water use planning does not takes into account the long term need
Comments and Next Steps		
21a. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: Planning and management in the catchment or landscape containing the protected area incorporates provision for adequate environmental conditions (e.g. volume, quality and timing of water flow, air pol	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
21b. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: Management of corridors linking the protected area provides for wildlife passage to key habitats outside the protected area (e.g. to allow migratory fish to travel between freshwater spawning sites an	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
21c. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: "Planning adresses ecosystem-specific needs and/or the needs of particular species of concern at an ecosystem scale (e.g. volume, quality and timing of freshwater flow to sustain particular species,	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
22. State and commercial neighbours:Is there co-operation with adjacent land and water users?	1	0: There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users 1: There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users but little or no cooperation 2: There is contact between m
Comments and Next Steps		
23. Indigenous people: Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the protected area have input to	3	0: Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area

management decisions?		1: Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management 2: Indigenou
Comments and Next Steps		
24. Local communities: Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions?	3	0: Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area 1: Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management 2: Local communities directly contribute to so
Comments and Next Steps		
24 a. Impact on communities: There is open communication and trust between local and/or indigenous people, stakeholders and protected area managers	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
24 b. Impact on communities: Programmes to enhance community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
24 c. Impact on communities: Local and/or indigenous people actively support the protected area	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
25. Economic benefit: Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities, e.g. income, employment, payment for environmental services?	2	0: The protected area does not deliver any economic benefits to local communities 1: Potential economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed 2: There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities 3: There is a
Comments and Next Steps		
26. Monitoring and evaluation: Are management activities monitored against performance?	2	0: There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area 1: There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results 2: There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and

		evaluation system but re
Comments and Next Steps		
27. Visitor facilities: Are visitor facilities adequate?	2	0: There are no visitor facilities and services despite an identified need 1: Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation 2: Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be
Comments and Next Steps		
28. Commercial tourism operators: Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?	1	0: There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area 1: There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters 2: There is limited co-operati
Comments and Next Steps		
29. Fees: If fees (i.e. entry fees or fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?	1	0: Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected 1: Fees are collected, but make no contribution to the protected area or its environs 2: Fees are collected, and make some contribution to the protected area and its environs 3: Fees are c
Comments and Next Steps		
30. Condition of values: What is the condition of the important values of the protected area as compared to when it was first designated?	3	0: Many important biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded 1: Some biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded 2: Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded b
Comments and Next Steps		
30a: Condition of values: The assessment of the condition of values is based on research and/or monitoring	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
30b: Condition of values Specific management programmes are being implemented to address threats to biodiversity, ecological and cultural values	1	0: No 1: Yes

Comments and Next Steps		
30c: Condition of values: Activities to maintain key biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are a routine part of park management	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
TOTAL SCORE	86	

Objective 1: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

SECTION II: Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for Protected Areas

Name, affiliation and contact details for person responsible for completing the METT (email etc.)	Diane Wade-Moore (UNDP)	
Date assessment carried out	40,632	Month DD, YYYY (e.g., May 12, 2010)
Name of protected area	Bladen Nature Reserve	
WDPA site code (these codes can be found on www.unep-wcmc.org/wdpa/)	12241	
Designations(please choose 1-3)	1	1: National 2: IUCN Category 3: International (please complete lines 35-69 as necessary)
Country	Belize	
Location of protected area (province and if possible map reference)		
Date of establishment	1,994	
Ownership details (please choose 1-4)	1	1: State 2: Private 3: Community 4: Other
Management Authority	Bladen Consortium	
Size of protected area (ha)	39,225	
Number of Permanent staff	10	
Number of Temporary staff	1	

Annual budget (US$) for recurrent (operational) funds – excluding staff salary costs	-	
Annual budget (US$) for project or other supplementary funds – excluding staff salary costs	72,000	
What are the main values for which the area is designated	Extremely high biodiversity, pristine primary tropical wet & moist forest, watershed protection	
List the two primary protected area management objectives in below:		
Management objective 1	To protect and preserve in perpetuity the biodiversity, cultural resources and watershed features found within Bladen, as an integral part of the National Protected Areas System, the Maya Mountain region and the Maya Golden Landscape.	
Management objective 2	To contribute towards other environmental services critical for Belizeans and the global community such as clean air, clean water, flood control, carbon sequestration, and temperature regulation.	
No. of people involved in completing assessment	3	
Including: (please choose 1-8)	1	1: PA manager 2: PA staff 3: Other PA agency staff 4: Donors 5: NGOs

Information on International Designations	Please indicate your answer here	
UNESCO World Heritage site (see: whc.unesco.org/en/list)	NO	
Date Listed		

Site name		
Site area		
Geographical co-ordinates		
Criteria for designation		(i.e. criteria i to x)
Statement of Outstanding Universal Value		
Ramsar site (see: www.wetlands.org/RSDB/)	NO	
Date Listed		
Site name		
Site area		
Geographical number		
Reason for Designation (see Ramsar Information Sheet)		
UNESCO Man and Biosphere Reserves (see: www.unesco.org/mab/wnbrs.shtml)	NO	
Date Listed		
Site name		
Site area		Total, Core, Buffe,
Geographical co-ordinates		
Criteria for designation		
Fulfilment of three functions of MAB		conservation, deve support
Please list other designations (i.e. ASEAN Heritage, Natura 2000) and any supporting information below	NO	
		Name
		Detail
		Name
		Detail
		Name
		Detail

Data Sheet 2: Protected Areas Threats		
1. Residential and commercial development within a protected area		
Threats from human settlements or other non-agricultural land uses with a substantial footprint		

1.1 Housing and settlement	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
1.2 Commercial and industrial areas	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
1.3 Tourism and recreation infrastructure	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2. Agriculture and aquaculture within a protected area		
Threats from farming and grazing as a result of agricultural expansion and intensification, including silviculture, mariculture and aquaculture		
2.1 Annual and perennial non-timber crop cultivation	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.1a Drug cultivation	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.2 Wood and pulp plantations	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.3 Livestock farming and grazing	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.4 Marine and freshwater aquaculture	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
3. Energy production and mining within a protected area		
Threats from production of non-biological resources		
3.1 Oil and gas drilling	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
3.2 Mining and quarrying	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High

3.3 Energy generation, including from hydropower dams	3	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4. Transportation and service corridors within a protected area		
Threats from long narrow transport corridors and the vehicles that use them including associated wildlife mortality		
4.1 Roads and railroads (include road-killed animals)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4.2 Utility and service lines (e.g. electricity cables, telephone lines,)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4.3 Shipping lanes and canals	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4.4 Flight paths	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5. Biological resource use and harm within a protected area		
Threats from consumptive use of "wild" biological resources including both deliberate and unintentional harvesting effects; also persecution or control of specific species (note this includes hunting and killing of animals)		
5.1 Hunting, killing and collecting terrestrial animals (including killing of animals as a result of human/wildlife conflict)	3	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.2 Gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber)	3	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.3 Logging and wood harvesting	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.4 Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6. Human intrusions and disturbance within a protected area		
Threats from human activities that alter, destroy or disturb habitats and species associated with non-consumptive uses of biological resources		

6.1 Recreational activities and tourism	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.2 War, civil unrest and military exercises	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.3 Research, education and other work-related activities in protected areas	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.4 Activities of protected area managers (e.g. construction or vehicle use, artificial watering points and dams)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.5 Deliberate vandalism, destructive activities or threats to protected area staff and visitors	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7. Natural system modifications		
Threats from other actions that convert or degrade habitat or change the way the ecosystem functions		
7.1 Fire and fire suppression (including arson)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.2 Dams, hydrological modification and water management/use	3	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3a Increased fragmentation within protected area	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3b Isolation from other natural habitat (e.g. deforestation, dams without effective aquatic wildlife passages)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3c Other 'edge effects' on park values	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3d Loss of keystone species (e.g. top predators, pollinators etc)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8. Invasive and other problematic species and genes		
Threats from terrestrial and aquatic non-native and native plants, animals, pathogens/microbes or genetic materials that have or are predicted to have harmful effects on biodiversity following introduction, spread and/or increase		
8.1 Invasive non-native/alien plants		0: N/A

(weeds)	2	1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.1a Invasive non-native/alien animals	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.1b Pathogens (non-native or native but creating new/increased problems)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.2 Introduced genetic material (e.g. genetically modified organisms)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9. Pollution entering or generated within protected area		
Threats from introduction of exotic and/or excess materials or energy from point and non-point sources		
9.1 Household sewage and urban waste water	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.1a Sewage and waste water from protected area facilities (e.g. toilets, hotels etc)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.2 Industrial, mining and military effluents and discharges (e.g. poor water quality discharge from dams, e.g. unnatural temperatures, de-oxygenated, other pollution)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.3 Agricultural and forestry effluents (e.g. excess fertilizers or pesticides)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.4 Garbage and solid waste	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.5 Air-borne pollutants	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.6 Excess energy (e.g. heat pollution, lights etc)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10. Geological events		
10.1 Volcanoes	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10.2 Earthquakes/Tsunamis	-	0: N/A 1: Low

		2: Medium 3: High
10.3 Avalanches/ Landslides	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10.4 Erosion and siltation/ deposition (e.g. shoreline or riverbed changes)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11. Climate change and severe weather		
Threats from long-term climatic changes which may be linked to global warming and other severe climatic/weather events outside of the natural range of variation		
11.1 Habitat shifting and alteration	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11.2 Droughts	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11.3 Temperature extremes	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11.4 Storms and flooding	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12. Specific cultural and social threats		
12.1 Loss of cultural links, traditional knowledge and/or management practices	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12.2 Natural deterioration of important cultural site values	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12.3 Destruction of cultural heritage buildings, gardens, sites etc	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
ASSESSMENT FORM		
1. Legal status: Does the protected area have legal status (or in the case of private reserves is covered by a covenant or similar)?	3	0: The protected area is not gazetted/covenanted 1: There is agreement that the protected area should be gazetted/covenanted but the process has not yet begun 2: The protected area is
Comments and Next Steps		
2. Protected area regulations: Are		0: There are no regulations for

appropriate regulations in place to control land use and activities (e.g. hunting)?	3	controlling land use and activities in the protected area 1: Some regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but these are major weaknesses 2: Regulations for controlling land use and a
Comments and Next Steps		
3. Law Enforcement: Can staff (i.e. those with responsibility for managing the site) enforce protected area rules well enough?	2	0: The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations 1: There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budg
Comments and Next Steps		
4. Protected area objectives: Is management undertaken according to agreed objectives?	2	0: No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area 1: The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives 2: The protected area has agreed objectives, but is only partially managed according to these obje
Comments and Next Steps		
5. Protected area design: Is the protected area the right size and shape to protect species, habitats, ecological processes and water catchments of key conservation concern?	2	0: Inadequacies in protected area design mean achieving the major objectives of the protected area is very difficult 1: Inadequacies in protected area design mean that achievement of major objectives is difficult but some mitigating actions are being take
Comments and Next Steps		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation: Is the boundary known and demarcated?	2	0: The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users 1: The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land user
Comments and Next Steps		
7. Management plan: Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?	2	0: There is no management plan for the protected area 1: A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented

		2: A management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other p
Comments and Next Steps		
7.a Planning process: The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
7.b Planning process: There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
7.c Planning process: The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
8. Regular work plan: Is there a regular work plan and is it being implemented	2	0: No regular work plan exists 1: A regular work plan exists but few of the activities are implemented 2: A regular work plan exists and many activities are implemented 3: A regular work plan exists and all activities are implemented
Comments and Next Steps		
9. Resource inventory: Do you have enough information to manage the area?	2	0: There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area 1: Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient
Comments and Next Steps		
10. Protection systems: Are systems in place to control access/resource use in the protected area?	1	0: Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) do not exist or are not effective in controlling access/resource use 1: Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access/resource use 2: Protection systems are moderately effective in contr
Comments and Next Steps		
11. Research: Is there a programme of management-orientated survey	3	0: There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected

and research work?		area 1: There is a small amount of survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management 2: There is considerable survey and research work but it
Comments and Next Steps		
12. Resource management: Is active resource management being undertaken?	1	0: Active resource management is not being undertaken 1: Very few of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values are being implemented 2: Many of the requirements for active management o
Comments and Next Steps		
13. Staff numbers: Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	2	0: There are no staff 1: Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities 2: Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities 3: Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the protected area
14. Staff training: Are staff adequately trained to fulfill management objectives?	3	0: Staff lack the skills needed for protected area management 1: Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area 2: Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of mana
Comments and Next Steps		
15. Current budget: Is the current budget sufficient?	1	0: There is no budget for management of the protected area 1: The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage 2: The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to
Comments and Next Steps		
16. Security of budget: Is the budget secure?	1	0: There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or highly variable funding

		1: There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding 2: There is a
Comments and Next Steps		
17. Management of budget: Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	3	0: Budget management is very poor and significantly undermines effectiveness (e.g. late release of budget in financial year) 1: Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness 2: Budget management is adequate but could be improved 3: Budget managem
Comments and Next Steps		
18. Equipment: Is equipment sufficient for management needs?	2	0: There are little or no equipment and facilities for management needs 1: There are some equipment and facilities but these are inadequate for most management needs 2: There are equipment and facilities, but still some gaps that constrain management 3: T
Comments and Next Steps		
19. Maintenance of equipment: Is equipment adequately maintained?	2	0: There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities 1: There is some ad hoc maintenance of equipment and facilities 2: There is basic maintenance of equipment and facilities 3: Equipment and facilities are well maintained
Comments and Next Steps		
20. Education and awareness: Is there a planned education programme linked to the objectives and needs?	2	0: There is no education and awareness programme 1: There is a limited and ad hoc education and awareness programme 2: There is an education and awareness programme but it only partly meets needs and could be improved 3: There is an appropriate and fully
Comments and Next Steps		
21. Planning for land and water use: Does land and water use planning recognise the protected area and aid the achievement of objectives?	2	0: Adjacent land and water use planning does not take into account the needs of the protected area and activities/policies are detrimental to

		the survival of the area 1: Adjacent land and water use planning does not takes into account the long term need
Comments and Next Steps		
21a. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: Planning and management in the catchment or landscape containing the protected area incorporates provision for adequate environmental conditions (e.g. volume, quality and timing of water flow, air pol	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
21b. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: Management of corridors linking the protected area provides for wildlife passage to key habitats outside the protected area (e.g. to allow migratory fish to travel between freshwater spawning sites an	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
21c. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: "Planning adresses ecosystem-specific needs and/or the needs of particular species of concern at an ecosystem scale (e.g. volume, quality and timing of freshwater flow to sustain particular species,	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
22. State and commercial neighbours:Is there co-operation with adjacent land and water users?	1	0: There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users 1: There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users but little or no cooperation 2: There is contact between m
Comments and Next Steps		
23. Indigenous people: Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the protected area have input to management decisions?	1	0: Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area 1: Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management 2: Indigenou
Comments and Next Steps		

24. Local communities: Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions?	1	0: Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area 1: Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management 2: Local communities directly contribute to so
Comments and Next Steps		
24 a. Impact on communities: There is open communication and trust between local and/or indigenous people, stakeholders and protected area managers	- 1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
24 b. Impact on communities: Programmes to enhance community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	-	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
24 c. Impact on communities: Local and/or indigenous people actively support the protected area	-	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
25. Economic benefit: Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities, e.g. income, employment, payment for environmental services?	1	0: The protected area does not deliver any economic benefits to local communities 1: Potential economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed 2: There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities 3: There is a
Comments and Next Steps		
26. Monitoring and evaluation: Are management activities monitored against performance?	2	0: There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area 1: There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results 2: There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but re
Comments and Next Steps		
27. Visitor facilities: Are visitor facilities adequate?	2	0: There are no visitor facilities and services despite an identified need 1: Visitor facilities and services are

		inappropriate for current levels of visitation 2: Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be
Comments and Next Steps		
28. Commercial tourism operators: Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?	-	0: There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area 1: There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters 2: There is limited co-operati
Comments and Next Steps		
29. Fees: If fees (i.e. entry fees or fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?	-	0: Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected 1: Fees are collected, but make no contribution to the protected area or its environs 2: Fees are collected, and make some contribution to the protected area and its environs 3: Fees are c
Comments and Next Steps		
30. Condition of values: What is the condition of the important values of the protected area as compared to when it was first designated?	2	0: Many important biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded 1: Some biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded 2: Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded b
Comments and Next Steps		
30a: Condition of values: The assessment of the condition of values is based on research and/or monitoring	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
30b: Condition of values Specific management programmes are being implemented to address threats to biodiversity, ecological and cultural values	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
30c: Condition of values: Activities to maintain key biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are a routine part of park management	1	0: No 1: Yes

Comments and Next Steps		
TOTAL SCORE	63	

Objective 1: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

SECTION II: Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for Protected Areas (4)

Name, affiliation and contact details for person responsible for completing the METT (email etc.)	Diane Wade-Moore (UNDP)	
Date assessment carried out	40,632	Month DD, YYYY (e.g., May 12, 2010)
Name of protected area	Port Honduras Marine Reserve	
WDPA site code (these codes can be found on www.unep-wcmc.org/wdpa/)	12241	
Designations(please choose 1-3)	1	1: National 2: IUCN Category 3: International (please complete lines 35-69 as necessary)
Country	Belize	
Location of protected area (province and if possible map reference)		
Date of establishment	2,000	
Ownership details (please choose 1-4)	1	1: State 2: Private 3: Community 4: Other
Management Authority	TIDE	
Size of protected area (ha)	41,440	
Number of Permanent staff	34	
Number of Temporary staff	-	
Annual budget (US$) for recurrent (operational) funds - excluding staff salary costs	62,000	
Annual budget (US$) for project or other supplementary funds - excluding staff salary costs	-	
What are the main values for which the area is designated	Protection of Marine Resources	

List the two primary protected area management objectives in below:		
Management objective 1	To physically protect the marine resources from illegal or unsustainable harvesting through law enforcement, boundary demarcation and signs	
Management objective 2	Conduct marine research that informs management decisions and educate local communities.	
No. of people involved in completing assessment	3	
Including: (please choose 1-8)	1	1: PA manager 2: PA staff 3: Other PA agency staff 4: Donors 5: NGOs

Information on International Designations	Please indicate your answer here	
UNESCO World Heritage site (see: whc.unesco.org/en/list)	NO	
Date Listed		
Site name		
Site area		
Geographical co-ordinates		
Criteria for designation		(i.e. criteria i to x)
Statement of Outstanding Universal Value		
Ramsar site (see: www.wetlands.org/RSDB/)	NO	
Date Listed		
Site name		
Site area		
Geographical number		
Reason for Designation (see Ramsar Information Sheet)		
UNESCO Man and Biosphere Reserves (see: www.unesco.org/mab/wnbrs.shtml)	NO	
Date Listed		

Site name		
Site area		Total, Core, Buffe,
Geographical co-ordinates		
Criteria for designation		
Fulfilment of three functions of MAB		conservation, deve support
Please list other designations (i.e. ASEAN Heritage, Natura 2000) and any supporting information below	NO	
		Name
		Detail
		Name
		Detail
		Name
		Detail

Data Sheet 2: Protected Areas Threats		
1. Residential and commercial development within a protected area		
Threats from human settlements or other non-agricultural land uses with a substantial footprint		
1.1 Housing and settlement	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
1.2 Commercial and industrial areas	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
1.3 Tourism and recreation infrastructure	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2. Agriculture and aquaculture within a protected area		
Threats from farming and grazing as a result of agricultural expansion and intensification, including silviculture, mariculture and aquaculture		
2.1 Annual and perennial non-timber		0: N/A

crop cultivation	-	1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.1a Drug cultivation	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.2 Wood and pulp plantations	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.3 Livestock farming and grazing	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.4 Marine and freshwater aquaculture	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
3. Energy production and mining within a protected area		
Threats from production of non-biological resources		
3.1 Oil and gas drilling	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
3.2 Mining and quarrying	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
3.3 Energy generation, including from hydropower dams	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4. Transportation and service corridors within a protected area		
Threats from long narrow transport corridors and the vehicles that use them including associated wildlife mortality		
4.1 Roads and railroads (include road-killed animals)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4.2 Utility and service lines (e.g. electricity cables, telephone lines,)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4.3 Shipping lanes and canals	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High

4.4 Flight paths	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5. Biological resource use and harm within a protected area		
Threats from consumptive use of "wild" biological resources including both deliberate and unintentional harvesting effects; also persecution or control of specific species (note this includes hunting and killing of animals)		
5.1 Hunting, killing and collecting terrestrial animals (including killing of animals as a result of human/wildlife conflict)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.2 Gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.3 Logging and wood harvesting	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.4 Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6. Human intrusions and disturbance within a protected area		
Threats from human activities that alter, destroy or disturb habitats and species associated with non-consumptive uses of biological resources		
6.1 Recreational activities and tourism	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.2 War, civil unrest and military exercises	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.3 Research, education and other work-related activities in protected areas	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.4 Activities of protected area managers (e.g. construction or vehicle use, artificial watering points and dams)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.5 Deliberate vandalism, destructive activities or threats to protected area staff and visitors	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7. Natural system modifications		

Threats from other actions that convert or degrade habitat or change the way the ecosystem functions		
7.1 Fire and fire suppression (including arson)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.2 Dams, hydrological modification and water management/use	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3a Increased fragmentation within protected area	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3b Isolation from other natural habitat (e.g. deforestation, dams without effective aquatic wildlife passages)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3c Other 'edge effects' on park values	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3d Loss of keystone species (e.g. top predators, pollinators etc)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8. Invasive and other problematic species and genes		
Threats from terrestrial and aquatic non-native and native plants, animals, pathogens/microbes or genetic materials that have or are predicted to have harmful effects on biodiversity following introduction, spread and/or increase		
8.1 Invasive non-native/alien plants (weeds)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.1a Invasive non-native/alien animals	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.1b Pathogens (non-native or native but creating new/increased problems)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.2 Introduced genetic material (e.g. genetically modified organisms)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9. Pollution entering or generated within protected area		
Threats from introduction of exotic and/or excess materials or energy from point and non-point sources		
9.1 Household sewage and urban waste water	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.1a Sewage and waste water from protected area facilities (e.g. toilets,	1	0: N/A 1: Low

hotels etc)		2: Medium 3: High
9.2 Industrial, mining and military effluents and discharges (e.g. poor water quality discharge from dams, e.g. unnatural temperatures, de-oxygenated, other pollution)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.3 Agricultural and forestry effluents (e.g. excess fertilizers or pesticides)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.4 Garbage and solid waste	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.5 Air-borne pollutants	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.6 Excess energy (e.g. heat pollution, lights etc)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10. Geological events		
10.1 Volcanoes	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10.2 Earthquakes/Tsunamis	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10.3 Avalanches/ Landslides	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10.4 Erosion and siltation/ deposition (e.g. shoreline or riverbed changes)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11. Climate change and severe weather		
Threats from long-term climatic changes which may be linked to global warming and other severe climatic/weather events outside of the natural range of variation		
11.1 Habitat shifting and alteration	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11.2 Droughts	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11.3 Temperature extremes	1	0: N/A 1: Low

		2: Medium 3: High
11.4 Storms and flooding	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12. Specific cultural and social threats		
12.1 Loss of cultural links, traditional knowledge and/or management practices	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12.2 Natural deterioration of important cultural site values	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12.3 Destruction of cultural heritage buildings, gardens, sites etc	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
ASSESSMENT FORM		
1. Legal status: Does the protected area have legal status (or in the case of private reserves is covered by a covenant or similar)?	3	0: The protected area is not gazetted/covenanted 1: There is agreement that the protected area should be gazetted/covenanted but the process has not yet begun 2: The protected area is
Comments and Next Steps		
2. Protected area regulations: Are appropriate regulations in place to control land use and activities (e.g. hunting)?	3	0: There are no regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area 1: Some regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but these are major weaknesses 2: Regulations for controlling land use and a
Comments and Next Steps		
3. Law Enforcement: Can staff (i.e. those with responsibility for managing the site) enforce protected area rules well enough?	2	0: The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations 1: There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budg
Comments and Next Steps		
4. Protected area objectives: Is management undertaken according to agreed objectives?	2	0: No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area 1: The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed

		according to these objectives 2: The protected area has agreed objectives, but is only partially managed according to these obje
Comments and Next Steps		
5. Protected area design: Is the protected area the right size and shape to protect species, habitats, ecological processes and water catchments of key conservation concern?	2	0: Inadequacies in protected area design mean achieving the major objectives of the protected area is very difficult 1: Inadequacies in protected area design mean that achievement of major objectives is difficult but some mitigating actions are being take
Comments and Next Steps		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation: Is the boundary known and demarcated?	2	0: The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users 1: The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land user
Comments and Next Steps		
7. Management plan: Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?	2	0: There is no management plan for the protected area 1: A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented 2: A management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other p
Comments and Next Steps		
7.a Planning process: The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
7.b Planning process: There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
7.c Planning process: The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
8. Regular work plan: Is there a		0: No regular work plan exists

regular work plan and is it being implemented	2	1: A regular work plan exists but few of the activities are implemented 2: A regular work plan exists and many activities are implemented 3: A regular work plan exists and all activities are implemented
Comments and Next Steps		
9. Resource inventory: Do you have enough information to manage the area?	2	0: There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area 1: Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient
Comments and Next Steps		
10. Protection systems: Are systems in place to control access/resource use in the protected area?	2	0: Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) do not exist or are not effective in controlling access/resource use 1: Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access/resource use 2: Protection systems are moderately effective in contr
Comments and Next Steps		
11. Research: Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	3	0: There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area 1: There is a small amount of survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management 2: There is considerable survey and research work but it
Comments and Next Steps		
12. Resource management: Is active resource management being undertaken?	2	0: Active resource management is not being undertaken 1: Very few of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values are being implemented 2: Many of the requirements for active management o
Comments and Next Steps		
13. Staff numbers: Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	2	0: There are no staff 1: Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities 2: Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management

		activities 3: Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the protected area
14. Staff training: Are staff adequately trained to fulfill management objectives?	3	0: Staff lack the skills needed for protected area management 1: Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area 2: Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of mana
Comments and Next Steps		
15. Current budget: Is the current budget sufficient?	2	0: There is no budget for management of the protected area 1: The available budget is inadequate for basic management needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage 2: The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to
Comments and Next Steps		
16. Security of budget: Is the budget secure?	2	0: There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or highly variable funding 1: There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding 2: There is a
Comments and Next Steps		
17. Management of budget: Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	3	0: Budget management is very poor and significantly undermines effectiveness (e.g. late release of budget in financial year) 1: Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness 2: Budget management is adequate but could be improved 3: Budget managem
Comments and Next Steps		
18. Equipment: Is equipment sufficient for management needs?	2	0: There are little or no equipment and facilities for management needs 1: There are some equipment and facilities but these are inadequate for most management needs 2: There are equipment and facilities, but still some gaps that

		constrain management 3: T
Comments and Next Steps		
19. Maintenance of equipment: Is equipment adequately maintained?	2	0: There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities 1: There is some ad hoc maintenance of equipment and facilities 2: There is basic maintenance of equipment and facilities 3: Equipment and facilities are well maintained
Comments and Next Steps		
20. Education and awareness: Is there a planned education programme linked to the objectives and needs?	3	0: There is no education and awareness programme 1: There is a limited and ad hoc education and awareness programme 2: There is an education and awareness programme but it only partly meets needs and could be improved 3: There is an appropriate and fully
Comments and Next Steps		
21. Planning for land and water use: Does land and water use planning recognise the protected area and aid the achievement of objectives?	2	0: Adjacent land and water use planning does not take into account the needs of the protected area and activities/policies are detrimental to the survival of the area 1: Adjacent land and water use planning does not takes into account the long term need
Comments and Next Steps		
21a. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: Planning and management in the catchment or landscape containing the protected area incorporates provision for adequate environmental conditions (e.g. volume, quality and timing of water flow, air pol	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
21b. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: Management of corridors linking the protected area provides for wildlife passage to key habitats outside the protected area (e.g. to allow migratory fish to travel between freshwater spawning sites an	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		

21c. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: "Planning adresses ecosystem-specific needs and/or the needs of particular species of concern at an ecosystem scale (e.g. volume, quality and timing of freshwater flow to sustain particular species,	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
22. State and commercial neighbours:Is there co-operation with adjacent land and water users?	2	0: There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users 1: There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users but little or no cooperation 2: There is contact between m
Comments and Next Steps		
23. Indigenous people: Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the protected area have input to management decisions?	1	0: Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area 1: Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management 2: Indigenou
Comments and Next Steps		
24. Local communities: Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions?	1	0: Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area 1: Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management 2: Local communities directly contribute to so
Comments and Next Steps		
24 a. Impact on communities: There is open communication and trust between local and/or indigenous people, stakeholders and protected area managers	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
24 b. Impact on communities: Programmes to enhance community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		

24 c. Impact on communities: Local and/or indigenous people actively support the protected area	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
25. Economic benefit: Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities, e.g. income, employment, payment for environmental services?	3	0: The protected area does not deliver any economic benefits to local communities 1: Potential economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed 2: There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities 3: There is a
Comments and Next Steps		
26. Monitoring and evaluation: Are management activities monitored against performance?	2	0: There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area 1: There is some ad hoc monitoring and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results 2: There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but re
Comments and Next Steps		
27. Visitor facilities: Are visitor facilities adequate?	2	0: There are no visitor facilities and services despite an identified need 1: Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation 2: Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be
Comments and Next Steps		
28. Commercial tourism operators: Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?	2	0: There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area 1: There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters 2: There is limited co-operati
Comments and Next Steps		
29. Fees: If fees (i.e. entry fees or fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?	2	0: Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected 1: Fees are collected, but make no contribution to the protected area or its environs 2: Fees are collected, and make some contribution to the protected area and its environs

		3: Fees are c
Comments and Next Steps		
30. Condition of values: What is the condition of the important values of the protected area as compared to when it was first designated?	2	0: Many important biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded 1: Some biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded 2: Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded b
Comments and Next Steps		
30a: Condition of values: The assessment of the condition of values is based on research and/or monitoring	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
30b: Condition of values Specific management programmes are being implemented to address threats to biodiversity, ecological and cultural values	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
30c: Condition of values: Activities to maintain key biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are a routine part of park management	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
TOTAL SCORE	78	

Objective 1: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems

SECTION II: Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool for Protected Areas (5)

Name, affiliation and contact details for person responsible for completing the METT (email etc.)	Diane Wade-Moore (UNDP)	
Date assessment carried out	40,632	Month DD, YYYY (e.g., May 12, 2010)
Name of protected area	Block 127	
WDPA site code (these codes can be found on www.unep-wcmc.org/wdpa/)		

Designations(please choose 1-3)	1	1: National 2: IUCN Category 3: International (please complete lines 35-69 as necessary)
Country	Belize	
Location of protected area (province and if possible map reference)		
Date of establishment	2,001	
Ownership details (please choose 1-4)	2	1: State 2: Private 3: Community 4: Other
Management Authority	TIDE	
Size of protected area (ha)	10,926	
Number of Permanent staff	5	
Number of Temporary staff	1	
Annual budget (US$) for recurrent (operational) funds – excluding staff salary costs	80,000	
Annual budget (US$) for project or other supplementary funds – excluding staff salary costs	70,000	
What are the main values for which the area is designated	Under the Tropical Forest Conservation Agreement, lands are for conservation purposes only (biodiversity conservation)	
List the two primary protected area management objectives in below:		
Management objective 1	To effectively protect the natural resources in the area through law enforcement, boundary demarcation and signs	
Management objective 2	To educate the buffer communities on the benefits of conservation and sustainable development	
No. of people involved in completing assessment	3	
Including: (please choose 1-8)	1	1: PA manager 2: PA staff 3: Other PA agency staff 4: Donors 5: NGOs

Information on International Designations	Please indicate your answer here	
UNESCO World Heritage site (see: whc.unesco.org/en/list)	NO	
Date Listed		
Site name		
Site area		
Geographical co-ordinates		
Criteria for designation		(i.e. criteria i to x)
Statement of Outstanding Universal Value		
Ramsar site (see: www.wetlands.org/RSDB/)	NO	
Date Listed		
Site name		
Site area		
Geographical number		
Reason for Designation (see Ramsar Information Sheet)		
UNESCO Man and Biosphere Reserves (see: www.unesco.org/mab/wnbrs.shtml)	NO	
Date Listed		
Site name		
Site area		Total, Core, Buffe,
Geographical co-ordinates		
Criteria for designation		
Fulfilment of three functions of MAB		conservation, deve support
Please list other designations (i.e. ASEAN Heritage, Natura 2000) and any supporting information below	NO	
		Name
		Detail
		Name
		Detail
		Name
		Detail

Data Sheet 2: Protected Areas Threats		
1. Residential and commercial development within a protected area		
Threats from human settlements or other non-agricultural land uses with a substantial footprint		
1.1 Housing and settlement	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
1.2 Commercial and industrial areas	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
1.3 Tourism and recreation infrastructure	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2. Agriculture and aquaculture within a protected area		
Threats from farming and grazing as a result of agricultural expansion and intensification, including silviculture, mariculture and aquaculture		
2.1 Annual and perennial non-timber crop cultivation	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.1a Drug cultivation	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.2 Wood and pulp plantations	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.3 Livestock farming and grazing	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
2.4 Marine and freshwater aquaculture	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
3. Energy production and mining within a protected area		

Threats from production of non-biological resources		
3.1 Oil and gas drilling	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
3.2 Mining and quarrying	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
3.3 Energy generation, including from hydropower dams	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4. Transportation and service corridors within a protected area		
Threats from long narrow transport corridors and the vehicles that use them including associated wildlife mortality		
4.1 Roads and railroads (include road-killed animals)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4.2 Utility and service lines (e.g. electricity cables, telephone lines,)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4.3 Shipping lanes and canals	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
4.4 Flight paths	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5. Biological resource use and harm within a protected area		
Threats from consumptive use of "wild" biological resources including both deliberate and unintentional harvesting effects; also persecution or control of specific species (note this includes hunting and killing of animals)		
5.1 Hunting, killing and collecting terrestrial animals (including killing of animals as a result of human/wildlife conflict)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.2 Gathering terrestrial plants or plant products (non-timber)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.3 Logging and wood harvesting		0: N/A

	1	1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
5.4 Fishing, killing and harvesting aquatic resources	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6. Human intrusions and disturbance within a protected area		
Threats from human activities that alter, destroy or disturb habitats and species associated with non-consumptive uses of biological resources		
6.1 Recreational activities and tourism	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.2 War, civil unrest and military exercises	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.3 Research, education and other work-related activities in protected areas	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.4 Activities of protected area managers (e.g. construction or vehicle use, artificial watering points and dams)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
6.5 Deliberate vandalism, destructive activities or threats to protected area staff and visitors	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7. Natural system modifications		
Threats from other actions that convert or degrade habitat or change the way the ecosystem functions		
7.1 Fire and fire suppression (including arson)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.2 Dams, hydrological modification and water management/use	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3a Increased fragmentation within protected area	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3b Isolation from other natural habitat (e.g. deforestation, dams without effective aquatic wildlife passages)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
7.3c Other 'edge effects' on park values	1	0: N/A 1: Low

		2: Medium 3: High
7.3d Loss of keystone species (e.g. top predators, pollinators etc)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8. Invasive and other problematic species and genes		
Threats from terrestrial and aquatic non-native and native plants, animals, pathogens/microbes or genetic materials that have or are predicted to have harmful effects on biodiversity following introduction, spread and/or increase		
8.1 Invasive non-native/alien plants (weeds)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.1a Invasive non-native/alien animals	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.1b Pathogens (non-native or native but creating new/increased problems)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
8.2 Introduced genetic material (e.g. genetically modified organisms)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9. Pollution entering or generated within protected area		
Threats from introduction of exotic and/or excess materials or energy from point and non-point sources		
9.1 Household sewage and urban waste water	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.1a Sewage and waste water from protected area facilities (e.g. toilets, hotels etc)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.2 Industrial, mining and military effluents and discharges (e.g. poor water quality discharge from dams, e.g. unnatural temperatures, de-oxygenated, other pollution)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.3 Agricultural and forestry effluents (e.g. excess fertilizers or pesticides)	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.4 Garbage and solid waste	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
9.5 Air-borne pollutants	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High

9.6 Excess energy (e.g. heat pollution, lights etc)	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10. Geological events		
10.1 Volcanoes	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10.2 Earthquakes/Tsunamis	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10.3 Avalanches/ Landslides	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
10.4 Erosion and siltation/ deposition (e.g. shoreline or riverbed changes)	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11. Climate change and severe weather		
Threats from long-term climatic changes which may be linked to global warming and other severe climatic/weather events outside of the natural range of variation		
11.1 Habitat shifting and alteration	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11.2 Droughts	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11.3 Temperature extremes	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
11.4 Storms and flooding	2	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12. Specific cultural and social threats		
12.1 Loss of cultural links, traditional knowledge and/or management practices	1	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12.2 Natural deterioration of important cultural site values	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High
12.3 Destruction of cultural heritage buildings, gardens, sites etc	-	0: N/A 1: Low 2: Medium 3: High

ASSESSMENT FORM		
1. Legal status: Does the protected area have legal status (or in the case of private reserves is covered by a covenant or similar)?	3	0: The protected area is not gazetted/covenanted 1: There is agreement that the protected area should be gazetted/covenanted but the process has not yet begun 2: The protected area is
Comments and Next Steps		
2. Protected area regulations: Are appropriate regulations in place to control land use and activities (e.g. hunting)?	3	0: There are no regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area 1: Some regulations for controlling land use and activities in the protected area exist but these are major weaknesses 2: Regulations for controlling land use and a
Comments and Next Steps		
3. Law Enforcement: Can staff (i.e. those with responsibility for managing the site) enforce protected area rules well enough?	2	0: The staff have no effective capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations 1: There are major deficiencies in staff capacity/resources to enforce protected area legislation and regulations (e.g. lack of skills, no patrol budg
Comments and Next Steps		
4. Protected area objectives: Is management undertaken according to agreed objectives?	2	0: No firm objectives have been agreed for the protected area 1: The protected area has agreed objectives, but is not managed according to these objectives 2: The protected area has agreed objectives, but is only partially managed according to these obje
Comments and Next Steps		
5. Protected area design: Is the protected area the right size and shape to protect species, habitats, ecological processes and water catchments of key conservation concern?	1	0: Inadequacies in protected area design mean achieving the major objectives of the protected area is very difficult 1: Inadequacies in protected area design mean that achievement of major objectives is difficult but some mitigating actions are being take
Comments and Next Steps		
6. Protected area boundary demarcation: Is the boundary known and demarcated?	2	0: The boundary of the protected area is not known by the management authority or local residents/neighbouring land users

		1: The boundary of the protected area is known by the management authority but is not known by local residents/neighbouring land user
Comments and Next Steps		
7. Management plan: Is there a management plan and is it being implemented?	1	0: There is no management plan for the protected area 1: A management plan is being prepared or has been prepared but is not being implemented 2: A management plan exists but it is only being partially implemented because of funding constraints or other p
Comments and Next Steps		
7.a Planning process: The planning process allows adequate opportunity for key stakeholders to influence the management plan	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
7.b Planning process: There is an established schedule and process for periodic review and updating of the management plan	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
7.c Planning process: The results of monitoring, research and evaluation are routinely incorporated into planning	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
8. Regular work plan: Is there a regular work plan and is it being implemented	2	0: No regular work plan exists 1: A regular work plan exists but few of the activities are implemented 2: A regular work plan exists and many activities are implemented 3: A regular work plan exists and all activities are implemented
Comments and Next Steps		
9. Resource inventory: Do you have enough information to manage the area?	2	0: There is little or no information available on the critical habitats, species and cultural values of the protected area 1: Information on the critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values of the protected area is not sufficient
Comments and Next Steps		
10. Protection systems: Are systems in place to control	2	0: Protection systems (patrols, permits etc) do not exist or are not

access/resource use in the protected area?		effective in controlling access/resource use 1: Protection systems are only partially effective in controlling access/resource use 2: Protection systems are moderately effective in contr
Comments and Next Steps		
11. Research: Is there a programme of management-orientated survey and research work?	2	0: There is no survey or research work taking place in the protected area 1: There is a small amount of survey and research work but it is not directed towards the needs of protected area management 2: There is considerable survey and research work but it
Comments and Next Steps		
12. Resource management: Is active resource management being undertaken?	2	0: Active resource management is not being undertaken 1: Very few of the requirements for active management of critical habitats, species, ecological processes and cultural values are being implemented 2: Many of the requirements for active management o
Comments and Next Steps		
13. Staff numbers: Are there enough people employed to manage the protected area?	2	0: There are no staff 1: Staff numbers are inadequate for critical management activities 2: Staff numbers are below optimum level for critical management activities 3: Staff numbers are adequate for the management needs of the protected area
14. Staff training: Are staff adequately trained to fulfill management objectives?	3	0: Staff lack the skills needed for protected area management 1: Staff training and skills are low relative to the needs of the protected area 2: Staff training and skills are adequate, but could be further improved to fully achieve the objectives of mana
Comments and Next Steps		
15. Current budget: Is the current budget sufficient?	2	0: There is no budget for management of the protected area 1: The available budget is inadequate for basic management

		needs and presents a serious constraint to the capacity to manage 2: The available budget is acceptable but could be further improved to
Comments and Next Steps		
16. Security of budget: Is the budget secure?	1	0: There is no secure budget for the protected area and management is wholly reliant on outside or highly variable funding 1: There is very little secure budget and the protected area could not function adequately without outside funding 2: There is a
Comments and Next Steps		
17. Management of budget: Is the budget managed to meet critical management needs?	3	0: Budget management is very poor and significantly undermines effectiveness (e.g. late release of budget in financial year) 1: Budget management is poor and constrains effectiveness 2: Budget management is adequate but could be improved 3: Budget managem
Comments and Next Steps		
18. Equipment: Is equipment sufficient for management needs?	2	0: There are little or no equipment and facilities for management needs 1: There are some equipment and facilities but these are inadequate for most management needs 2: There are equipment and facilities, but still some gaps that constrain management 3: T
Comments and Next Steps		
19. Maintenance of equipment: Is equipment adequately maintained?	2	0: There is little or no maintenance of equipment and facilities 1: There is some ad hoc maintenance of equipment and facilities 2: There is basic maintenance of equipment and facilities 3: Equipment and facilities are well maintained
Comments and Next Steps		
20. Education and awareness: Is there a planned education programme linked to the objectives and needs?	2	0: There is no education and awareness programme 1: There is a limited and ad hoc education and awareness programme

		2: There is an education and awareness programme but it only partly meets needs and could be improved 3: There is an appropriate and fully
Comments and Next Steps		
21. Planning for land and water use: Does land and water use planning recognise the protected area and aid the achievement of objectives?	2	0: Adjacent land and water use planning does not take into account the needs of the protected area and activities/policies are detrimental to the survival of the area 1: Adjacent land and water use planning does not takes into account the long term need
Comments and Next Steps		
21a. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: Planning and management in the catchment or landscape containing the protected area incorporates provision for adequate environmental conditions (e.g. volume, quality and timing of water flow, air pol	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
21b. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: Management of corridors linking the protected area provides for wildlife passage to key habitats outside the protected area (e.g. to allow migratory fish to travel between freshwater spawning sites an	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
21c. Land and water planning for habitat conservation: "Planning adresses ecosystem-specific needs and/or the needs of particular species of concern at an ecosystem scale (e.g. volume, quality and timing of freshwater flow to sustain particular species,	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
22. State and commercial neighbours:Is there co-operation with adjacent land and water users?	1	0: There is no contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users 1: There is contact between managers and neighbouring official or corporate land and water users but little or no cooperation 2: There is contact between m
Comments and Next Steps		

23. Indigenous people: Do indigenous and traditional peoples resident or regularly using the protected area have input to management decisions?	1	0: Indigenous and traditional peoples have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area 1: Indigenous and traditional peoples have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management 2: Indigenou
Comments and Next Steps		
24. Local communities: Do local communities resident or near the protected area have input to management decisions?	1	0: Local communities have no input into decisions relating to the management of the protected area 1: Local communities have some input into discussions relating to management but no direct role in management 2: Local communities directly contribute to so
Comments and Next Steps		
24 a. Impact on communities: There is open communication and trust between local and/or indigenous people, stakeholders and protected area managers	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
24 b. Impact on communities: Programmes to enhance community welfare, while conserving protected area resources, are being implemented	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
24 c. Impact on communities: Local and/or indigenous people actively support the protected area	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
25. Economic benefit: Is the protected area providing economic benefits to local communities, e.g. income, employment, payment for environmental services?	2	0: The protected area does not deliver any economic benefits to local communities 1: Potential economic benefits are recognised and plans to realise these are being developed 2: There is some flow of economic benefits to local communities 3: There is a
Comments and Next Steps		
26. Monitoring and evaluation: Are management activities monitored against performance?	2	0: There is no monitoring and evaluation in the protected area 1: There is some ad hoc monitoring

		and evaluation, but no overall strategy and/or no regular collection of results 2: There is an agreed and implemented monitoring and evaluation system but re
Comments and Next Steps		
27. Visitor facilities: Are visitor facilities adequate?	-	0: There are no visitor facilities and services despite an identified need 1: Visitor facilities and services are inappropriate for current levels of visitation 2: Visitor facilities and services are adequate for current levels of visitation but could be
Comments and Next Steps		
28. Commercial tourism operators: Do commercial tour operators contribute to protected area management?	1	0: There is little or no contact between managers and tourism operators using the protected area 1: There is contact between managers and tourism operators but this is largely confined to administrative or regulatory matters 2: There is limited co-operati
Comments and Next Steps		
29. Fees: If fees (i.e. entry fees or fines) are applied, do they help protected area management?	-	0: Although fees are theoretically applied, they are not collected 1: Fees are collected, but make no contribution to the protected area or its environs 2: Fees are collected, and make some contribution to the protected area and its environs 3: Fees are c
Comments and Next Steps		
30. Condition of values: What is the condition of the important values of the protected area as compared to when it was first designated?	2	0: Many important biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded 1: Some biodiversity, ecological or cultural values are being severely degraded 2: Some biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are being partially degraded b
Comments and Next Steps		
30a: Condition of values: The assessment of the condition of values is based on research and/or monitoring	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		

30b: Condition of values Specific management programmes are being implemented to address threats to biodiversity, ecological and cultural values	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
30c: Condition of values: Activities to maintain key biodiversity, ecological and cultural values are a routine part of park management	1	0: No 1: Yes
Comments and Next Steps		
TOTAL SCORE	65	

11 Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

One interviewee mentioned that the salary of the Project Manager in this project (and other such projects) is not financially sustainable and will inevitably lead to lost institutional capacity within government, as such salaries cannot be sustained. The interviewee recommends that project salaries be more commensurate with government salaries with a certain maximum or cap established.

This comment has not been included in the report in the section on Financial sustainability as the evaluator and other stakeholders interviewed are of the opinion that sustainability of project results is dependent on building the capacity of technical staff and policy makers, and not the Project Manager. Project management is a separate function that is always dependent on the lifecycle of projects, and therefore is not the goal of capacity building efforts. Furthermore, salaries must be competitive in order to attract candidates with the right mix of skills for managing a large UNDP/GEF project.

12 Clearance Form to be completed by CO and RCU and included in final document

Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: _____
Signature: _____ Date:_____

UNDP- GEF- RCU

Name: _____
Signature: _____ Date:_____